
Downtown Eastside Demographic Study of SRO and Social Housing Tenants

April 2008

Prepared for:
City of Vancouver
BC Housing
The Vancouver Agreement

Prepared by:
Martha Lewis, TRAC Tenant Resource & Advisory Centre
Kathleen Boyes, Neighbourhood Housing Society
Dale McClanaghan, McClanaghan & Associates
Jason Copas, McClanaghan & Associates

	Page
Executive Summary	1
About the Study and Methodology	3
About this Study	3
About the Sampling Strategy	3
About the Survey Instrument	4
About the Field Research	4
Project Management	5
Protecting the Reliability and Validity of the Research	6
About the SRO Residents	7
About the Sample of Responses Obtained	7
Socio-demographic Profile	7
Economic Profile	11
Housing History and Housing Situation	14
History of Homelessness and Frequency of Moves	20
Future Housing Plans	22
Health Profile	24
Patterns of Service Use	27
Drug and Cigarette Use	29
Satisfaction with their Housing	31
Problems in their Building	35
Best and Worst Things about their Housing and the Downtown Eastside	38
Concluding Comments	40
About the Social Housing Residents	41
About the Sample of Responses Obtained	41
Socio-demographic Profile	42
Economic Profile	46
Housing History and Housing Situation	48
History of Homelessness and Frequency of Moves	53
Future Housing Plans	55
Health Profile	56
Patterns of Service Use	58
Drug and Cigarette Use	60
Satisfaction with their Housing	62
Problems in their Building	66
Best and Worst Things about their Housing and the Downtown Eastside	68
Concluding Comments	69
Appendices	70

Executive Summary

This report provides a picture of the socio-demographic and economic profile of residents living in the SROs and social housing in the Downtown Eastside. Market housing, care facilities, treatment centres and shelters were not included in this study.

The information collected through this study is intended to inform future policy decisions and is designed to gain a better understanding of the needs and circumstances of residents living in the SRO and social housing in Vancouver's Downtown Eastside. Information about residents in SRO and social housing is provided along a number of dimensions including:

- Their general socio-demographic and economic profile;
- Their general housing situation;
- Their income and income source;
- Their language and cultural heritage;
- The condition and cost of their housing;
- Their general satisfaction with their housing;
- Their housing history including history of homelessness;
- Their future housing intentions;
- Their general health status; and,
- Their service and support needs.

In addition, the study provides information on:

- i. Differences in the population characteristics and tenant profile of residents living in larger SRO hotels (over 40 units) versus SROs of under 40 units;
- ii. Differences in the housing conditions and circumstances across different groups based on their different housing/management arrangements;
- iii. Differences along a number of demographic sub-dimensions including gender, Aboriginal status, and poor health status.

Much of the sub-group analysis is provided in tabular form in the Appendices.

The Study Findings

The body of this report discusses the research findings along the dimensions of SRO and social housing residents. It was necessary to disaggregate the data and subsequent analysis into these two major groups as the profile of the residents, as well as their housing, was adjudged to be distinct. For example, social housing respondents were far more likely than SRO respondents to be seniors, female and born outside of Canada. Adding to the mix, the Downtown Eastside includes Vancouver's historic Chinatown with many of the social housing respondents being of Chinese origin and living in this unique area. As such, attempts to analyze the findings as a single group would merely blend the findings of these distinct populations. For those wishing to compare the two populations along key dimensions, Appendix A provides a summary comparison. The list on the following page provides highlights from the study along the SRO and social housing resident profiles.

SRO Residents (Total of 628 respondents)

- 79% were male while 20% were female; 1% were transgender;
- Average age was 46 while 64% were between the ages of 35 and 54;
- 68% were Caucasian while 21% were Aboriginal or Metis;
- 90% lived in single person households;
- 13% were born in Vancouver and 4% elsewhere in Metro Vancouver;
- 60% received Income Assistance (i.e. welfare); 21% were employed; 12% received a federal pension; and 7% had other income sources;
- The average total monthly income from all sources was \$1,109;
- 77% reported incomes of under \$15,000/year;
- 68% reported rents of \$375/mo. or more with the average being \$395;
- 45% had lived in the DTES for 5 years or more;
- 45% had lived in their current housing for less than 1 year;
- 71% reported their previous home had been in the City of Vancouver;
- 11% had arrived directly from an emergency shelter or from the street;
- 52% had previously been homeless and 52% had stayed at a shelter;
- 43% had previously been married while 46% had children;
- 30% had previously applied for social housing;
- 28% assessed their health as poor or terrible;
- 79% reported health concerns with 47% identifying multiple concerns;
- 40% visited an emergency room in the past year; 21% were hospitalized;
- 52% reported using drugs including 28% who used drugs frequently;
- 77% reported smoking including 52% who smoked frequently;
- 41% said their current housing was worse than their previous housing.

Social Housing Residents (Total of 658 respondents)

- 49% were born outside Canada while 9% were born in Vancouver;
- 56% were male while 44% were female;
- Average age was 58 while 55% were age 55 or older;
- 43% were Caucasian, 38% Asian and 14% were Aboriginal or Metis;
- 76% lived in single person households;
- 51% received a federal pension; 25% received Income Assistance (welfare); 17% were employed; and 7% had other income sources;
- The average total monthly income from all sources was \$1,143;
- 72% had incomes under \$15,000/year;
- 28% reported rents of under \$325/mo. with the average being \$386;
- 69% had lived in the DTES for 5 years or more;
- 50% had lived in their current housing for 5 years or more;
- 83% reported their previous home had been in the City of Vancouver;
- 28% had previously been homeless while 30% had stayed at a shelter;
- 65% were or had previously been married while 63% had children;
- 31% assessed their health as poor or terrible;
- 75% reported health concerns with 37% identifying multiple concerns;
- 26% visited an emergency room in the past year; 21% were hospitalized;
- 15% reported using drugs including 7% who used drugs frequently;
- 42% reported smoking including 30% who smoked frequently;
- 13% indicated their current housing was worse than their previous housing while 63% felt their housing was better than previously.

About the Study and Methodology

About this Study

The Vancouver Agreement Housing Task Team contracted with TRAC Tenant Resource & Advisory Centre, the Neighbourhood Housing Society (NHS) as well as Dale McClanaghan and Jason Copas of McClanaghan & Associates to assist in preparing an up-dated picture of the socio-demographic and economic profile of residents living the SRO housing stock and social housing units in Vancouver's Downtown Eastside.

The information collected through this study is intended to inform future policy decisions and is designed to gain a better understanding of the needs and circumstances of residents living in the SRO and social housing in Vancouver's Downtown Eastside including information on:

- Their general socio-demographic and economic profile;
- Their general housing situation;
- Their income and income source;
- Their language and cultural heritage;
- The condition and cost of their housing;
- Their general satisfaction with their housing;
- Their housing history including history of homelessness;
- Their future housing intentions;
- Their general health status; and,
- Their service and support needs.

About the Sampling Strategy

The report prepared by the City of Vancouver titled "*2007 Survey of Low Income Housing in the Downtown Core*", estimated that there were approximately 4,993 single room occupancy (SRO) hotel units and 5,171 social housing units in Vancouver's Downtown Eastside. Using the City of Vancouver report as a framework, the focus of this study was to obtain a random sample of responses from across a large and statistically reliable sample of SRO hotel and social housing residents in the Downtown Eastside.

The sampling framework which was developed used a stratified random sample approach designed to take into account differences in hotel size and geographic location. The use of this approach helped remove the potential for bias from the over-representation of certain building or housing types and ensure that a representative sample of responses was obtained from across the area. The social housing sample was also structured to take into consideration difference in program priorities including differences across family, senior, mixed and special needs or "other"¹ housing developments.

¹ "Other" housing includes a diverse mix of housing targeted to a mix of client groups and which include a broad range of housing and support options.

The sampling framework was also designed to create the capacity for the research team to provide members of the Vancouver Agreement Housing Task Team with information on:

- The population characteristics of SRO residents and tenants living in social housing in Vancouver's Downtown Eastside;
- Differences in the population characteristics and tenant profile of residents living in SRO buildings with 40 units or more compared to those living in buildings with fewer than 40 units;
- Differences in the housing conditions and housing circumstances across different groups based on their different housing/management arrangements;
- Differences in gender, age and ethnicity, including Aboriginal identity, as well as differences in language and cultural backgrounds; and,
- Differences in the general health needs and patterns of service use across the different client groups.

Confidence Level

The sample of responses across the SRO developments (628) and social housing (658) developments helped to provide for a high degree of confidence in the reliability of the reported findings with a sample of this size generating a confidence level of $\pm 4\%$ 19 times out of 20.

It is recommended that any analysis conducted on smaller demographic sub-groups take into account the sample size of that sub-group prior to drawing conclusions about that entire sub-population across the Downtown Eastside.

About the Survey Instrument

The data was collected through face to face interviews using a survey instrument which was developed in consultation with a Steering Committee which included representatives from the City of Vancouver, BC Housing, the Vancouver Agreement, Vancouver Coastal Health Authority, the Ministry of Employment and Income Assistance (MEIA), the Office of Housing and Construction Standards and CMHC. The survey included both open-ended and closed-ended questions designed to help provide insight into the various aspects of the housing and living situation of SRO and social housing residents living in the Downtown Eastside.

About the Field Research

The research was conducted by a team of 28 researchers over a 5 month period between September 2007 and January 2008. The initial team of researchers was identified through service agencies who work in the Downtown Eastside area with the researchers being selected on the basis of their ability to carry out the work as well as their knowledge of the area.

The initial pool of researchers were individuals who were living in the SRO hotels at the time that the research was completed and who were familiar with the types of issues and challenges which may arise.

As some of the initial pool of researchers dropped out of the study, new researchers were added through the contact base of existing researchers as well as from study team members. A notice for researchers was also posted on Craigslist and some researchers were found through this means.

Researcher Training

Each of the researchers received approximately four hours of training on how to administer the survey and record the responses. The training included working with each of the individual researchers to ensure that they had a clear understanding of the intent of each of the survey questions and an understanding of the type of responses that were expected. The training also included a review of different interview techniques and probes which could be used to gather more complete information from study participants.

The training was designed to ensure that the researchers made it clear to study participants that their participation in the study was voluntary and that the members of the research team understood and respected this principle. Each of the researchers also signed an "oath of confidentiality" as part of their training. The oath of confidentiality was designed to ensure that each of the researchers understood the importance of respecting the rights and privacy of those who agreed to participate in the study.

Participant Incentive

The study team considered using the practice of a small financial incentive to encourage participation in the study. Due to the large number of community researchers who would be required to collect the data, as well as the challenging environment in which they were conducting the research it was determined that this approach to providing an incentive would not be viable. As an alternative, the study team provided the community researchers with cigarettes which they were able to offer to willing participants. This approach proved successful in gaining the participation of some potential respondents.

Project Management

Each of the researchers completed surveys at a pace that was suitable to their capability and availability. While a total of 28 researchers assisted in the survey administration process, over 80% of the surveys were collected by a core team of 10 researchers.

The researchers were given weekly assignments based on the sampling strategy established at the outset of the study. The weekly assignments

included the assignment of specific buildings (SROs or social housing) as well as an indication of the number of surveys to be completed in each.

The assignment of specific buildings and response quotas helped to ensure that a random sample of responses was obtained from across the study universe and that specific hotels or geographic areas were not over-represented. A similar approach was developed for the social housing sample which included a mix of responses across senior, special needs and family housing as well as mixed developments.

Protecting the Reliability and Validity of the Research

In addition to establishing a rigorous sampling framework, other measures were taken to protect the reliability and validity of the findings including:

1. All of the researchers participated in a training session before conducting the field research.
2. Weekly meetings were scheduled with the researchers to review their surveys for completeness and accuracy.
3. The researchers were asked to complete their surveys on different days of the week and at different times of the day (morning, afternoon and evening) in order to minimize the potential for bias (i.e. those who work may be out during the day²).
4. Random follow-up visits were completed with a sample of hotels and social housing developments to provide the necessary assurance that the researchers had visited the specified locations and that they had completed the surveys. In cases where this assurance could not be obtained, the responses were dropped from the sample.

Recognition of the Dedication and Commitment of the Research Team

The project team would like to recognize the high level of dedication and commitment on the part of the researchers who completed this research. For some, this research started out as a way to earn some extra money to make ends meet. For others, there was a personal interest and commitment to the study objectives and a desire to learn more about the experiences of those living in Vancouver's Downtown Eastside. As the study progressed, a core group of researchers persisted and it is they who best understood that they were helping to "give a voice to the voiceless street".

Researchers who made significant contributions included Liz Barr, Paul Campbell, Judy Johanson, Darlene Mahyr-Richardson, Laura Mayne, Keith Pilipchuck, Paul Rutherford, Patrick Santoro, Jerry Shallow, April Smith, Michael Tripper, Shelley Xu, Sunny Yu, Natalie and Rosa.

² In total, 33% of the surveys conducted in the SROs were conducted in the evening (after 5 PM) while an additional 13% were conducted on the weekend.

SRO: ABOUT THE RESIDENTS

About the Sample of Responses Obtained

This section provides a summary of the responses received from across the SRO residents who were surveyed. The findings reported in this section are based on a total of 628 surveys from across 97 hotels. A response rate of 628 surveys provides the desired confidence level of $\pm 4\%$ for reported findings, 19 times out of 20.

Socio-demographic Profile

This section provides a general summary of the socio-demographic profile of SRO residents including information on their:

- Gender
- Age
- Ethnicity and Cultural Diversity
- Educational Attainment
- Aboriginal Status
- Languages Spoken
- Place of Birth
- Childhood Experiences and Life Course

Gender

Male respondents accounted for 79% of the total while female respondents accounted for 20% of the total. One percent was transgender.

Gender

	Frequency	Valid Percent ³
Male	495	78.8
Female	126	20.1
Transgender	7	1.1
Total	628	100.0

Age

Reported ages of respondents ranged from 18 to 88 with the average age of respondents being 46. Among the male respondents, the average age was 47 while the average age among female respondents was 43. The average age of the transgender respondents was 37.

³ The term 'valid percent' accounts for all those who responded to the particular question under consideration. Those failing to provide a response are dropped from the total to allow the working or 'valid' percent to add up to 100%.

Age Distribution

The largest group of respondents (35%) were in the 45-54 age cohort with those 35-44 accounting for an additional 29%. Only 7% were seniors (65 years of age or older) while 4% were under the age of 25.

Age

	Frequency	Valid Percent
0-24	22	3.5
25-34	73	11.7
35-44	179	28.7
45-54	217	34.8
55-64	89	14.3
65-84	42	6.7
85+	1	.2
Total who responded ⁴	623	100.0
Did not respond	5	
Total	628	

Household Type

Ninety percent reported their household was a single person household while the remaining 10% were distributed across households comprised of 2 or more unrelated individuals living together (5%), couples without children (3%), and families with one or more children of dependent age (1%).

Ethnicity and Aboriginal Status

Two in 3 respondents (68%) reported that they were Caucasian while 6% were of an Asian ethnicity. Seventeen percent were First Nations while an additional 4% were Metis.

Ethnicity

	Frequency	Valid Percent
Asian	36	5.7
Black	13	2.1
Caucasian	426	67.8
First Nations	105	16.7
Hispanic	11	1.8
Other (including Metis)	35	5.6
No response	2	.3
Total	628	100.0

⁴ In many cases, respondents did not respond to a particular question; analysis was conducted upon those providing a response. The number who did not respond and the total sample is also provided in the tables.

Educational Attainment

Sixty-six percent reported that they had attended high school while 11% reported that they had attended only elementary school. Of those who had attended high school, less than half (44%) had graduated. An additional 22% of respondents reported that they had attended trade or vocational school or had gone to college or university.

Languages Spoken

Approximately 89% of all respondents reported that English was their primary language.

Cantonese and Mandarin speakers accounted for 4% of the total sample within the SROs while French and Spanish speakers each accounted for 2% of the total. A large number of other languages were also reported although any of the other languages identified accounted for less than 1%. Overall, there were 20 different languages identified as primary languages.

Place of Birth

Eighteen percent of respondents reported that they were born outside Canada while 50% reported that they were born in Canada outside of BC.

Place of birth

	Frequency	Valid Percent
Vancouver	81	12.9
Elsewhere in Greater Vancouver	26	4.2
Elsewhere in BC	94	15.0
Elsewhere in Canada	315	50.3
Outside of Canada	110	17.6
Total who responded	626	100.0
Did not respond	2	
Total	628	

Childhood Experiences and Life Course

The study looked at a number of different indicators related to the childhood experiences of survey respondents to determine if it was possible to gain any additional insight into their general life course and the different types of factors which may have contributed to their current housing situation. Some of the specific questions which were considered include:

1. The age at which respondents left home;
2. Their history of being in foster care; and,
3. Their history of incarceration.

Age Leaving Home

Forty-four percent of respondents reported they were 16 or younger when they left home while 81% reported leaving home before they were 20. The average age for respondents leaving home was 17.

Age first left home

	Frequency	Valid Percent
20 or older	115	18.8
17-19	227	37.1
16 or younger	270	44.1
Total who responded	612	100.0
Did not respond	16	
Total	628	

History of being in Public Care Facility

When asked whether they had ever been in some public care facility such as a foster home, group home, prison or mental health institution, more than 1 in 3 (36%) indicated that they had been in some form of public care while 63% reported that this was not the case.

History of being in a public care facility

	Frequency	Valid Percent
Yes	226	36.0
No	395	62.9
No response	7	1.1
Total	628	100.0

Type of Public Care

Fourteen percent of the respondents reported that they had been in foster care at some point during their lives⁵ while 4% reported that they had been in a group home.

Eighteen percent reported that they had been in prison at some point in their lives⁶ while 2% had attended residential school. An additional 2% had been in a long term mental health institution.

⁵ The average age of SRO respondents who had been in foster care was 42.

⁶ The average age of SRO respondents who had been in prison was 46.

Economic Profile

This section looks at the economic circumstances of those living in the SRO housing including data related to:

1. Their income and income source;
2. Access to employment opportunities;
3. Nature of employment opportunities;
4. Availability to work;
5. Average monthly income;
6. Annual income; and,
7. Average monthly rental payment.

Income and Income Source

The majority of respondents reported that their primary source of income was Income Assistance with 60% indicating this to be the case. Additionally, 21% of respondents reported that their primary source of income was from employment while 12% of respondents reported that they received Federal Disability Benefits or a senior's pension.

Principal source of income in past year

	Frequency	Valid Percent
Employment	132	21.1
Employment Insurance	19	3.0
Income Assistance	375	59.8
Federal Pension (senior or disability)	73	11.6
Retirement income or private pensions	8	1.3
Student loans	2	.3
Grey economy	12	1.9
Other	6	1.0
Total who responded	627	100.0
Did not respond	1	
Total	628	

Nature of Employment

When asked to indicate the nature of their employment, the majority of respondents (55%) declined to provide a response, likely suggesting that this question did not apply to a large number of respondents. Of those reporting an active source of employment income, 24% indicated that they had a job with responses split between those reporting full time and part time employment (12% each). Smaller numbers of respondents indicated their principle income source as via 'labour ready' or temp agencies, collecting bottles/cans or binning, volunteer activities or through the sex trade.

Principle employment income source amongst those actively earning an income

	Frequency	Percent
Full time regular employment	76	12.1
Part time regular employment	77	12.3
Labour ready or temp agencies	33	5.3
Squeeging, binning, collecting bottles	31	4.9
Sex trade work	22	3.5
Volunteer	25	4.0
Other	17	2.7
Total who responded	281	44.7
Did not respond	347	55.3
Total	628	100.0

Availability to Work

When asked about availability to work, 46% were able to work while 48% indicated that they were not able to work. While self reporting may not always provide a reliable measure of actual capability and availability to work, the findings nonetheless suggest that, given access to the right opportunities or training, some individuals living in the SRO housing stock may be able to be integrated into the workforce.

Able to work

	Frequency	Valid Percent
Yes	290	46.3
No	302	48.2
Unsure	33	5.3
No response	2	.3
Total who responded	627	100.0
Did not respond	1	
Total	628	

Average Incomes

The average monthly income for respondents was reported to be \$1,109. This ranged from \$838 for individuals receiving income assistance to \$1,887 for those who reported income from employment. Those receiving Federal Disability Benefits or a senior's pension reported an average monthly income of \$1,019 while those receiving a private pension reported an average monthly income of \$1,120.

A Note on Reported Incomes and Income Assistance (IA) Rates

The text in this box provides some context in relation to the reported incomes of respondents. As a very general observation, average reported incomes appear higher than Income Assistance rates for singles expected to work, however, a significant number of SRO residents qualify for higher benefit rates (eg. through disability or persistent multiple barriers). The following text provides a baseline for the different benefit rates and how they could have an impact on reported incomes.

Current rates of Income Assistance (combined with other government benefits) are \$639 for singles expected to work, \$687 for single persons with persistent multiple barriers, and \$941 for persons with disabilities as compared to the average monthly income of IA recipients in this study (\$838). It is important to note a number of caveats pertaining to these findings. First, while the study did not ask individuals to specify which rate of Income Assistance they received (able to work, persistent multiple barriers, permanently disabled, couple) many of the study respondents reported a number of chronic health and/or addictions conditions which would be consistent with the profile of those with persistent multiple barriers or with disabilities. Those individuals would therefore receive larger monthly Income Assistance benefits than singles expected to work, a fact which will be reflected in the reported incomes in the study.

In addition, 1 in 10 respondent household in the SRO population were not single person households and would qualify for higher assistance rates (for example, couples expected to work receive IA benefits of \$935 per month). Moreover, a number of respondents spoke of having supplementary sources of income above and beyond the 'primary' source (in this case, Income Assistance). This question asked respondents to estimate their total income from all sources and, to the extent that those responding to the survey have secondary sources of income, these sources would be reflected in the total incomes discussed herein. A number of study respondents indicated supplementing their incomes through such sources as labour ready or temp work, bottle collecting and sex trade work.

Annual Income

Seventy-seven percent reported an annual income of \$15,000 or less while 1 in 10 reported an annual income of between \$15,000 and \$20,000. The remaining 13% reported an annual income of more than \$20,000.

Income range

	Frequency	Valid Percent
\$0-\$9,999	180	32.0
\$10,000-\$14,999	250	44.5
\$15,000-\$19,999	54	9.6
\$20,000-\$24,999	30	5.3
\$25,000-\$29,999	12	2.1
\$30,000+	36	6.4
Total who responded	562	100.0
Did not respond	66	
Total	628	

Monthly Rent

The average reported rent for SRO respondents was \$395 per month. The study findings also suggest that 88% paid between \$325 and \$500 per month for their housing with 30% paying \$375 per month – the current shelter portion allowed for single persons under income assistance.

Rent Range

	Frequency	Valid Percent
>\$500	47	7.7
\$376-\$500	184	30.1
\$375	185	30.2
\$325-\$374	172	28.1
<\$325	24	3.9
Total who responded	612	100.0
Did not respond	16	
Total	628	

Housing History and Housing Situation

This section looks at a number of different aspects related to the housing history and housing situation of SRO respondents including:

1. Their length of time in the Downtown Eastside and their current housing;
2. Their prior place of residence and their previous housing arrangements;
3. Their ties to the community and the Greater Vancouver area;
4. Changes in their personal circumstances;
5. Their main reasons for moving from their previous housing; and,
6. Their main reasons for moving to the Downtown Eastside area.

Length of Time in the Downtown Eastside

One in 5 (21%) reported that they had lived in the Downtown Eastside for one year or less while 45% had lived there for at least 5 years.

Time in DTES

	Frequency	Valid Percent
Less than 6 months	68	10.8
6 months to 1 year	66	10.5
Between 1 and 2 years	70	11.1
Between 2 and 5 years	135	21.5
More than 5 years	284	45.2
Unsure	3	.5
No response	2	.3
Total	628	100.0

Length of Time in their Current Housing

Sixteen percent had lived in their current housing for 5 years or more while almost half (45%) had lived in their current housing for one year or less.

Time at address

	Frequency	Valid Percent
Less than 6 months	156	24.8
6 months to 1 year	128	20.4
Between 1 and 2 years	132	21.0
Between 2 and 5 years	114	18.2
More than 5 years	98	15.6
Total	628	100.0

Prior Place of Residence

When asked where they had lived prior to moving to their current housing, 71% reported that their previous housing had been in Vancouver while 14% reported that they were previously living elsewhere in Metro Vancouver.

While the table on page 10 notes that relatively few respondents were born in Vancouver or Metro Vancouver, the current findings clearly indicate that the large majority of respondents had most recently lived elsewhere in Vancouver or Metro Vancouver. This suggests that a very significant number of residents of the Downtown Eastside initially moved to Vancouver from outside the Metro Vancouver region and only later found themselves living in the DTES neighbourhood. Conversely, relatively few residents moved directly to the DTES from destinations outside Metro Vancouver. Phrased differently, even if not born here, a large number of residents of the DTES have ties to, and have put down roots in, the City of Vancouver.

Location of previous housing

	Frequency	Valid Percent
DTES	245	39.0
Elsewhere in City of Vancouver	199	31.7
Elsewhere in Lower Mainland	86	13.7
Elsewhere in BC	33	5.3
Outside of BC	65	10.4
Total	628	100.0

Ties to the Community and the Greater Vancouver area

Adding to the above picture, while a large percentage of respondents reported that their previous place of residence was in Vancouver, only 16%

of all SRO respondents had attended school in Vancouver (either elementary school or high school). An additional 11% reported that they had attended school somewhere in the Greater Vancouver area while 17% reported that they had attended school elsewhere in B.C. A significant majority of respondents, (62%) reported that they had attended school outside B.C.⁷

Previous Housing Arrangements

One in 3 (33%) had lived in another SRO unit prior to moving to their current housing. An additional 30% reported that they had previously lived in other rental housing including a private apartment (17%), a private suite in a house (10%) or social housing (3%). More than 1 in 10 (11%) had either stayed at an emergency shelter (5%) or had lived on the streets (6%) prior to moving into their current housing.

Previous housing type

	Frequency	Valid Percent
House	30	4.8
Private apartment	106	17.0
Private suite in house	65	10.4
Room in place shared with others	55	8.8
Stayed with family or friends	40	6.4
Subsidized housing	15	2.4
Supported housing	5	.8
SRO	214	34.3
Emergency shelter	34	5.4
Jail	5	.8
Hospital	4	.6
Recovery House	7	1.1
Homeless/on street	35	5.6
Other	9	1.4
Total who responded	624	100.0
Did not respond	4	
Total	628	

Previously Married

In spite of the large majority of singles, when asked to disclose their prior marital status, 43% reported that they had previously been married while 57% had never been married.

⁷ Some respondent attended school in a number of jurisdictions thereby accounting for a total of >100%.

Previously married

	Frequency	Valid Percent
Yes	267	42.5
No	358	57.0
No response	3	.5
Total	628	100.0

Children

Almost half (46%) reported that they had children while 54% did not have children. Respondents were then asked whether they had children aged 18 or younger (i.e. children of dependent age). Of those who responded, 69% reported having children of a dependent age including 32% with 2 or more children 18 or younger.

Have children

	Frequency	Valid Percent
Yes	283	45.5
No	333	53.5
No response	6	1.0
Total who responded	622	100.0
Did not respond	6	
Total	628	

Finally, respondents were asked to specify whether they were in contact with their child or children. Of those who were parents and who responded, 45% indicated that they were in regular contact with their children. More than 1 in 3 (36%) were not in contact with their children.

In contact with children

	Frequency	Valid Percent
Yes, regularly	123	44.6
Only sometimes/some of them	55	19.9
No	98	35.5
Total who responded	276	100.0
Did not respond	352	
Total	628	

Changes in Personal Circumstances

When asked whether they had experienced any changes in their personal circumstances in the past year which had an impact on their housing situation, 31% reported this to be the case.

Life changes affecting housing in past year

	Frequency	Valid Percent
Yes	195	31.1
No	414	65.9
Unsure	9	1.4
No response	10	1.6
Total	628	100.0

Among those who indicated a change in their personal circumstances, health-related concerns (including addiction issues, age and mental illness) were the most frequently cited concern followed by a breakdown in relationships with family or friends and a loss of employment or financial hardship.

Type of life change

	Frequency	Valid Percent
Relationship or family problems or breakdown	43	23.0
Fight/dispute with roommate/neighbour	15	8.0
Financial issues	27	14.4
Health issues/age/drug use	72	38.5
Eviction or landlord problems	16	8.6
Got out of/went to jail	5	2.7
Issues of poor housing	5	2.7
Other (new job, government assistance, theft)	3	1.5
Total who responded	187	100.0
Did not respond	441	
Total	628	

Main Reason for Moving from Their Previous Housing

Survey respondents were also asked to indicate the reasons why they had moved from their previous housing with the table on the following page providing an overview of the range of responses received:

Main reason for previous move

	Frequency	Valid Percent
<i>Push related factors</i>	486	78.9
Bad or unsafe housing environment	94	15.3
Affordability issues	82	13.3
Needed shelter/last place closed or was sold	79	12.8
Eviction or landlord issues	75	12.2
Family or relationship issues	67	10.9
Difficulties with roommate or neighbour	42	6.8
Drug or alcohol use or health/health issues	31	5.0
Loss of employment	16	2.6
<i>Pull related factors</i>	118	19.3
Needed change/independence/better housing	48	7.9
Pursuit of employment or education	32	5.2
Moved to Vancouver/Canada	26	4.2
Access to services/amenities/gov't assistance	12	2.0
<i>Other</i>	11	1.8
Total who responded	615	100.0
Did not respond	13	
Total	628	

In analyzing the different responses received, it would appear that *push-related factors* such as poor quality or unsafe housing, affordability issues, eviction, failed relationships, loss of employment and other factors largely dictated their decision/need to move with 79% citing a push-related reason for leaving their previous housing.

Pull-related factors appear to play a key role in 19% of the cases with these respondents reporting a desire for more independence, a bigger place or better housing, a decision to move to Vancouver or the pursuit of education or employment as some of the factors contributing to their decision to move.

Reason for Moving to the Downtown Eastside Area

Respondents were also asked to identify the types of reasons that contributed to their decision to move to the Downtown Eastside with the following table providing a summary of the list of reasons provided. Financial reasons were by far the biggest single reason people first moved to the Downtown Eastside area.

Main reason for first moving to Downtown Eastside

	Frequency	Valid Percent
<i>Push related factors</i>	319	52.8
Cheap rent/only thing financially available	223	36.9
Needed shelter/nowhere else to go/lost job	38	6.3
Relationship breakdown	33	5.5
Health issues	20	3.3
Legal issues	5	0.8
<i>Pull related factors</i>	214	35.4
Employment/education reasons	69	11.4
'Lifestyle' issues including partying, drugs, etc.	52	8.6
Be with or near family or friends	36	6.0
Access to services and amenities	34	5.6
Get better or own place	16	2.6
It is my home	7	1.2
<i>Other or 'ad hoc' reasons⁸</i>	71	11.7
Total who responded	604	100.0
Did not respond	24	
Total	628	

In reviewing the list of reasons given, 53% identified *push-related factors* such as affordability issues, basic shelter needs or health/relationship issues as playing a role in their decision to first move to the Downtown Eastside.

One in 3 respondents (35%) identified *pull-related factors* including considerations related to lifestyle, employment, education as well as access to services and amenities. Some respondents also mentioned that they had moved to the Downtown Eastside to be closer to family or friends. An additional 12% provided ad hoc reasons such as 'accidental' reasons.

History of Homelessness and Frequency of Moves

History of Evictions and Frequency of Moves

Survey respondents were asked about the number of times that they had moved in the past year as well as the number of times that they had been evicted. Half (50%) had moved at least once in the past year with 1 in 5 (19%) reporting that they had moved more than once. In addition, 13% had been evicted in the past year.

Reasons for Eviction

Of the 81 respondents who indicated that they had been evicted in the past year, the following were the reasons that were given for their eviction:

⁸ "Ad hoc" reasons include visited by decided to stay, moved 'by accident', and preferable climate.

- Drug use/poor or unsanitary practices (27%);
- Non-payment of rent (25%);
- Conflict with owner/manager or kicked out (23%);
- Discrimination/victimization (17%);
- Building was closed, sold or condemned (6%).

History of Homelessness

The survey included questions around the extent to which respondents had experienced homelessness in the past year including patterns of shelter use, episodes of 'sofa surfing' and periods of 'sleeping rough' or on the street.

Patterns of Shelter Use

Over half (52%) had used an emergency shelter at some point in their lives. Twenty-two percent had used an emergency shelter within the past year with 12% reporting that they had used an emergency shelter more than once.

Use of shelter

	Frequency	Valid Percent
Yes	324	51.6
No	300	47.8
No response	4	.6
Total	628	100.0

Episodes of Sofa Surfing

Almost half (48%) had stayed with family or friends at least once in the past because they had no where else to stay. Seventeen percent had stayed with family or friends in the past year while 11% indicated that they had stayed with family or friends on more than one occasion.

Stay with family or friends (Sofa surf)

	Frequency	Valid Percent
Yes	300	47.8
No	323	51.4
No response	5	.8
Total	628	100.0

Living on the Streets or 'Sleeping Rough'

Over half (52%) reported having slept rough at some point in their lives. Twenty percent of all respondents reported that they had slept rough in the

past year with 1 in 4 of those reporting a single episode and 3 in 4 reporting two or more episodes.

Sleep rough

	Frequency	Valid Percent
Yes	326	51.9
No	300	47.8
No response	2	.3
Total	628	100.0

Prior History of Living in Social Housing and Reasons for Moving

Respondents were asked whether they had previously lived in social housing. Fourteen percent reported that they had previously lived in social housing. Eviction and relationship issues were the most commonly cited reasons for leaving social housing (3% each) followed by economic reasons, unsafe or unsatisfactory housing, and a desire to move (1%-2% each). Two individuals (less than 1% of all respondents) indicated either a change in family composition (i.e. their children became independent) or the closing of the building as their reason for leaving social housing.

Previously lived in social housing

	Frequency	Valid Percent
Yes	87	13.9
No	534	85.4
Unsure	4	.6
Total who responded	625	100.0
Did not respond	3	
Total	628	

Future Housing Plans

Respondents were asked about their future housing plans including:

1. Their desire to leave the Downtown Eastside;
2. Preferred housing locations;
3. Amount of time expected to remain in the Downtown Eastside; and,
4. Whether they had ever applied to live in social housing.

Desire to Leave the Downtown Eastside

Sixteen percent indicated that they would like to continue to live in the Downtown Eastside while 70% reported that they would move elsewhere.⁹

Move from DTES if could afford to

	Frequency	Valid Percent
Yes	438	69.7
No	103	16.4
Unsure	81	12.9
No response	6	1.0
Total	628	100.0

Preferred Locations

Of those indicating a preference to move, 43% reported that they would like to live elsewhere in Vancouver. One in 4 (26%) reported they would like to live elsewhere in Metro Vancouver.

Where respondents would chose to move

	Frequency	Valid Percent
Vancouver West Side	51	11.9
Vancouver Downtown	55	12.9
Vancouver East Side	78	18.3
Elsewhere in Greater Vancouver	111	26.0
Elsewhere in BC	41	9.6
Outside BC	28	6.6
Anywhere/unsure	63	14.8
Total who responded	427	100.0
Did not respond	201	
Total	628	

Application for Social Housing

Thirty percent reported that they had applied to live in social housing while 69% reported that they had never applied¹⁰. Fifty-five percent of those who had applied indicated that they had applied within the past 2 years.

⁹ The question as to where people would choose to live is a complex issue informed by a number of contending considerations. While many reported an interest in leaving the DTES, access to services and amenities was ranked high in response to another question, perhaps suggesting that, for some, the desire to leave the DTES may well be offset by the need to have ready access to these key services and amenities.

¹⁰ While the survey did not capture data as to why respondents had or had not applied to live in social housing, there may be many reasons for this. The notion (actual or by reputation) of a lengthy multi-year wait list before applicants may be considered for admission may be a factor, as may be the relative newness

Previously applied for social housing

	Frequency	Valid Percent
Yes ¹¹	187	30.1
No	430	69.1
Unsure	5	.8
Total who responded	622	100.0
Did not respond	6	
Total	628	

Expectation of Remaining in the Downtown Eastside Area

When asked how much longer they expected to continue to be living in the Downtown Eastside, 13% of respondents reported that they expected to still be living in the Downtown Eastside 5 years from now while 1 in 4 (26%) expected to leave within the next year. Almost half (45%) were unsure about how much longer they would remain in the Downtown Eastside.

How much longer in DTES

	Frequency	Valid Percent
Less than 1 year	160	25.6
1 to 2 years	62	9.9
2 to 5 years	39	6.2
More than 5 years	79	12.6
Unsure	281	44.9
No response	5	.8
Total who responded	626	100.0
Did not respond	2	
Total	628	

Health Profile

Self-Reported Health Assessment

Close to 1 in 3 (31%) reported that their health was *very good* or *excellent* while 41% rated their health as *average*. Twenty-eight percent rated their health as *poor* or *terrible*.

of subsidized housing provided for low income singles. Additionally, the very difficulties many individuals in the DTES face with 'agency' or acting with one's long term benefits in mind may inhibit or prevent some from applying. Finally, a simple lack of knowledge or information pertaining to where and how to apply for subsidized housing may play a role in some instances.

¹¹ In terms of those indicating they had previously applied to live in social housing, individuals 45 or older were more likely to have applied to live in social housing than those under 45 (33% compared to 27%). Thirty-eight percent of Aboriginal respondents had applied for social housing compared to 29% of Caucasians and 17% of Asians. Thirty-eight percent of females had applied compared to 27% of males.

Self assessed health

	Frequency	Valid Percent
Excellent	48	7.7
Very good	143	22.8
Average	256	40.9
Poor	149	23.8
Terrible	27	4.3
No response	3	.5
Total who responded	626	100.0
Did not respond	2	
Total	628	

Changes in Health

Respondents were asked if they had experienced any change in their health in the past year. Fourteen percent reported that their health was better than the previous year while 32% reported that their health had declined. More than half (54%) reported that their health had not changed.

Health compared to one year ago

	Frequency	Valid Percent
Much better	28	4.5
Somewhat better	59	9.4
About the same	337	53.7
Somewhat worse	130	20.7
Much worse	71	11.3
Unsure	2	.3
No response	1	.2
Total	628	100.0

Nature of Health Challenges

When asked if they had any specific health related concerns, 1 in 5 respondents (21%) reported that they did not have any health issues while 79% identified at least one health concern. Almost half (47%) identified multiple health concerns.

Specific Health Challenges Identified

When asked about their specific health challenges, the following provides an overview of the range of health concerns identified:

- Physical limitations (43%);
- Drug addiction (32%);

- Mental health issues (30%);
- TB, Hep C or HIV/AIDS (22%);
- Alcohol addiction¹² (20%);
- FAS/Brain injury (7%).

Rate of Hospitalization

Twenty-one percent reported that they had been hospitalized in the past year with 8% reporting that they had been hospitalized more than once.

Hospitalized in past year

	Frequency	Valid Percent
Yes	132	21.2
No	484	77.6
Unsure	7	1.1
Total who responded	624	100.0
Did not respond	5	
Total	628	

Emergency Room Use

Forty percent reported having used an emergency room at least once in the past year while 21% reported multiple visits. Of those who visited an emergency room, 86% reported that they had been hospitalized.

Emergency use in past year

	Frequency	Valid Percent
Yes	246	39.5
No	372	59.7
Unsure	4	.6
Total who responded	622	100.0
Did not respond	6	
Total	628	

Health Impact of Living in the Downtown Eastside

Respondents were asked whether living in the Downtown Eastside had compromised their health. Four in 10 (40%) reported that living in the Downtown Eastside had affected their health. Of those who believed that their health was compromised by living in the Downtown Eastside, the following table provides an overview of the types of challenges they faced.

¹² Eleven percent of respondents reported that they have both a drug and alcohol addiction.

How health is compromised

	Frequency	Valid Percent
Stress/anxiety/depression	95	39.7
Expose to drugs	47	19.7
Unhealthy environment ¹³	107	44.8
Violence/security issues	11	4.6
Other	3	1.3
Total who responded	239	100.0
Did not respond	389	
Total	628	

Patterns of Service Use

The study also explored the different service need and patterns of service use across SRO residents over the past year including their use of the following services:

- Income support;
- Job training/skills development;
- Food bank and meal program services;
- Mental health and addiction services;
- Hospitals and health clinics;
- Community centres;
- Safe injection site;
- Services and supports within their building.

The following table summarizes the percent of respondents who used each of the services and the number of users who reported frequent use of a service.

Use of Support Services

Support Service	% Reporting Use of Service	% Reporting Frequent Use
Income Support	64%	90%
Food Bank and Meal Programs	39%	56%
Health Clinic or Other Health Services	38%	33%
Community Centre	37%	51%
Hospital	32%	21%
Mental Health and Addictions Services	15%	48%
Job Training/ Skills Development	14%	42%
Safe Injection Site	9%	39%
On-Site Services and Supports	4%	56%

¹³ Unhealthy environment can include poor air quality, lack of cleanliness and exposure to sickness.

Specific Service Needs

The survey also included a question which asked respondents to identify the three (3) things that they need help with immediately and the extent to which they have been able to get the help that they needed. In looking at the range of responses received, it would appear that almost 3 in 4 (72%) identified at least one thing that they needed help with. Thirty-five percent were able to identify two needs they needed help with while 10% were able to identify three things that they needed help.

Among those who identified at least one thing, the following provides a summary of the list of needs that were identified:

- Housing-related needs (40%);
- Income and income support (19%);
- Health-related needs (16%);
- Skills training of access to employment (12%);
- Emotional support (6%).

In addition, 8% identified some other needs including:

- Diet and nutrition counseling;
- Access to transit;
- Assistance in leaving the Downtown Eastside;
- Legal aid and/or advocacy.

Extent to Which Needs Are Being Met

The survey asked respondents to indicate whether they have been successful in getting the help that they needed. Of those who identified at least one need, almost half (48%) reported that they felt that they had been successful in finding the assistance that they needed. At the same time, 1 in 5 (20%) reported that they had not been successful in getting the help that they needed while 31% reported that they were unsure.

Access to Basic Necessities including Food and Clothing

Respondents were also asked a number of questions about where they access basic necessities including food and clothing. This question was considered important in that many of the affordable retail options in the Downtown Eastside for basic supplies like food or clothing have closed down or gone out of business in the past 10-20 years making it all the more essential that viable options for the purchase of affordable necessities for low income residents remain within the community.

Access to Food

Respondents indicated they obtained food from the following sources¹⁴:

- Foodbank or meal program¹⁵ (32%);
- Large supermarkets or grocery stores¹⁶ (21%);
- Army and Navy (19%);
- Save on Meats (14%);
- Chinatown (7%);
- Sunrise Market (5%);
- Other¹⁷ (20%).

Access to Clothing

Respondents identified a number of places where they obtained clothing¹⁸ including:

- Donations, gifts, charities, free, binning (33%);
- Army and Navy (33%);
- Thrift shops such as Value Village (20%);
- Department stores, malls (11%);
- Chinatown (3%);
- Don't buy or need to buy clothes (2%).

An additional 6% of respondents did not respond to this question.

Drug and Cigarette Use

The survey asked respondents whether they used drugs or smoked cigarettes. More than 3 in 4 (77%) reported that they smoked with more than half (52%) indicating they were regular smokers. Over half (52%) used drugs including 28% who disclosed that they used drugs regularly.

¹⁴ A number of respondents provided more than one response, therefore total responses will add up to more than 100%.

¹⁵ These services included Salvation Army, Union Gospel Mission, Living Room, Mission Possible, 44, Harbour Light, Dugout, Womens' Centre, Evelyne Saller, Sisters of Atonement, Quest, First United Church.

¹⁶ These included Safeway, Superstore, Save on Foods, Buy Low Foods, Costco, IGA, T&T.

¹⁷ This included local stores, corner stores, local cafes and restaurants, fast food and pizza restaurants and other ad hoc responses.

¹⁸ A number of respondents provided more than one response, therefore total responses will add up to more than 100%.

Drug use

	Frequency	Valid Percent
Yes, frequently	176	28.2
Yes, only a bit or occasionally	149	23.9
No	286	45.8
No response	13	2.1
Total who responded	624	100.0
Did not respond	4	
Total	628	

Tobacco use

	Frequency	Valid Percent
Yes, frequently	323	51.5
Yes, only a bit or occasionally	158	25.2
No	143	22.8
No response	3	.5
Total who responded	627	100.0
Did not respond	1	
Total	628	

Type of Drug and Estimated Cost of Drug Use

Respondents were asked to identify the type of drug(s) that they use and to estimate the cost of their habit. Among those who indicated active drug use, over half (51% or 142 total respondents of the sample of 628) use pot while 35% (98 respondents) use crack. An additional 13% (36 respondents) reported using cocaine while 10% (28 respondents) reported using heroin. Four percent (10 respondents) reported that they use crystal meth.

Some respondents reported that they use more than one type of drug.

When asked to estimate the cost of their habit, the average cost was estimated to be \$30 per day. Eleven percent of respondents who actively use drugs (or 5% of the total sample of SRO respondents—32 of the 628 total respondents) reported that they spent \$100 or more per day on drugs. Forty-five percent of those with a drug habit reported that they spent \$20 or more per day on their habit while 34% spent between \$5 and \$19 daily. Twenty-two percent of respondents spent less than \$5 per day.

Finally, in terms of the age at which respondents reported starting to use drugs, of those responding to this question 57% reported beginning their drug use at age 16 or younger. With regard to alcohol use, 73% reported beginning their alcohol use at age 16 or younger.

Satisfaction with their Housing

Respondents were asked about their general satisfaction with different aspects of their current housing situation including:

1. Their general satisfaction with their overall housing situation;
2. Their situation compared to others they know;
3. Their current housing situation compared to their previous situation;
4. Their satisfaction with their rent;
5. Their satisfaction with their neighbourhood;
6. Their satisfaction with safety and security in their building;
7. Their satisfaction with the management of their building;
8. Their satisfaction with the level of maintenance;
9. Their satisfaction with policies related to guests.

When considering the satisfaction levels of respondents, it may also be useful to consider and take into account levels of expectation. In particular, individuals living in SROs may have decidedly modest expectations of their housing and living arrangements and this may in turn be reflected in their satisfaction ratings.

Overall Satisfaction with their Current Housing

When asked to rate their overall level of satisfaction with their current housing, 1 in 3 respondents reported their general satisfaction level was either "good" or "very good" while 1 in 4 (24%) reported their overall satisfaction level as either "poor" or "very poor".

Overall satisfaction rating

	Frequency	Valid Percent
Very good	48	7.7
Good	167	26.7
OK	254	40.6
Poor	105	16.8
Very poor	43	6.9
N/A	8	1.3
Total who responded	625	100.0
Did not respond	3	
Total	628	

Current Housing when Compared to Others

When asked to report on how their current housing situation compares to others they know, 36% reported that they felt that their housing situation

was “somewhat” or “a lot” better while 29% of respondents reported that they believed that their housing situation was “somewhat” or “a lot” worse.

Satisfaction compared to others

	Frequency	Valid Percent
A lot better	102	16.2
Somewhat better	124	19.7
About the same	185	29.5
Somewhat worse	99	15.8
A lot worse	85	13.5
No response	33	5.3
Total	628	100.0

Current versus Previous Housing

When asked how their current versus their previous housing situation, 32% reported that their current housing situation was “somewhat” or “a lot” better while 41% indicated that their current housing situation was “somewhat” or “a lot” worse than their previous housing situation.

Level of satisfaction of current versus previous housing

	Frequency	Valid Percent
A lot better	85	13.6
Somewhat better	118	18.8
About the same	149	23.8
Somewhat worse	114	18.2
A lot worse	140	22.4
Unsure	15	2.4
No response	5	.8
Total who responded	626	100.0
Did not respond	2	
Total	628	

Satisfaction with their Rent

When asked to rate their satisfaction with their rent, one in three (34%) reported that they felt that their rent was “good” or “very good” while 22% reported that their rent was “poor” or “very poor”.

Rent rating

	Frequency	Valid Percent
Very good	56	8.9
Good	159	25.3
OK	272	43.3
Poor	98	15.6
Very poor	38	6.1
N/A	5	.8
Total	628	100.0

Satisfaction with their Neighbourhood

When asked to rate their satisfaction with their neighbourhood, 20% reported that their neighbourhood was "good" or "very good" while almost half (48%) felt that conditions in their neighbourhood were "poor" or "very poor".

Neighbourhood rating

	Frequency	Valid Percent
Very good	17	2.7
Good	110	17.5
OK	198	31.6
Poor	190	30.3
Very poor	109	17.4
N/A	3	.5
Total who responded	627	100.0
Did not respond	1	
Total	628	

Satisfaction with Safety and Security in the Building

When asked to rate their satisfaction with the safety and security in the building, 46% reported that the security in the building was either "good" or "very good". At the same time, 21% reported that the level of safety and security in their building was "poor" or "very poor".

Safety rating

	Frequency	Valid Percent
Very good	71	11.4
Good	214	34.2
OK	204	32.6
Poor	98	15.7
Very poor	33	5.3
N/A	5	.8
Total who responded	625	100.0
Did not respond	3	
Total	628	

Satisfaction with Management of the Building

When asked to rate their satisfaction with the building management, 43% reported that management in the building was either "good" or "very good" while 1 in 4 (24%) reported that management was "poor" or "very poor".

Management rating

	Frequency	Valid Percent
Very good	87	13.9
Good	182	29.0
OK	198	31.6
Poor	102	16.3
Very poor	47	7.5
N/A	11	1.8
Total who responded	627	100.0
Did not respond	1	
Total	628	

Satisfaction with Maintenance of the Building

In terms of the level of maintenance in their building, 39% of respondents reported that maintenance was either "good" or "very good". At the same time, 29% reported that they felt that maintenance in their building was either "poor" or "very poor".

Maintenance rating

	Frequency	Valid Percent
Very good	51	8.1
Good	194	31.0
OK	195	31.2
Poor	122	19.5
Very poor	57	9.1
N/A	7	1.1
Total who responded	626	100.0
Did not respond	2	
Total	628	

Satisfaction with Ability to have Guests

When asked to rate their satisfaction with their ability to have guests¹⁹, 27% of respondents reported that they felt that the policies were “good” or “very good” while 35% of respondents reported that they felt that the policies were “poor” or “very poor”.

Ability to have guests rating

	Frequency	Valid Percent
Very good	46	7.4
Good	123	19.7
OK	178	28.5
Poor	121	19.4
Very poor	100	16.0
N/A	57	9.1
Total who responded	625	100.0
Did not respond	3	
Total	628	

Problems in Their Building

Respondents were asked to comment on a number of different types of issues and to indicate the extent to which they perceived these types of issues to be a “big problem” or “small problem” in their housing. The types of issues that were identified included:

¹⁹ The notion of ‘having a guest’ refers to the basic idea of being able to have a friend, family member or associate visit the resident in his or her unit without any economic or other sanction being imposed.

1. Pests
2. Noise
3. Security
4. Drug Related Activity
5. Guest Fees

Pests as a Problem in their Building

Pests could include concerns about mice, rats, cockroaches or bedbugs. Forty percent reported that pests were a big problem in their building.

Pests as problem

	Frequency	Valid Percent
Big problem	249	39.6
Small problem	220	35.0
Not a problem	153	24.4
No response	6	1.0
Total	628	100.0

In terms of the types of pest problems that were identified, 23% of the respondents identified more than one type of pest while 10% indicated all major vermin (mice/rats, bedbugs and cockroaches) were a problem. Bedbugs were the most frequently cited individual problem with 31% of respondents reporting this as a problem. Cockroaches and insects were identified as a problem by 28% while rodents were identified by 17%.
Noise as a Problem in their Building

Seventeen percent reported that noise in the building was a big problem.

Noise problem

	Frequency	Valid Percent
Big problem	108	17.2
Small problem	183	29.2
Not a problem	330	52.6
No response	6	1.0
Total who responded	627	100.0
Did not respond	1	
Total	628	

Security Problems in their Building

Eleven percent reported that they felt that security-related concerns were a “big” problem in their building while 2 in 3 (67%) did not perceive a problem²⁰.

Security problem

	Frequency	Valid Percent
Big problem	69	11.0
Small problem	130	20.7
Not a problem	422	67.2
No response	7	1.1
Total	628	100.0

Drug-Related Activity as a Problem in their Building

Fourteen percent identified drug-related activities as a “big problem” while more than half (55%) did not consider drug activities to be a problem.

Drug problem

	Frequency	Valid Percent
Big problem	90	14.3
Small problem	175	27.9
Not a problem	345	54.9
No response	18	2.9
Total	628	100.0

Strangers in the Building as a Problem

Eleven percent of respondents reported that they felt that strangers in the building constituted a “big problem” while 60% did not perceive strangers in the building to be a problem.

Strangers in building problem

	Frequency	Valid Percent
Big problem	70	11.1
Small problem	167	26.6
Not a problem	374	59.6
No response	17	2.7
Total	628	100.0

²⁰ The issue of safety and security was asked in two separate questions; the first asked respondents to rate their housing along key dimensions, the second asked about the size of key problems within their housing.

Guest Fees as a Problem in their Building

Guest fees are financial charges which are, at times, imposed when guests visit a friend or family member living in an SRO which has adopted this practice. While the research found that this did not appear to be a widespread practice (75% of respondents did not perceive guest fees to be a problem), 11% identified this as a “big problem” in that they or their guests were forced to pay a sum of money simply to be able to meet in the resident’s unit. The standard guest fee tended to fall between \$5 and \$20 with \$10 being the most commonly cited fee.

It must be added, however, that there are also some living in SROs who believe that guest fees are helpful in screening unwanted individuals from entering their building. The survey was not able to capture the extent to which respondents might support the practice of guest fees for reasons of enhanced security, but it can be concluded from the findings that guest fees represent a hardship for some SRO residents.

Guest fee problem

	Frequency	Valid Percent
Big problem	71	11.3
Small problem	36	5.7
Not a problem	468	74.5
No response	53	8.4
Total	628	100.0

The Best Thing about their Housing and Neighbourhood

Respondents were asked to indicate what they liked “best” about their housing and about the DTES. The following reflects the most frequently cited responses with regard to their housing:

- Accessibility or convenience afforded by living in the DTES (21%);
- Affordability of the housing (12%);
- Their unit (10%);
- Access to family and friends (9%);
- A safe and quiet place to live (7%);
- A place to live/a roof over one’s head (6%);
- The management of their housing (5%);
- The neighbourhood (1%).

Eleven percent reported there was nothing they liked about their housing.

In terms of satisfaction with their neighbourhood, the following list reflects the most frequently cited responses from those living in the SROs:

- General access to shops, transit, downtown (29%);
- Access to social services (17%);
- Friends, social environment, community feeling (15%);
- Affordability (4%);
- Access to Chinatown (2%).

In addition, 22% reported that there was nothing that they liked best about their neighbourhood.

Worst Thing about their Housing and Neighbourhood

Respondents were also asked to indicate what they liked least about their housing as well as what they liked least about living in the Downtown Eastside. In terms of the negative aspects of the neighbourhood, the following reflects the general distribution of responses:

- Drug problems (dealers and users) (36%);
- Crime/violence/lack of safety (12%);
- The neighbourhood/poverty issues (9%); and,
- Unsanitary conditions (including vermin) (8%).

Other issues reported include noise (3%), poor or badly managed housing (3%), police (2%) and 'everything' (2%).

Three percent reported that there was nothing negative about their neighbourhood while 13% did not respond to this question.

In terms of dissatisfaction with their housing, the following list reflects the most frequently cited responses:

- Unhealthy or unsanitary conditions (including vermin and noise) (29%);
- Lack of private bathroom or kitchen facilities (18%);
- Neighbourhood, residents (14%);
- Poor management or problems entertaining guests (13%);
- Poor state of housing and maintenance (10%);
- Drug problems (9%);
- Unsanitary conditions (including vermin) (8%);
- Crime/violence/lack of safety (7%);
- Small unit (6%).

Other issues reported include the cost of the housing (1%), and the stigma of living in the DTES (1%).

Six percent reported that there was nothing negative about their housing while 12% did not respond to this question.

Concluding Comments

Finally, respondents were asked if they had any final or concluding comments they wished to make. In total, 47% of SRO respondents offered feedback of this nature. Much of this feedback was direct and often addressed strong beliefs or priorities of the respondents. Following is a sample of the themes they touched upon.

- I want a real apartment with a kitchen and bathroom.
- I want to move into social housing. I rely on church and neighbours for support.
- I want housing which doesn't allow anyone to come through and break in and with a manager who doesn't blow you off.
- I am starting an addictions counseling program. People have to be able to get in a program when they are ready, not wait till they are back using.
- Rents are too high. I can only afford drafty/dusty apartments that cause allergies. More education programs for people with learning disabilities needed.
- Not impressed with drug use and dealers and theft. Open drug use, police harassment and violence around town.
- Need to update computer skills. Would like to try rehab.
- Need more drug rehab facilities. Make sure people get help when needed.
- Living around here is like a trap—it's very hard to leave.
- It's scary on the streets. I need better food and wish people would leave me alone. I have been robbed a few times.
- I don't know about services or how to apply for housing.
- Building needs a lot of work--no heat, too many roaches. Get rid of restrictions on visitors.

SOCIAL HOUSING: ABOUT THE RESIDENTS

About the Sample of Responses Obtained

This section provides a summary of the responses received from across the sample of social housing developments that were surveyed. The findings reported in this section are based on a total of 658 completed surveys from across 69 social housing developments. A response rate of 658 surveys provides the desired confidence level of $\pm 4\%$ for reported findings 19 times out of 20.

In developing the sampling strategy to support this phase of the research, one of the objectives was to ensure that the sample of responses obtained was representative of the general profile of developments. Based on the responses obtained, 3 in 4 (76%) were single person households (either senior or non-senior) while 11% were from couples without children. An additional 13% came from family households.

Across the sample, there were a total of 210 units which were surveyed in senior's developments. Of these, 82% were 55 or older while an additional 11% were between 45 and 54. The remaining 7% were individuals who were under 45 but who were living in seniors housing.

In terms of mixed developments, 79% of respondents were 45 or older with the majority of those being individuals 55 years of age or older. The remaining 21% of respondents living in mixed developments were under the age of 45.

It is important to note that one third of those living in "other" housing (housing targeted to low income single persons) were 55 or older while an additional 32% were between the ages of 45 and 54.

About the Mix of Social Housing Units

To some extent, the social housing sample is different from the SRO sample in that the units are targeted to specific client groups including low income families, seniors and those with special housing needs. Based on the findings set out in the *City of Vancouver 2007 Survey of Low Income Housing in the Downtown Core*, approximately 40% of the social housing units in the Downtown Eastside are targeted to seniors while approximately 15% are targeted to low income families. In addition, approximately 45% of units are special needs housing designed to respond to a diverse range of needs.

Socio-Demographic Profile

This section provides a general summary of the socio-demographic profile of social housing tenants including information on their:

- Gender
- Age
- Ethnicity and Cultural Diversity
- Educational Attainment
- Aboriginal Status
- Languages Spoken
- Place of Birth
- Childhood Experiences and Life Course

Gender

The responses indicate that 56% of the respondents were male while 44% were female.

Gender

	Frequency	Valid Percent
Male	367	55.9
Female	287	43.8
Transgender	2	.3
Total who responded	656	100.0
Did not respond	2	
Total	658	

Average Age

The ages reported across those living in sample of social housing units surveyed ranged from 15 to 98 years with the average age across social housing respondents being 58. Across the family housing developments, the average reported age was 36 while across the seniors developments the average age was 68. The average age of those living in mixed developments which could include family, seniors and other housing types was 58. Among those living in the housing targeted to low income singles or "other" housing, the average reported age was 49.²¹

Age Distribution

More than half (55%) of the respondents living in social housing were 55 or older with an additional 22% between the ages of 45 to 54.

²¹ In looking at the sample of responses obtained, it is important to note that across the seniors developments surveyed, approximately 82% of respondents were 55 or older while across the mixed developments approximately 54% were 55 or older. Likewise, across the special needs housing, approximately 33% of respondents were 55 or older.

Age

	Frequency	Valid Percent
0-25	17	2.6
25-34	32	4.9
35-44	104	15.9
45-54	142	21.6
55-64	113	17.2
65-84	211	32.2
85+	37	5.6
Total responses	656	100.0
Did not respond	2	
Total	658	

Household Type

Three in 4 (76%) reported they were singles while 10% were couples without children. An additional 10% were families, split evenly between single parent and two parent families. Other family configurations accounted for 3% while 1% was comprised of 2 or more unrelated individuals living together.

Ethnicity and Cultural Diversity

Forty-three percent of respondents were Caucasian while 38% were of an Asian ethnicity including 31% Chinese and 5% Vietnamese.

Aboriginal Status

Eleven percent of respondents were Aboriginal while an additional 3% indicated that they were Metis.

Ethnicity

	Frequency	Valid Percent
Asian	251	38.1
Black	15	2.3
Caucasian	280	42.6
First Nations	70	10.6
Hispanic	11	1.7
Other	30	4.6
No response	1	.2
Total	658	100.0

Educational Attainment

Forty-four percent reported that they had attended high school while 18% reported that they had attended only elementary school. Of those who had

attended high school, less than half (46%) had graduated. Twelve percent reported that they had not completed any schooling with this response being more prevalent among the elderly Chinese population.

Level of education completed

	Frequency	Valid Percent
Elementary school	118	18.0
High school	290	44.1
Trade or vocational school	37	5.6
College or university	129	19.6
Not completed any schooling	76	11.6
No response	7	1.1
Total who responded	657	100.0
Did not respond	1	
Total	658	

Languages Spoken

Fifty-seven percent reported that English was their primary language while 31% reported that they were native Cantonese speakers and an additional 4% spoke Mandarin as their primary language.

Place of Birth

The cultural diversity of those living in social housing is reflected in the information about the place of birth of survey respondents. Almost half of all respondents (49%) reported that they had been born outside of Canada with more than 1 in 4 (26%) reporting that they had been born in China. An additional 4% reported that Hong Kong was their country of origin while Vietnam was also the birthplace of 4% of respondents. Conversely, only 1 in 10 (10%) reported that they were born in Metro Vancouver while 31% reported that they were born elsewhere in Canada led by Ontario (11%) and Alberta (6%). In total, among the 658 respondents living in social housing there were 51 different countries of origin identified.

Place of birth

	Frequency	Valid Percent
Outside of Canada	321	49.2
Elsewhere in Canada	202	31.0
Elsewhere in BC	61	9.4
Elsewhere in Metro Vancouver	9	1.4
Vancouver	59	9.0
Total who responded	652	100.0
Did not respond	6	
Total	658	

Childhood Experiences and Life Course

Age Leaving Home

Among those living in social housing, approximately 31% reported that they were 16 or younger when they left home with the average age being 19.

Age first left home

	Frequency	Valid Percent
20 or older	229	36.4
17-19	208	33.1
16 or younger	192	30.5
Total who responded	629	100.0
Did not respond	29	
Total	658	

History of Being in Public Care Institution

When asked whether they had ever been in some public care facility such as a foster home, group home, prison or mental health institution, 1 in 5 (20%) indicated that they had been in some form of public care.

History of public care

	Frequency	Valid Percent
Yes	132	20.1
No	515	78.4
No response	10	1.5
Total who responded	657	100.0
Did not respond	1	
Total	658	

Type of Public Care

The following summarizes the nature of public care facilities respondents reported having lived in at some point in their lives:

- Prison (10%);²²
- Forster care (7%);
- Group home (3%);
- Long term mental health institution (3%);
- Residential school (1%).

²² Of those who reported that they had previously spent time in prison, approximately 77% were living in the "other" housing type which includes various integrated housing and support models.

Economic Profile

This section looks at the economic circumstances of those living in social housing including data related to:

1. Their income and income source;
2. Access to employment opportunities;
3. Nature of employment opportunities;
4. Availability to work;
5. Average monthly income;
6. Annual income; and,
7. Average monthly rent payment.

Income and Income Source

Among those living in social housing, the majority of respondents (51%) reported that they received Disability Benefits or a senior's pension as their primary source of income while 1 in 4 (25%) received income assistance. Seventeen percent reported that income from employment was their primary source of income.

Principal source of income in past year

	Frequency	Valid Percent
Employment	109	16.6
Employment Insurance	1	.2
Income Assistance	167	25.4
Federal Pension (senior or disability)	337	51.2
Retirement income or private pensions	4	.6
Student loans	7	1.1
Grey economy	7	1.1
Other	26	4.0
Total	658	100.0

Nature of Employment

When asked to indicate the nature of their employment, the majority of respondents (74%) declined to provide a response, likely suggesting that this question did not apply to a large number of respondents. Of those reporting an active source of employment income, 17% indicated that they had a job with responses split between those reporting full time employment (8%) and part time employment (9%). Smaller numbers of respondents indicated their principle income source as via 'labour ready' or temp agencies, collecting bottles/cans or binning, volunteer activities or through the sex trade.

Principle employment income source amongst those actively earning an income

	Frequency	Valid Percent
Full time regular employment	55	8.4
Part time regular employment	56	8.5
Labour ready or temp agencies	4	.6
Squeeging, binning, collecting bottles	15	2.3
Sex trade work	3	.5
Volunteer	21	3.2
Other	16	2.4
Total who responded	170	25.8
Did not respond	488	74.2
Total	658	100.0

Availability to Work

Twenty-nine percent reported that they were able to work while 2 in 3 (67%)²³ indicated that they were not able to work.

Able to work

	Frequency	Valid Percent
Yes	189	28.7
No	439	66.7
Unsure	29	4.4
No response	1	.2
Total	658	100.0

Average Incomes

Among those living in social housing, the average monthly income was \$1,143. This ranged from \$843 for those receiving income assistance to \$1,805 for those receiving income from employment. Those receiving Federal disability benefits or a senior pension reported an average monthly income of \$1,088 while those reporting retirement income or a private pension indicated that they received approximately \$790 per month.

Annual Income

Seventy-two percent reported an annual income of \$15,000 or less while 14% of respondents reported an annual income of between \$15,000 and \$20,000. The remaining 13% reported an annual income of over \$20,000.

²³ It is possible that the percentage of respondents reporting that they worked is higher than the percentage of respondents who reported that income from employment was their primary source of income.

Income

	Frequency	Valid Percent
\$0-\$9,999	163	27.5
\$10,000-\$14,999	261	44.1
\$15,000-\$19,999	82	13.9
\$20,000-\$24,999	50	8.4
\$25,000-\$29,000	11	1.9
\$30,000+	25	4.2
Total who responded	592	100.0
Did not respond	66	
Total	658	

Monthly Rent

Among those living in social housing, the average reported rent was \$386 per month. Over half (57%) paid rent of between \$325 and \$500 per month. More than 1 in 4 respondents (28%) paid less than \$325 per month.

Rent Range

	Frequency	Valid Percent
<\$325	179	28.3
\$325-\$374	221	35.0
\$375	48	7.6
\$376-\$500	89	14.1
>\$500	95	15.0
Total who responded	632	100.0
Did not respond	26	
Total	658	

Housing History and Housing Situation

This section looks at a number of different aspects related to the housing history and housing situation of social housing tenants including:

1. Their length of time in the Downtown Eastside;
2. Their length of time in their current housing;
3. Their prior place of residence;
4. Their ties to the community and the Greater Vancouver area;
5. Their previous housing arrangement;
6. Changes in their personal circumstances;
7. Their main reasons for moving from their previous housing; and,
8. Their main reasons for moving to the Downtown Eastside area.

Length of Time in the Downtown Eastside

Only 7% of respondents had lived in the Downtown Eastside area for less than one year. On the other hand, more than 2 in 3 (69%) reported that they had lived in the Downtown Eastside for at least 5 years.

Time in DTES

	Frequency	Valid Percent
Less than 6 months	12	1.8
6 months to 1 year	36	5.5
Between 1 and 2 years	50	7.6
Between 2 and 5 years	106	16.1
More than 5 years	454	69.0
Total	658	100.0

Length of Time in their Current Housing

Half (50%) reported that they had lived in their current housing for 5 years or more while 17% had lived in their current housing for one year or less.

Time at address

	Frequency	Valid Percent
Less than 6 months	49	7.4
6 months to 1 year	61	9.3
Between 1 and 2 years	83	12.6
Between 2 and 5 years	137	20.8
More than 5 years	328	49.8
Total	658	100.0

Prior Place of Residence

When asked where they had lived prior to moving to their current housing 83% reported that their previous housing was in Vancouver while an additional 11% had lived elsewhere in Metro Vancouver.

Location of previous housing

	Frequency	Valid Percent
DTES	314	47.8
Elsewhere in City of Vancouver	228	34.7
Elsewhere in Lower Mainland	71	10.8
Elsewhere in BC	16	2.4
Outside of BC	28	4.3
Total who responded	657	100.0
Did not respond	1	
Total	658	

Ties to the Community and the Greater Vancouver area

While a large percentage of respondents reported that their previous place of residence was in Vancouver, it is interesting to note that only 12% of social housing respondents had gone to school in Vancouver (either elementary school or high school). An additional 5% reported that they had attended school elsewhere in the Greater Vancouver area while 11% reported that they had attended school elsewhere in B.C. Almost 2 in 3 respondents (65%) had attended school outside of B.C. while 9% had not gone to school.

Previous Housing Arrangements

One in 4 (24%) had moved from an SRO unit while 20% had stayed with family or friends. Nine percent had been either staying in an emergency shelter (5%) or living on the streets (4%) prior to moving to their current housing.

Previous housing type

	Frequency	Valid Percent
House	21	3.2
Private apartment	74	11.3
Private suite in house	85	13.0
Room in place shared with others	29	4.4
Stayed with family or friends	132	20.2
Subsidized housing	64	9.8
Supported housing	8	1.2
SRO	158	24.2
Emergency shelter	31	4.8
Jail/hospital	4	.6
Recovery House	11	1.7
Homeless/on street	24	3.7
Other	11	1.7
Total	658	100.0

Previously Married

When asked to disclose their prior marital status, almost 2 in 3 (65%) reported previously being married while 35% had never been married.

Previously married

	Frequency	Valid Percent
Yes	429	65.2
No	229	34.8
Total	658	100.0

Children

Respondents were asked if they have children. Approximately 63% reported that they have children while 37% did not have children. Respondents were then asked whether they had children aged 18 or younger (i.e. children of dependent age). Of those who responded, 27% reported having children of a dependent age including 15% with 2 or more children 18 or younger.

Finally, respondents were asked to specify whether they were in contact with their children. Of those who had children and who responded, 2 in 3 (66%) indicated that they were in regular contact with their children while 17% reported that they were not in contact with their children.

In contact with children

	Frequency	Valid Percent
Yes, regularly in contact	273	66.1
Only sometimes in contact	70	16.9
No, not in contact	70	16.9
Total who responded	413	100.0
Did not respond	245	
Total	658	

Changes in Personal Circumstances

Twelve percent reported they had experienced changes in their personal circumstances in the past year which had an impact on their housing situation.

Life changes affecting housing

	Frequency	Valid Percent
Yes	80	12.2
No	568	86.3
No response	10	1.6
Total	658	100.0

Of those who responded to this question, more than half (54%) reported health- and age-related concerns. An additional 17% reported that they had experienced a breakdown in relationships with family or friends.

Type of life change

	Frequency	Valid Percent
Relationship or family problems	13	17.1
Fight/dispute with roommate/neighbour	3	3.9
Financial issues	5	6.6
Health issues/age/drug use	41	53.9
Eviction or landlord problems	5	6.6
Issues of poor housing	3	3.9
Other	6	1.0
Total who responded	76	100.0
Did not respond	582	
Total	658	

Main Reason for Moving from Their Previous Housing

Survey respondents were also asked to indicate the reasons they had moved from their previous housing with the list below providing an overview of the range of responses received:

- Affordability issues (15%);
- Family or relationship issues (15%);
- Bad or unsafe housing environment (14%);
- Independence/bigger or better housing (13%);
- Needed shelter/last place closed/sold (12%);
- Offered/received government assistance (9%);
- Wanted access to Chinatown (4%);
- Eviction or landlord issues (4%).

In analyzing the responses received, it would appear that *push-related factors* such as poor quality or unsafe housing, affordability issues, eviction, failed relationships, loss of employment and other factors often contributed to their decision/need to move with 60% moving for push-related issue.

The responses also suggests that *pull-related factors* played a role in 1 in 4 cases (26%) with top responses including a desire for independence, bigger or better housing, access to Chinatown or an offer of government assistance.

Reason for First Moving to the Downtown Eastside

Respondents were asked to identify the reasons that contributed to their decision to first move to the Downtown Eastside. The following list provides a summary of the reasons provided:

- Cheap rent/only thing financially available (34%);
- Relationship or family issues (17%);
- Offered and wanted social housing (6%);
- Employment/education reasons (6%);
- Access to Chinatown (5%);
- Health or age related concerns (5%);
- 'Lifestyle' issues including drugs, partying, etc. (3%);
- Access to services/amenities (3%);
- Be with or near family and friends (3%);
- Needed shelter/eviction/no where else to go (3%).

In reviewing the list of reasons given, 59% of respondents identified *push-related factors* such as affordability, relationship or family problems, health concerns, or a lack of housing options as triggering their move to the DTES.

Twenty-three percent identified *pull-related factors* including considerations related to lifestyle, employment, education as well as access to services/amenities/subsidized housing or to family and friends.

History of Homelessness and Frequency of Moves

History of Frequent Moves and Eviction

When asked how many times they had moved in the past year, 15% reported that they had moved at least once in the past year with 5% reporting that they had moved more than once.

Three percent reported that they had been evicted in the past year.

Reasons for Eviction

While the number of respondents living in social housing who reported that they had been evicted in the past year is too small to support any meaningful analytical breakdown of the reasons for their eviction, in general the range of responses were received were similar to those reported among SRO residents: in particular, issues of non-payment of rent, problem behaviour, conflict with management and discrimination were offered. In addition, it is

interesting to note that 2 respondents reported that they had been functionally evicted from their previous housing as a result of the collapse of the roof of their rental building during a heavy rainstorm.

History of Homelessness

The survey also included questions pertaining to the extent to which respondents had experienced homelessness in the past year including patterns of shelter use, episodes of 'sofa surfing' and periods of 'sleeping rough' or living on the streets.

Patterns of Shelter Use

Thirty percent reported that they had used an emergency shelter at some point in their lives. In addition, 6% of those reporting prior shelter use had used a shelter within the past year while 4% had used one more than once.

Use of shelter

	Frequency	Valid Percent
Yes	198	30.1
No	460	69.9
Total	658	100.0

Episodes of Sofa Surfing

Twenty-seven percent of the respondents reported that they had stayed with family or friends at least once in the past because they had nowhere else to stay while 2% reported that they had done so in the past year.

Living on the Streets or 'Sleeping Rough'

When asked whether they had ever 'slept rough' or lived on the streets, 28% reported that they had done so at some point in their lives while 4% had done so in the past year with half of those reporting two or more episodes.

Sleep rough

	Frequency	Valid Percent
Yes	182	27.7
No	474	72.1
No response	1	.2
Total who responded	657	100.0
Did not respond	1	
Total	658	

Future Housing Plans

Respondents were also asked a number of questions about their future housing plans including:

1. Their desire to leave the Downtown Eastside;
2. Preferred housing destination;
3. Amount of time they expected to remain in the Downtown Eastside; and,
4. Whether they had ever applied to live in social housing.

Desire to Leave the Downtown Eastside

Forty-six percent indicated that they would like to continue to live in the Downtown Eastside while 45% of respondents reported that they would like to live somewhere else.

Move from DTES if could afford to

	Frequency	Valid Percent
Yes	293	44.6
No	299	45.5
Unsure	59	9.0
No response	6	.9
Total who responded	657	100.0
Did not respond	1	
Total	658	

Preferred Destinations

Of those specifying where they would move to if they left the DTES, 52% reported that they would like to live elsewhere in Vancouver while 20% of respondents suggested elsewhere in Greater Vancouver.

Preferred destination if leaving DTES

	Frequency	Valid Percent
Vancouver	151	51.9
Metro Vancouver	59	20.3
Elsewhere in BC	31	10.7
Outside BC	7	2.4
Anywhere/unsure	43	14.8
Total who responded	291	100.0
Did not respond	367	
Total	658	

Expectation of Remaining in the Downtown Eastside Area

More than 1 in 4 (27%) reported that they expected to still be living in the Downtown Eastside in 5 years while only 5% reported that they would leave the neighbourhood within the next year. However, over half (55%) were unsure about how much longer they would remain in the Downtown Eastside.

How much longer in DTES

	Frequency	Valid Percent
Less than 1 year	31	4.7
1 to 2 years	50	7.6
2 to 5 years	30	4.6
More than 5 years	174	26.5
Unsure	363	55.3
No response	9	1.4
Total who responded	657	100.0
Did not respond	1	
Total	658	

Health Profile

Reported Health Assessment

Twenty-five percent of respondents reported that their health was very good or excellent while 44% indicated that their health was average and 31% rated their health as poor or terrible.

Self assessed health

	Frequency	Valid Percent
Excellent	38	5.8
Very good	128	19.5
Average	287	43.6
Poor	180	27.4
Terrible	23	3.5
No response	2	.3
Total	658	100.0

Changes in Health

When asked if they had experienced any change in their health in the past year, 16% reported that their health was better than the previous year while 27% reported that their health had declined.

Health compared to one year ago

	Frequency	Valid Percent
Much better	32	4.9
Somewhat better	75	11.4
About the same	364	55.3
Somewhat worse	132	20.1
Much worse	47	7.1
No response	8	1.2
Total	658	100.0

Nature of Health Challenges

When asked if they had any specific health related concerns 1 in 4 respondents (25%) did not report any health issues while 75% identified at least one health concern. Thirty-seven percent identified multiple concerns.

Specific Health Challenges Identified

The following provides an overview of the range of health concerns identified:

- Physical limitations (53%)
- Mental health issues (25%)
- Diabetes (17%)
- Alcohol addiction²⁴ (15%)
- Drug addiction (14%)
- TB, Hep C or HIV/AIDS (13%)
- FAS/Brain injury (6%)

Rate of Hospitalization

Twenty-one percent reported that they had been hospitalized in the past year with 7% reporting that they had been hospitalized more than once.

Hospitalized in past year

	Frequency	Valid Percent
Yes	140	21.3
No	517	78.7
Total who responded	657	100.0
Did not respond	1	
Total	658	

²⁴ Approximately 8% of respondents reported that they have both a drug and alcohol addiction.

Emergency Room Use

Twenty-six percent had used an emergency room at least once while 11% reported multiple visits. Of those who visited an emergency room, 52% reported that they had also been hospitalized.

Emergency use in past year

	Frequency	Valid Percent
Yes	170	25.9
No	487	74.1
Total who responded	657	100.0
Did not respond	1	
Total	658	

Health Impact of Living in the Downtown Eastside

When asked whether living in the Downtown Eastside had compromised their health, 20% reported that they felt that living in the Downtown Eastside had affected their health with the following providing a general overview of the range of responses received:

- Depression, stress and anxiety (52%);
- Unhealthy environment²⁵ (33%);
- Exposure to drugs (11%).

Patterns of Service Use

The study also explored the different service needs and patterns of service use across social housing tenants over the past year including their use of the following services:

- Income support
- Job training/skills development
- Food bank and meal program services
- Mental health and addiction services
- Hospitals or health clinics
- Community centres
- Safe injection site
- Services and supports within their building

The following table summarizes the percent of respondents who used each of the services and the number of users who reported frequent use of a service.

²⁵ Unhealthy environment can include poor air quality, lack of cleanliness and exposure to sickness.

Use of Support Services

Support Service	% Reporting Use of Service	% Reporting Frequent Use
Income Support	45%	92%
Community Centre	38%	52%
Hospital	32%	9%
Health Clinic or Other Health Services	30%	37%
Food Bank and Meal Programs	24%	36%
Mental Health and Addictions Services	13%	61%
On-Site Services and Supports	12%	74%
Job Training/ Skills Development	8%	40%
Safe Injection Site	3%	15%

Specific Service Needs

The survey asked respondents to identify the three (3) things that they need help with immediately as well as the extent to which they have been able to get the help that they need. Half (51%) of respondents identified at least one thing that they needed help with while 17% of respondents were able to identify two things and 4% identified three things.

Among those who identified at least one thing, the following provides a summary of the list of needs that were identified:

- Income and income support (41%);
- Health-related needs (32%);
- Housing-related needs (20%);
- Emotional support (15%);
- Skills training or access to employment (12%).

In addition, 22% of respondents identified some other needs including:

- Diet and nutrition counseling;
- Access to transit;
- Assistance in leaving the Downtown Eastside;
- Legal aid and/or advocacy.

Extent to Which Needs Are Being Met

The survey also asked respondents to indicate whether they have been successful in getting assistance to help them meet their needs. Of those who identified at least one need, approximately 1 in 4 (26%) reported that they felt that they had been successful in finding the assistance that they needed. Over half (53%) reported that they had not been successful while 20% reported that they were unsure as to whether they had been successful.

Access to Basic Necessities including Food and Clothing

Respondents were also asked a number of questions about where they access basic necessities including food and clothing. In terms of access to food, respondents identified the following places²⁶:

- Chinatown (36%);
- Large supermarkets or grocery stores²⁷ (29%);
- Foodbank or meal program²⁸ (13%);
- Sunrise Market (12%);
- Other²⁹ (12%);
- Save on Meats (11%);
- Army and Navy (10%).

Access to Clothing

Respondents also identified a number of places where they obtained clothing³⁰ including:

- Army and Navy (28%);
- Donations, free, charities, gifts (19%);
- Chinatown (19%);
- Department stores, malls (18%);
- Thrift shops including Value Village (16%);
- Don't buy or need to buy clothes (7%).

An additional 12% did not provide a response.

Drug and Cigarette Use

The survey included questions on respondents' drugs and cigarette use. Forty-two percent reported that they smoked while 15% used drugs.

Frequency of Use

Thirty percent of respondents reported that they smoked regularly while 13% indicated they smoked occasionally. Seven percent of respondents reported using drugs frequently while 8% did so occasionally.

²⁶ A number of respondents provided more than one response, therefore total responses will add up to more than 100%.

²⁷ These included Safeway, Superstore, Save on Foods, Buy Low Foods, Costco, IGA, T&T.

²⁸ These services included Salvation Army, Union Gospel Mission, Living Room, Mission Possible, 44, Harbour Light, Dugout, Womens' Centre, Evelyn Sallers, Sisters of Atonement, Quest, First United Church.

²⁹ This included local stores, corner stores, local cafes and restaurants, fast food and pizza restaurants and other ad hoc responses.

³⁰ A number of respondents provided more than one response, therefore total responses will add up to more than 100%.

Drug use

	Frequency	Valid Percent
Yes	45	6.8
Yes, only a bit or occasionally	55	8.4
No	542	82.4
No response	16	2.4
Total	658	100.0

Tobacco use

	Frequency	Valid Percent
Yes	195	29.6
Yes, only a bit or occasionally	84	12.8
No	376	57.1
No response	3	.5
Total	658	100.0

Type of Drug and Estimated Cost of Drug Use

Respondents were also asked to identify the type of drug that they use as well as the estimated cost of their drug use. Among those who use drugs and who provided a response to this question³¹, half (51%) use pot while 23% use crack. An additional 16% reported that they use cocaine, 6% use heroin and 4% use crystal meth. Some respondents reported that they use more than one type of drug.

When asked to estimate the cost of their habit, the average reported cost of their habit was \$17 per day. *Of those who reported using drugs*, one in four (26% of drug users or 19 out of 658 total respondents) spent \$20 or more per day on their habit. In addition, 40% (29 out of 658 respondents) reported that they spent between \$5 and \$19 daily while 33% (24 out of 658 respondents) reported that they spent less than \$5 per day on drugs. Three individuals (less than 1%) reported that they spent more than \$100 per day on drugs.

Finally, in terms of the age at which respondents reported starting to use drugs, of those responding to this question 56%, reported beginning their drug use age 16 or younger. With regard to alcohol use, 65% reported beginning their alcohol use at age 16 or younger.

³¹ It must be kept in mind that 15% of the social housing tenants reported using drugs. Any summary conclusions on this sub-sample must keep the relatively small scale of drug use (and low number of respondents) within this sub-population in mind.

Satisfaction with their Housing

Those living in social housing were asked similar questions to the SRO residents in terms of their general satisfaction with their housing situation including:

1. Their general satisfaction with their overall housing situation;
2. Their situation compared to others they know;
3. Their current housing situation compared to their previous situation;
4. Their satisfaction with their rent;
5. Their satisfaction with their neighbourhood;
6. Their satisfaction with safety and security in their building;
7. Their satisfaction with the management of their building;
8. Their satisfaction with the level of maintenance;
9. Their satisfaction with policies related to guests.

Overall Satisfaction with their Current Housing

Sixty-five percent of respondents indicated that their overall satisfaction with their housing was either "very good" or "good". Eight percent felt their satisfaction level was either "poor" or "very poor".

Overall rating

	Frequency	Valid Percent
Very good	163	24.8
Good	266	40.4
OK	158	24.0
Poor	35	5.3
Very poor	16	2.4
N/A	20	3.0
Total	658	100.0

Current Housing when Compared to Others

When asked to compare their current housing situation to that of others they know, 42% reported that they felt that their current housing situation was "somewhat better" or "a lot better" while 10% of respondents reported that they believed that their housing situation was "somewhat worse" or "a lot worse". Thirty-one percent of respondents did not respond to this question.

Compared to others

	Frequency	Valid Percent
A lot better	163	24.8
Somewhat better	111	16.9
About the same	119	18.1
Somewhat worse	44	6.7
A lot worse	20	3.0
No response	201	30.5
Total	658	100.0

Current versus Previous Housing

When asked to rate their current housing to their previous housing, 63% of respondents reported that their current housing situation was "somewhat" or "a lot" better while 13% of all respondents indicated that they felt that their current housing situation was "somewhat" or "a lot" worse.

Current versus previous housing rating

	Frequency	Valid Percent
A lot better	320	48.6
Somewhat better	152	23.1
About the same	84	12.8
Somewhat worse	67	10.2
A lot worse	21	3.2
Unsure	9	1.4
No response	5	.8
Total	658	100.0

Satisfaction with their Rent

Over half (52%) reported that their rent was "very good" or "good" while 15% reported that their rent was "poor" or "very poor".

Rent rating

	Frequency	Valid Percent
Very good	188	28.6
Good	152	23.1
OK	211	32.1
Poor	63	9.6
Very poor	35	5.3
N/A	9	1.4
Total	658	100.0

Satisfaction with their Neighbourhood

Thirty-six percent reported that their neighbourhood was “very good” or “good” while 29% felt that their neighbourhood was “poor” or “very poor”.

Neighbourhood rating

	Frequency	Valid Percent
Very good	43	6.5
Good	194	29.5
OK	220	33.5
Poor	120	18.3
Very poor	73	11.1
N/A	7	1.1
Total who responded	657	100.0
Did not respond	1	
Total	658	

Satisfaction with Safety and Security in the Building

When asked to rate their satisfaction with the safety and security in their building, 59% reported that the security in the building was either “good” or “very good”. Seventeen percent reported that they felt that the general level of safety and security in their building was “poor” or “very poor”.

Safety rating

	Frequency	Valid Percent
Very good	151	23.0
Good	237	36.1
OK	155	23.6
Poor	63	9.6
Very poor	48	7.3
N/A	3	.5
Total who responded	657	100.0
Did not respond	1	
Total	658	

Satisfaction with Management of the Building

Sixty-two percent of respondents reported that the management in the building was either “good” or “very good”. Sixteen percent considered building management to be either “poor” or “very poor”.

Management rating

	Frequency	Valid Percent
Very good	162	24.6
Good	248	37.7
OK	139	21.1
Poor	58	8.8
Very poor	44	6.7
N/A	7	1.1
Total	658	100.0

Satisfaction with Maintenance of the Building

When asked about maintenance in their building, 61% reported that maintenance was either "good" or "very good" while 16% of respondents reported that maintenance standards were either "poor" or "very poor".

Maintenance rating

	Frequency	Valid Percent
Very good	160	24.3
Good	238	36.2
OK	143	21.7
Poor	74	11.2
Very poor	31	4.7
N/A	12	1.8
Total	658	100.0

Satisfaction with Ability to have Guests

When asked to rate their satisfaction with their ability to have guests, 44% of respondents reported that they felt that the policies were "good" or "very good" while 4% of respondents reported that they felt that the policies were "poor" or "very poor". A sizeable group (36%) indicated that this question was not applicable to their circumstances.

Guests rating

	Frequency	Valid Percent
Very good	123	18.7
Good	171	26.0
OK	100	15.2
Poor	16	2.4
Very poor	12	1.8
N/A	236	35.9
Total	658	100.0

Problems in Their Building

Respondents were asked to comment on a number of different types of issues and to indicate the extent to which they perceived these types of issues to be a problem in their housing. The types of issues that were identified included:

1. Pests;
2. Noise;
3. Security;
4. Drug Related Activity;
5. Guest Fees.

Pests as a Problem in Building

Twenty percent reported that pests were a big problem in their building.

Pests as problem

	Frequency	Valid Percent
Big problem	132	20.1
Small problem	246	37.4
Not a problem	274	41.6
No response	6	.9
Total	658	100.0

In terms of the types of pest problems that were identified, 13% identified more than one type of pest while 1% of all respondents indicated all major vermin (mice/rats, bedbugs and cockroaches) were a problem. Roaches and insects were the most frequently cited individual problem with 23% reporting this as a problem. Bedbugs were identified as a problem by 21% while mice or rats were identified as a problem by 13%.

Noise as a Problem in Building

When asked whether noise in the building was a problem, 10% of respondents reported that they felt that noise in the building was a big problem while two thirds (68%) did not see noise as a problem.

Noise problem

	Frequency	Valid Percent
Big problem	68	10.3
Small problem	133	20.2
Not a problem	450	68.4
No response	7	1.1
Total	658	100.0

Safety and Security Problems in Building

When asked about safety and security issues in their building 10% reported that they felt that security-related concerns were a “big” problem while 3 in 4 (75%) did not see security-related concerns as a problem in their building.

Security problem

	Frequency	Valid Percent
Big problem	64	9.7
Small problem	93	14.1
Not a problem	491	74.6
No response	10	1.5
Total	658	100.0

Drug Related Activity as a Problem in Building

Fourteen percent identified drug-related activities as a “big problem” in their building while 61% reported that they did not constitute a problem.

Drug problem

	Frequency	Valid Percent
Big problem	93	14.1
Small problem	143	21.7
Not a problem	404	61.4
No response	18	2.7
Total	658	100.0

Strangers in Building as a Problem

When asked whether strangers in the building were a problem, 14% suggested this was a “big problem” while 60% felt it was not a problem.

Strangers in building problem

	Frequency	Valid Percent
Big problem	95	14.4
Small problem	145	22.0
Not a problem	393	59.7
No response	25	3.8
Total	658	100.0

Guest Fees as a Problem in Building

Guest fees did not constitute a problem in the social housing stock.

Guest fee problem

	Frequency	Valid Percent
Big problem	0	.0
Small problem	3	.5
Not a problem	529	80.4
No response	126	19.1
Total	658	100.0

The Best Thing about their Housing and Neighbourhood

Respondents were asked to indicate what they liked “best” about their housing and about the DTES. The following reflects the most frequently cited responses with regard to their housing:

- Accessibility or convenience afforded by living in the DTES (22%);
- Affordability of their housing (18%);
- Safety or security of their housing (17%);
- Satisfaction with the unit or building (eg. amenities, size of unit) (16%);
- Access to friends or family (12%);
- Quiet place to live (11%);
- Cleanliness (9%);
- Management of their housing (8%);
- Access to services (4%);
- The DTES neighbourhood (4%).

Three percent reported there was nothing that they liked about their housing.

In terms of satisfaction with their neighbourhood, the following list reflects the most frequently cited responses from those living in social housing:

- Access to Chinatown (39%);
- General access to shops, transit, downtown (27%);
- Access to social services (20%);
- Friends, social environment, community feeling (12%);
- Affordability (3%).

Thirty-six percent reported there was nothing that they liked about their neighbourhood.

Worst Thing about their Housing and the Neighbourhood

Respondents living in social housing were also asked to indicate what they liked least about their housing as well as what they liked least about living in the Downtown Eastside. In terms of the negative aspects of their housing, the following reflects the general distribution of responses:

- Poor or unsatisfactory housing/management/maintenance (19%);
- The neighbourhood/poverty issues (12%);

- Drug problems (dealers and users) (10%);
- Unsanitary conditions (including vermin) (8%); and,
- Crime/violence/lack of safety (7%).

Forty-four percent either did not respond or reported that there was nothing negative about their housing.

When asked to indicate the worst thing about the DTES the following responses were recorded:

- Drug problems (dealers and users) (37%);
- Crime/violence/lack of safety or security (29%);
- The neighbourhood/people and general poverty issues (18%);
- Unsanitary conditions (including vermin) (5%);
- Noise (3%).

Seventeen percent did not believe that there was any worst thing about the neighbourhood.

Concluding Comments

Finally, respondents were asked if they had any final or concluding comments they wished to make. In total, 70% of respondents living in social housing offered feedback of this nature. Much of this feedback was direct and often addressed strong beliefs or priorities of the respondents. Following is a sample of the themes they touched upon.

- BC Housing sending drug addicts, homeless to live here for 3 years. The prostitutes make noise in night. They bang on our doors--It's very stressful.
- Certain drugs not covered. As senior on fixed income I would like increase in coverage.
- CPP isn't enough for seniors and 30% of rent is too much. Cost of prescription drugs and vitamins way too much.
- Everything is fine except the drugs in the complex--it's not good for the children.
- Government and BC Housing are doing a great job.
- Government should build a lot more subsidized housing everywhere -not just in Chinatown. More stringent laws needed regarding problems in DTES.
- Hastings St. element spills over to our parking lot--should do something about it.
- Human waste is rampant, especially in summer. Needles, condoms. Worried about childrens' safety. Government should remove homeless and addicts from area.
- Lots of strangers in building—I don't know if they live here. I'm afraid to look at them.

APPENDIX A

Summary Table A: SRO and Social Housing Totals

Variable	SRO Total	Social Housing Total
Total sample size	628	658
Percentage of males	79%	56%
Percentage of females	20%	44%
Transgender	2%	n/a
Average age	46 years	58 years
Percentage under 35	15%	8%
Percentage under 55	79%	45%
Percentage over 55	21%	55%
Caucasian	66%	43%
Asian	6%	38%
Hispanic or Black	4%	4%
Aboriginal Status (not including Metis)	15%	11%
Attended elementary school only	11%	18%
Attended high school	66%	44%
Attended vocational training or university	22%	25%
English as primary language	89%	57%
Chinese (Cantonese or Mandarin)	4%	35%
Born in Vancouver or Gr. Vancouver	17%	10%
Born in Canada outside Greater Vancouver	65%	40%
Born outside Canada	18%	49%
Left home 16 or younger	44%	31%
Average age left home	17 years	19 years
History of foster care	14%	7%
Time in prison	18%	10%
Reliance on income assistance	60%	25%
Income from employment	21%	17%
Disability or senior benefits	12%	51%
Percentage working full time	12%	8%
Percentage working part time	12%	9%
Available to work	46%	29%
Average total income	\$1,109	\$1,143
Average total income for those receiving Income Assistance	\$838	\$843
Average total income for those reporting employment	\$1,887	\$1,805
Percentage with annual incomes of \$15,000 or less	77%	72%
Average monthly rent	\$395	\$386
Percentage paying less than \$325 per month	4%	27%
Time in the DTES <1 year	21%	7%
Time in the DTES >5 years	45%	69%

Variable	SRO Total	Social Housing Total
Time in current housing <1 year	45%	17%
Time in current housing >5 years	16%	47%
Previous housing in Vancouver	71%	83%
Previous housing in Greater Vancouver	14%	11%
Previous housing elsewhere in B.C.	5%	2%
Previous housing outside of B.C.	10%	4%
Attended school in Vancouver	16%	12%
Attended school in Greater Vancouver	17%	5%
Previous housing type -SRO	34%	24%
Previous housing type –Other rental	36%	29%
Previous housing type- social housing	2%	10%
Previously stayed in emergency shelter or homeless	11%	9%
Changes in personal circumstances	31%	12%
Eviction in past year	14%	3%
Reason for moving (affordability)	13%	15%
Reason for moving (condition of housing)	15%	14%
Previous use of emergency shelters	52%	30%
Previous use of emergency shelters (past year)	22%	6%
Multiple use of emergency shelters (past year)	12%	4%
Previous experience sofa surfing	48%	27%
Sofa surfing (past year)	17%	2%
Multiple periods of sofa surfing (past year)	11%	1%
Previous experience sleeping rough	52%	28%
Sleeping rough (past year)	20%	4%
Multiple periods of sleeping rough (past year)	15%	2%
Previously lived in social housing	14%	n/a
Want to stay in Downtown Eastside	16%	46%
Applied to live in social housing	30%	n/a
Expect to remain in Downtown Eastside (5+ years)	13%	27%
Unsure how much longer in Downtown Eastside	45%	55%
Health- Excellent/Very Good	31%	25%
Health – Poor/Terrible	28%	31%
Decline in health in past year	32%	27%
Percent reporting multiple health issues	47%	37%
Physical limitations	43%	53%
Drug addiction	32%	14%
Mental Illness	30%	25%
TB/HEP C/HIV/AIDS	22%	13%
Alcohol Addiction	20%	15%

Variable	SRO Total	Social Housing Total
Drug and Alcohol Addiction	11%	8%
Brain Injury/FAS	7%	6%
Hospitalized in past year	21%	21%
Emergency room use in past year	39%	26%
Multiple emergency room use in past year	21%	11%
Concerns of health impact of DTES	40%	20%
Use of income support programs	75%	45%
Job training/skills development program use	17%	8%
Food bank/meal program use	47%	24%
Mental health or addiction program use	17%	13%
Health clinic use	48%	30%
Community centre use	41%	38%
Safe injection site use	11%	3%
Use of on-site services	4%	12%
Top ranked need identified	Housing	Income
Second top ranked need	Income	Health
Third top ranked need	Health	Housing
Extent to which needs are unmet	19%	53%
Overall satisfaction with housing (good/very good)	34%	65%
Compared with others (better/a lot better)	36%	42%
Compared with previous housing (better/a lot better)	32%	63%
Satisfaction with rent (good/very good)	33%	51%
Satisfaction with neighbourhood (good/very good)	21%	36%
Satisfaction with safety and security (good/ very good)	46%	59%
Satisfaction with management (good/very good)	43%	62%
Satisfaction with maintenance (good/very good)	39%	61%
Pests as a big problem	40%	20%
Problem with bed bugs	31%	21%
Noise as a big problem	17%	10%
Security as a big problem	11%	10%
Drug –related activity as a big problem	14%	14%
Strangers in the building as a big problem	11%	14%
Guest fees as a big problem	11%	1%
Best thing about the DTES	Accessibility	Accessibility
Worst thing about the DTES	Drug issues	Drug issues

APPENDIX B

Summary Table B: SRO Totals and SRO by Building Size

Variable	SRO	SRO > 40 units (%)	SRO 40 units or less (%)
Total sample size	628	443	185
Percentage of males	79%	78%	81%
Percentage of females	20%	21%	17%
Transgender	2%	1%	2%
Average age	46 years	47 years	46 years
Percentage under 35	15%	15%	16%
Percentage under 55	79%	78%	82%
Percentage over 55	21%	22%	19%
Caucasian	66%	70%	63%
Asian	6%	5%	9%
Hispanic or Black	4%	4%	4%
Aboriginal Status	15%	16%	18%
Attended elementary school only	11%	9%	15%
Attended high school	66%	67%	63%
Attended vocational training or university	22%	22%	21%
English as primary language	89%	89%	85%
Chinese (Cantonese or Mandarin)	4%	4%	7%
Born in Vancouver or Gr. Vancouver	17%	17%	17%
Born in Canada outside Greater Vancouver	65%	66%	64%
Born outside Canada	18%	17%	19%
Left home 16 or younger	44%	45%	42%
Average age left home	17 years	17 years	17 years
History of foster care	14%	15%	12%
Time in prison	18%	15%	22%
Reliance on income assistance	60%	60%	61%
Income from employment	21%	19%	27%
Disability or senior benefits	12%	14%	7%
Percentage working full time	12%	11%	15%
Percentage working part time	12%	12%	12%
Available to work	46%	45%	49%
Average total income	\$1,109	\$1,111	\$1,097
Average total income for those receiving Income Assistance	\$838	\$839	\$835
Average total income for those reporting employment	\$1,887	\$2,040	\$1,648
Percentage with annual incomes of \$15,000 or less	77%	77%	77%
Average monthly rent	\$395	\$403	\$374
Percentage paying less than \$325 per month	4%	2%	8%
Time in the DTES <1 year	21%	21%	23%
Time in the DTES >5 years	45%	45%	45%

Variable	SRO	SRO > 40 units (%)	SRO 40 units or less (%)
Time in current housing <1 year	45%	45%	45%
Time in current housing >5 years	16%	16%	15%
Previous housing in Vancouver	71%	71%	71%
Previous housing in Greater Vancouver	14%	15%	11%
Previous housing elsewhere in B.C.	5%	5%	7%
Previous housing outside of B.C.	10%	10%	11%
Attended school in Vancouver	16%	16%	15%
Attended school in Greater Vancouver	12%	13%	9%
Previous housing type -SRO	34%	35%	33%
Previous housing type –Other rental	36%	36%	37%
Previous housing type- Social housing	2%	2%	3%
Previously stayed in emergency shelter or homeless	11%	13%	8%
Changes in personal circumstances	31%	31%	32%
Eviction in past year	14%	14%	10%
Reason for most recent move (affordability)	13%	13%	14%
Reason for most recent move (condition of housing)	15%	16%	14%
Previous use of emergency shelters	52%	51%	53%
Previous use of emergency shelters (past year)	22%	23%	19%
Multiple use of emergency shelters (past year)	12%	12%	12%
Previous experience sofa surfing	48%	46%	51%
Sofa surfing (past year)	17%	16%	18%
Multiple periods of sofa surfing (past year)	11%	10%	12%
Previous experience sleeping rough	52%	50%	56%
Sleeping rough (past year)	20%	21%	19%
Multiple periods of sleeping rough (past year)	15%	15%	15%
Previously lived in social housing	14%	14%	15%
Want to stay in Downtown Eastside	16%	15%	21%
Applied to live in social housing	30%	28%	35%
Expect to remain in Downtown Eastside (5+ years)	13%	11%	17%
Unsure how much longer in Downtown Eastside	45%	47%	40%
Health- Excellent/Very Good	31%	29%	34%
Health – Poor/Terrible	28%	26%	32%
Decline in health in past year	32%	33%	30%
Percent reporting multiple health issues	47%	47%	48%
Physical limitations	43%	45%	40%
Drug addiction	32%	31%	35%
Mental Illness	30%	31%	28%
TB/HEP C/HIV/AIDS	22%	22%	24%
Alcohol Addiction	20%	19%	24%

Variable	SRO	SRO > 40 units (%)	SRO 40 units or less (%)
Drug and Alcohol Addiction	11%	10%	14%
Brain Injury/FAS	7%	6%	9%
Hospitalized in past year	21%	22%	18%
Emergency room use in past year	39%	42%	33%
Multiple emergency room use in past year	21%	21%	20%
Concerns of health impact of DTES	40%	42%	36%
Use of income support programs	75%	77%	71%
Job training/skills development program use	17%	18%	15%
Food bank/meal program use	47%	44%	55%
Mental health or addiction program use	17%	18%	14%
Health clinic use	48%	46%	52%
Community centre use	41%	39%	45%
Safe injection site use	11%	11%	11%
Use of on-site services	4%	5%	3%
Top ranked need identified	Housing	Housing	Housing
Second top ranked need	Income	Income	Health
Third top ranked need	Health	Health	Income
Extent to which needs are unmet	19%	16%	26%
Overall satisfaction with housing (good/very good)	34%	33%	38%
Compared with others (better/a lot better)	36%	36%	37%
Compared with previous housing (better/a lot better)	32%	31%	37%
Satisfaction with rent (good/very good)	33%	33%	38%
Satisfaction with neighbourhood (good/very good)	21%	16%	30%
Satisfaction with safety and security (good/ very good)	46%	45%	47%
Satisfaction with management (good/very good)	43%	43%	44%
Satisfaction with maintenance (good/very good)	39%	39%	40%
Pests as a big problem	40%	43%	31%
Problem with bed bugs	31%	29%	29%
Noise as a big problem	17%	20%	11%
Security as a big problem	11%	12%	10%
Drug-related activity as a big problem	14%	16%	10%
Strangers in the building as a big problem	11%	12%	10%
Guest fees as a big problem	11%	13%	7%
Best thing about DTES	Accessibility	Accessibility	Accessibility
Worst thing about DTES	Drug issues	Drug issues	Drug issues

APPENDIX C

Summary Table C: SRO and Social Housing by Gender

<i>Variable</i>	SRO Males	SRO Females	Social Hsg Males	Social Hsg Females
Total sample size	495	126	367	287
Percentage of males	--	--	--	--
Percentage of females	--	--	--	--
Transgender	--	--	--	--
Average age	47 years	44 years	57 years	60 years
Percentage under 35	14%	18%	7%	7%
Percentage under 55	77%	87%	47%	43%
Percentage over 55	23%	13%	53%	57%
Caucasian	73%	48%	55%	27%
Asian	5%	8%	26%	54%
Hispanic or Black	4%	2%	5%	2%
Aboriginal Status	12%	34%	10%	11%
Attended elementary school only	10%	15%	18%	19%
Attended high school	66%	67%	51%	36%
Attended vocational training or university	23%	15%	25%	25%
English as primary language	87%	91%	67%	45%
Chinese (Cantonese or Mandarin)	4%	6%	23%	49%
Born in Vancouver or Gr. Vancouver	18%	14%	10%	11%
Born in Canada outside Greater Vancouver	64%	68%	39%	26%
Born outside Canada	18%	18%	51%	63%
Left home 16 years or younger	43%	47%	34%	26%
Average age left home	17 years	17 years	19 years	20 years
History of foster care	13%	19%	7%	8%
Time in prison	20%	8%	15%	5%
Reliance on income assistance	58%	66%	30%	20%
Income from employment	23%	14%	15%	19%
Disability or senior benefits	12%	10%	50%	53%
Percentage working full time	13%	10%	11%	6%
Percentage working part time	13%	10%	5%	12%
Available to work	47%	43%	30%	28%
Average total income	\$1,123	\$1,053	\$1,175	\$1,100
Average total income for those receiving IA	\$842	\$820	\$843	\$844
Average total income for those reporting employment	\$1,894	\$1,832	\$2,035	\$1,584
Percentage with annual incomes of \$15,000 or less	76%	80%	69%	75%
Average monthly rent	\$393	\$402	\$382	\$393
Percentage paying less than \$325 per month	3%	8%	26%	31%
Time in the DTES <1 year	21%	22%	8%	6%
Time in the DTES >5 years	47%	40%	66%	73%

<i>Variable</i>	SRO Males	SRO Females	Social Hsg Males	Social Hsg Females
Time in current housing <1 year	44%	49%	21%	12%
Time in current housing >5 years	17%	11%	44%	57%
Previous housing in Vancouver	71%	71%	86%	78%
Previous housing in Greater Vancouver	13%	16%	8%	14%
Previous housing elsewhere in B.C.	5%	6%	2%	3%
Previous housing outside of B.C.	11%	8%	4%	5%
Attended school in Vancouver	16%	17%	13%	11%
Attended school in Greater Vancouver	10%	17%	5%	5%
Previous housing type -SRO	34%	33%	33%	14%
Previous housing type –Other rental	36%	37%	28%	29%
Previous housing type- social housing	2%	2%	9%	11%
Previously lived in shelter or was homeless	11%	10%	10%	6%
Changes in personal circumstances	30%	33%	13%	11%
Eviction in past year	13%	14%	3%	2%
Reason for moving (affordability)	13%	15%	16%	14%
Reason for moving (condition of housing)	14%	19%	16%	12%
Previous use of emergency shelters	51%	52%	37%	21%
Previous use of emergency shelters (past year)	21%	25%	8%	5%
Multiple use of emergency shelters (past year)	12%	11%	5%	3%
Previous experience sofa surfing	46%	52%	31%	22%
Sofa surfing (past year)	14%	27%	3%	1%
Multiple periods of sofa surfing (past year)	8%	20%	1%	1%
Previous experience sleeping rough	53%	48%	37%	15%
Sleeping rough (past year)	18%	28%	4%	4%
Multiple periods of sleeping rough (past year)	14%	18%	3%	2%
Previously lived in social housing	12%	21%	--	--
Want to stay in Downtown Eastside	16%	18%	40%	52%
Applied to live in social housing	27%	38%	--	--
Expect to remain in Downtown Eastside (5+ years)	13%	12%	31%	20%
Unsure how much longer in Downtown Eastside	46%	41%	46%	66%
Health- Excellent/Very Good	32%	25%	25%	25%
Health – Poor/Terrible	28%	29%	32%	30%
Decline in health in past year	30%	41%	27%	28%
Percent reporting multiple health issues	44%	60%	43%	30%
Physical limitations	44%	47%	55%	51%
Drug addiction	30%	41%	16%	10%
Mental Illness	28%	34%	27%	21%
TB/HEP C/HIV/AIDS	21%	27%	15%	9%

<i>Variable</i>	SRO Males	SRO Females	Social Hsg Males	Social Hsg Females
Alcohol Addiction	20%	22%	19%	9%
Drug and Alcohol Addiction	10%	13%	7%	6%
Brain Injury/FAS	7%	8%	8%	4%
Hospitalized in past year	20%	28%	21%	22%
Emergency room use in past year	37%	49%	28%	23%
Multiple emergency room use in past year	18%	30%	13%	10%
Concerns of health impact of DTES	39%	46%	22%	16%
Use of income support programs	75%	75%	59%	38%
Job training/skills development program use	17%	19%	9%	9%
Food bank/meal program use	46%	48%	32%	20%
Mental health or addiction program use	17%	17%	18%	10%
Health clinic use	44%	58%	40%	24%
Community centre use	39%	48%	45%	41%
Safe injection site use	9%	17%	2%	4%
Use of on-site services	3%	8%	15%	16%
Top ranked need identified	Housing	Housing	Income	Income
Second top ranked need	Income	Health	Health	Health
Third top ranked need	Health	Income	Housing	Emotional Support
Extent to which needs are unmet	21%	15%	45%	64%
Overall satisfaction with housing (good/very good)	34%	34%	66%	65%
Compared with others (better/a lot better)	36%	35%	47%	35%
Compared with previous housing (better/a lot better)	32%	33%	69%	75%
Satisfaction with rent (good/very good)	33%	37%	59%	43%
Satisfaction with neighbourhood (good/very good)	19%	22%	32%	42%
Satisfaction with safety and security (good/ very good)	46%	46%	60%	59%
Satisfaction with management (good/very good)	44%	40%	65%	60%
Satisfaction with maintenance (good/very good)	40%	36%	64%	56%
Pests as a big problem	39%	44%	20%	20%
Problem with bed bugs	29%	31%	21%	18%
Noise as a big problem	17%	18%	9%	12%
Security as a big problem	10%	15%	7%	13%
Drug –related activity as a big problem	13%	21%	10%	19%
Strangers in the building as a big problem	11%	14%	10%	20%
Guest fees as a big problem	9%	21%	1%	0%
Best thing about their housing	Accessibility	Accessibility	Accessibility	Accessibility
Worst thing about their housing	Drug issues	Drug issues	Drug issues	Drug issues

APPENDIX D Summary Table D: SRO/Social Housing by Poor/Terrible Health

<i>Variable</i>	SRO Poor or Terrible Health	Social Housing Poor or Terrible Health
Total sample size	176	203
Percentage of males	78%	57%
Percentage of females	21%	43%
Transgender	1%	0%
Average age	49 years	61 years
Percentage under 35	9%	3%
Percentage under 55	76%	41%
Percentage over 55	24%	59%
Caucasian	70%	46%
Asian	4%	33%
Hispanic or Black	4%	4%
Aboriginal Status	16%	11%
Completed elementary school	12%	21%
Completed high school	70%	44%
Vocational training or university	17%	19%
English as primary language	92%	61%
Chinese (Cantonese or Mandarin)	3%	32%
Born in Vancouver or Gr. Vancouver	18%	10%
Born in Canada outside Greater Vancouver	69%	44%
Born outside of Canada	14%	46%
Left home 16 years or younger	44%	34%
Average age left home	17 years	19 years
History of foster care	15%	8%
Time in prison	17%	13%
Reliance on income assistance	74%	28%
Income from employment	5%	5%
Disability or senior benefits	18%	62%
Percentage working full time	2%	3%
Percentage working part time	6%	2%
Available to work	19%	9%
Average total income	\$854	\$1,015
Average total income for those receiving IA	\$805	\$831
Average total income for those reporting employment	\$975	\$1,426
Percentage with annual incomes of \$15,000 or less	91%	78%
Average monthly rent	\$395	\$371
Percentage paying less than \$325 per month	4%	30%
Time in the DTES <1 year	21%	8%
Time in the DTES >5 years	48%	72%

<i>Variable</i>	SRO Poor or Terrible Health	Social Housing Poor or Terrible Health
Time in current housing <1 year	40%	19%
Time in current housing >5 years	22%	49%
Previous housing in Vancouver	71%	80%
Previous housing in Greater Vancouver	16%	12%
Previous housing elsewhere in B.C.	5%	5%
Previous housing outside of B.C.	8%	4%
Attended school in Vancouver	16%	10%
Attended school in Greater Vancouver	14%	5%
Previous housing type -SRO	34%	29%
Previous housing type –Other rental	40%	22%
Previous housing type- social housing	1%	8%
Previously stayed in emergency shelter/homeless	11%	10%
Changes in personal circumstances	38%	18%
Eviction	13%	3%
Reason for moving (affordability)	13%	13%
Reason for moving (condition of housing)	17%	11%
Previous use of emergency shelters	53%	34%
Previous use of emergency shelters (past year)	19%	7%
Multiple use of emergency shelters (past year)	9%	4%
Previous experience sofa surfing	45%	26%
Sofa surfing (past year)	14%	3%
Multiple periods of sofa surfing (past year)	9%	1%
Previous experience sleeping rough	53%	33%
Sleeping rough (past year)	15%	6%
Multiple periods of sleeping rough (past year)	11%	4%
Previously lived in social housing	13%	--
Want to stay in Downtown Eastside	17%	51%
Applied to live in social housing	36%	--
Expect to remain in Downtown Eastside (5+ years)	10%	28%
Unsure how much longer in Downtown Eastside	48%	54%
Health- Excellent/Very Good	--	--
Health – Poor/Terrible	--	--
Decline in health in past year	60%	57%
Percent reporting multiple health issues	64%	55%
Physical limitations	73%	83%
Drug addiction	36%	15%
Mental Illness	36%	33%
TB/HEP C/HIV/AIDS	32%	16%

<i>Variable</i>	SRO Poor or Terrible Health	Social Housing Poor or Terrible Health
Alcohol Addiction	23%	18%
Drug and Alcohol Addiction	15%	8%
Brain Injury/FAS	9%	8%
Hospitalized in past year	31%	34%
Emergency room use in past year	49%	31%
Multiple emergency room use in past year	35%	17%
Concerns of health impact of DTES	55%	23%
Use of income support programs	88%	59%
Job training/skills development program use	9%	6%
Food bank/meal program use	55%	29%
Mental health or addiction program use	14%	18%
Health clinic use	50%	39%
Community centre use	42%	36%
Safe injection site use	12%	4%
Use of on-site services	3%	16%
Top ranked need identified	Housing	Health
Second top ranked need	Health	Income
Third top ranked need	Income	Housing
Extent to which needs are unmet	17%	54%
Overall satisfaction with housing (good/very good)	31%	57%
Compared with others (better/a lot better)	39%	44%
Compared with previous housing (better/a lot better)	31%	71%
Satisfaction with rent (good/very good)	31%	52%
Satisfaction with neighbourhood (good/very good)	18%	32%
Satisfaction with safety and security (good/ very good)	41%	57%
Satisfaction with management (good/very good)	37%	59%
Satisfaction with maintenance (good/very good)	34%	57%
Pests as a big problem	42%	22%
Problem with bed bugs	31%	19%
Noise as a big problem	19%	8%
Security as a big problem	15%	8%
Drug –related activity as a big problem	14%	13%
Strangers in the building as a big problem	13%	14%
Guest fees as a big problem	9%	0%
Best thing about their housing	Accessibility	Accessibility
Worst thing about their housing	Drug issues	Drug issues

APPENDIX E Summary Table E: SRO and Social Housing by Aboriginal Status

Variable	SRO Aboriginal Status	Social Housing Aboriginal Status
Total sample size	126	87
Percentage of males	60%	53%
Percentage of females	39%	46%
Transgender	2%	1%
Average age	42%	49%
Percentage under 35	19%	13%
Percentage under 55	95%	66%
Percentage over 55	5%	34%
Caucasian	--	--
Asian	--	--
Hispanic or Black	--	--
Aboriginal Status	--	--
Attended elementary school only	14%	24%
Attended high school	76%	54%
Attended vocational training or university	10%	20%
English as primary language	91%	97%
Chinese (Cantonese or Mandarin)	0%	0%
Born in Vancouver or Gr. Vancouver	14%	17%
Born elsewhere Canada outside Greater Vancouver	85%	80%
Born outside of Canada	2%	2%
Left home 16 or younger	58%	54%
Average age left home	16 years	17 years
History of foster care	37%	24%
Time in prison	20%	22%
Reliance on income assistance	75%	45%
Income from employment	14%	8%
Disability or senior benefits	3%	39%
Percentage working full time	6%	8%
Percentage working part time	10%	2%
Available to work	47%	22%
Average total income	\$930	\$1,027
Average total income for those receiving Income Assistance	\$796	\$818
Average total income for those reporting employment	\$1,421	\$1,643
Percentage with annual incomes of \$15,000 or less	85%	78%
Average monthly rent	\$402	\$375
Percentage paying less than \$325 per month	0%	27%
Time in the DTES <1 year	17%	6%
Time in the DTES >5 years	43%	69%

Variable	SRO Aboriginal Status	Social Housing Aboriginal Status
Time in current housing <1 year	54%	28%
Time in current housing >5 years	8%	38%
Previous housing in Vancouver	77%	87%
Previous housing in Greater Vancouver	13%	8%
Previous housing elsewhere in B.C.	4%	1%
Previous housing outside of B.C.	6%	3%
Attended school in Vancouver	16%	18%
Attended school in Greater Vancouver	10%	6%
Previous housing type -SRO	37%	37%
Previous housing type –Other rental	26%	21%
Previous housing type- social housing	3%	13%
Previously stayed in emergency shelter or homeless	15%	23%
Changes in personal circumstances	35%	22%
Eviction in past year	18%	8%
Reason for moving (affordability)	12%	8%
Reason for moving (condition of housing)	15%	21%
Previous use of emergency shelters	66%	62%
Previous use of emergency shelters (past year)	32%	21%
Multiple use of emergency shelters (past year)	21%	13%
Previous experience sofa surfing	59%	47%
Sofa surfing (past year)	25%	5%
Multiple periods of sofa surfing (past year)	20%	3%
Previous experience sleeping rough	66%	58%
Sleeping rough (past year)	32%	13%
Multiple periods of sleeping rough (past year)	24%	11%
Previously lived in social housing	19%	--
Want to stay in Downtown Eastside	10%	32%
Applied to live in social housing	37%	--
Expect to remain in Downtown Eastside (5+ years)	9%	43%
Unsure how much longer in Downtown Eastside	45%	31%
Health- Excellent/Very Good	21%	23%
Health – Poor/Terrible	28%	32%
Decline in health in past year	41%	36%
Percent reporting multiple health issues	57%	63%
Physical limitations	37%	58%
Drug addiction	42%	31%
Mental Illness	26%	26%
TB/HEP C/HIV/AIDS	29%	28%

Variable	SRO Aboriginal Status	Social Housing Aboriginal Status
Alcohol Addiction	36%	37%
Drug and Alcohol Addiction	21%	17%
Brain Injury/FAS	12%	12%
Hospitalized in past year	30%	25%
Emergency room use in past year	51%	41%
Multiple emergency room use in past year	27%	14%
Concerns of health impact of DTES	44%	31%
Use of income support programs	89%	77%
Job training/skills development program use	25%	12%
Food bank/meal program use	62%	48%
Mental health or addiction program use	16%	22%
Health clinic use	59%	53%
Community centre use	54%	59%
Safe injection site use	15%	7%
Use of on-site services	2%	24%
Top ranked need identified	Housing	Health Care
Second top ranked need	Health Care	Housing
Third top ranked need	Income Support	Emotional Support
Extent to which needs are unmet	20%	37%
Overall satisfaction with housing (good/very good)	32%	75%
Compared with others (better/a lot better)	33%	60%
Compared with previous housing (better/a lot better)	31%	81%
Satisfaction with rent (good/very good)	33%	69%
Satisfaction with neighbourhood (good/very good)	22%	25%
Satisfaction with safety and security (good/ very good)	42%	66%
Satisfaction with management (good/very good)	39%	70%
Satisfaction with maintenance (good/very good)	37%	62%
Pests as a big problem	48%	29%
Problem with bed bugs	34%	40%
Noise as a big problem	23%	7%
Security as a big problem	17%	7%
Drug –related activity as a big problem	18%	12%
Strangers in the building as a big problem	14%	9%
Guest fees as a big problem	18%	0%
Best thing about the DTES	Accessibility	Accessibility
Worst thing about the DTES	Drug issues	Drug issues

APPENDIX F Summary Table F: SROs and ‘Non-Market’ SROs

<i>Variable</i>	SRO Total	Non-Market SROs
Total sample size	628	108
Percentage of males	79%	72%
Percentage of females	20%	26%
Transgender	2%	2%
Average age	46 years	46 years
Percentage under 35	15%	11%
Percentage under 55	79%	80%
Percentage over 55	21%	20%
Caucasian	66%	60%
Asian	6%	6%
Hispanic or Black	4%	6%
Aboriginal Status (not including Metis)	15%	21%
Completed elementary school	11%	13%
Completed high school	66%	61%
Vocational training or university	22%	21%
English as primary language	89%	95%
Chinese (Cantonese or Mandarin)	4%	1%
Born in Vancouver or Gr. Vancouver	17%	17%
Born elsewhere in Canada outside Greater Vancouver	65%	69%
Born outside of Canada	18%	15%
Left home 16 years or younger	44%	49%
Average age left home	17 years	17 years
History of foster care	14%	18%
Time in prison	18%	29%
Reliance on income assistance	60%	62%
Income from employment	21%	7%
Disability or senior benefits	12%	21%
Percentage working full time	12%	2%
Percentage working part time	12%	6%
Available to work	46%	33%
Average total income	\$1,109	\$976
Average total income for those receiving IA	\$838	\$825
Average total income for those reporting employment	\$1,887	\$1,827
Percentage with annual incomes of \$15,000 or less	77%	92%
Average monthly rent	\$395	\$359
Percentage paying less than \$325 per month	4%	8%
Time in the DTES <1 year	21%	8%
Time in the DTES >5 years	45%	66%

<i>Variable</i>	SRO Total	Non-Market SROs
Time in current housing <1 year	45%	33%
Time in current housing >5 years	16%	24%
Previous housing in Vancouver	71%	83%
Previous housing in Greater Vancouver	14%	7%
Previous housing elsewhere in B.C.	5%	7%
Previous housing outside of B.C.	10%	2%
Attended school in Vancouver	16%	19%
Attended school in Greater Vancouver	17%	6%
Previous housing type -SRO	34%	42%
Previous housing type –Other rental	36%	20%
Previous housing type- social housing	2%	14%
Previously stayed in emergency shelter/homeless	11%	17%
Changes in personal circumstances	31%	24%
Eviction	14%	7%
Reason for moving (affordability)	13%	9%
Reason for moving (condition of housing)	15%	15%
Previous use of emergency shelters	52%	63%
Previous use of emergency shelters (past year)	22%	13%
Multiple use of emergency shelters (past year)	12%	9%
Previous experience sofa surfing	48%	50%
Sofa surfing (past year)	17%	7%
Multiple periods of sofa surfing (past year)	11%	2%
Previous experience sleeping rough	52%	58%
Sleeping rough (past year)	20%	15%
Multiple periods of sleeping rough (past year)	15%	13%
Previously lived in social housing	14%	--
Want to stay in Downtown Eastside	16%	28%
Applied to live in social housing	30%	--
Expect to remain in Downtown Eastside (5+ years)	13%	34%
Unsure how much longer in Downtown Eastside	45%	31%
Health- Excellent/Very Good	31%	21%
Health – Poor/Terrible	28%	32%
Decline in health in past year	32%	32%
Percent reporting multiple health issues	47%	67%
Physical limitations	43%	50%
Drug addiction	32%	41%
Mental Illness	30%	46%
TB/HEP C/HIV/AIDS	22%	31%
Alcohol Addiction	20%	28%

<i>Variable</i>	SRO Total	Non-Market SROs
Drug and Alcohol Addiction	11%	19%
Brain Injury/FAS	7%	13%
Hospitalized in past year	21%	27%
Emergency room use in past year	39%	40%
Multiple emergency room use in past year	21%	25%
Concerns of health impact of DTES	40%	39%
Use of income support programs	75%	83%
Job training/skills development program use	17%	17%
Food bank/meal program use	47%	60%
Mental health or addiction program use	17%	35%
Health clinic use	48%	59%
Community centre use	41%	57%
Safe injection site use	11%	13%
Use of on-site services	4%	39%
Top ranked need identified	Housing	Income
Second top ranked need	Income	Housing
Third top ranked need	Health	Health
Extent to which needs are unmet	19%	30%
Overall satisfaction with housing (good/very good)	34%	60%
Compared with others (better/a lot better)	36%	49%
Compared with previous housing (better/a lot better)	32%	56%
Satisfaction with rent (good/very good)	33%	56%
Satisfaction with neighbourhood (good/very good)	21%	24%
Satisfaction with safety and security (good/ very good)	46%	58%
Satisfaction with management (good/very good)	43%	72%
Satisfaction with maintenance (good/very good)	39%	63%
Pests as a big problem	40%	32%
Problem with bed bugs	31%	21%
Noise as a big problem	17%	12%
Security as a big problem	11%	7%
Drug –related activity as a big problem	14%	6%
Strangers in the building as a big problem	11%	5%
Guest fees as a big problem	11%	0%
Best thing about their housing	Accessibility	Accessibility
Worst thing about their housing	Drug issues	Drug issues

APPENDIX G “Vulnerability Index”

In analyzing the data, the research team conceptualized and generated a tool entitled a “Vulnerability Index” which focuses on different risk factors related to housing stability.

The idea behind the vulnerability index is that many residents of the Downtown Eastside possess limited resources yet often face a multiplicity of serious life challenges. The index helps to identify a range of some potential challenges faced by many residents. Through the use of the index it may be possible to gain a better understanding of the depth of challenges faced by many residents in the Downtown Eastside.

The Vulnerability Index gathers a respondent profile along 9 dimensions (challenges) including:

- History of homelessness or ‘sleeping rough’;
- History of emergency shelter use;
- Emergency room use within the past year leading to hospitalization;
- Active drug use;
- Living with TB, Hepatitis C and/or HIV/AIDS;
- Educational attainment of elementary school or less;
- First left home at age 16 or less;
- History of public institutionalization (eg foster or group home, prison);
- Not in contact with their children.

Following are the general findings from an examination of the Vulnerability Index. The table indicates the number and percentage of residents in the two sub groups who face anywhere from 0 through 8 challenges (no survey respondent faced all 9 challenges).

Fifty-six percent of SRO residents face 3 or more “vulnerability” challenges while 31% of social housing residents face 3 or more of these challenges. The typical SRO resident faced 3.0 challenges while social housing residents faced an average of 2.0 challenges.

Vulnerability Index: No. and % of Residents in SROs and Social Housing facing Key Challenges											
SRO Residents	# challenges	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
	# respondents	70	101	108	90	95	77	63	21	3	0
	% respondents	11%	16%	17%	14%	15%	12%	10%	3%	0%	0%
Social Housing Residents	# challenges	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
	# respondents	148	202	106	66	44	39	34	18	1	0
	% respondents	23%	31%	16%	10%	7%	6%	5%	3%	0%	0%

APPENDIX H Survey Instrument

INTRODUCTION AND CONSENT

Hello, my name is _____. I'm conducting a study for the City of Vancouver and BC Housing which looks at the lives of residents in the Downtown Eastside of Vancouver.

This survey asks questions about you and your housing situation. Our goal is to understand the living situation of Downtown Eastside residents.

The questions will take approximately 20 minutes.

Your participation is up to you. You do not have to give your name and your privacy will be protected.

Are you interested in being part of this study and do you have any questions before we start?

Thank you.

Administrative Data (for researcher use only)

	Researcher name
	Time of day
	Day of week
	Name of hotel or residence of respondent
	Room # (Primary residence of respondent)
	Live alone <input type="checkbox"/> Live with others <input type="checkbox"/>
	English as primary language
	First language (if not English)
	Place survey administered (if different from above)
	Other comments

CURRENT HOUSING SITUATION

Q1. How long have you lived at this address?

- | | |
|--------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than 6 months |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 6 months to 1 year |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Between 1 and 2 years (12 months to 24 months) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Between 2 and 5 years (24 months to 60 months) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | More than 5 years |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Unsure |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | No response |

Q2. How long have you lived in the Downtown Eastside?

- | | |
|--------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than 6 months |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 6 months to 1 year |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Between 1 and 2 years (12 months to 24 months) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Between 2 and 5 years (24 months to 60 months) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | More than 5 years |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Unsure |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | No response |

Q3. How much rent do you pay? \$_____ /month

Q4. How would you rate your current housing compared to your previous housing?

- | | |
|--------------------------|-----------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | It is a lot better |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | It is somewhat better |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | It is about the same |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | It is somewhat worse |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | It is a lot worse |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Unsure |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | No response |

Q5. How would you rate the following aspects of your current housing?						
	Very Good	Good	OK	Poor	Very Poor	N/A
Rent	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Neighbourhood	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Safety and security in the building	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Building management	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Maintenance	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Ability to have guests	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overall satisfaction	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Q6. Compared to others you know, how would you rate your current housing?	
<input type="checkbox"/>	A lot better
<input type="checkbox"/>	Somewhat better
<input type="checkbox"/>	About the same
<input type="checkbox"/>	Somewhat worse
<input type="checkbox"/>	A lot worse
<input type="checkbox"/>	No response

Q7. How big a problem are each of the following in this building?				
	Big problem	Small problem	Not a problem	No response
Pests (mice/rats, roaches, bedbugs) _____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Noise	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Concerns for personal safety	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Drug related activity in building	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Strangers in the building	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Guest fees (\$_____/visit)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Q8 (a) What is the best thing about living i) in this housing and ii) in the DTES?
i) _____ ii) _____
Q8 (b). What is the worst thing about living i) in this housing and ii) in the DTES?
i) _____ ii) _____

Q9. If you could afford to live outside the DTES, would you move? (If no, please go to Q. 10)	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes, I would move (Where? _____)
<input type="checkbox"/>	No, I would stay in the Downtown Eastside
<input type="checkbox"/>	Unsure
<input type="checkbox"/>	No response
Q9(a). If you said you would move, please say why?	

Q10. How much longer do you see yourself living in the Downtown Eastside?	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Less than 1 year
<input type="checkbox"/>	1 to 2 years (13 to 24 months)
<input type="checkbox"/>	2 to 5 years (25 to 60 months)
<input type="checkbox"/>	More than 5 years (61+ months)
<input type="checkbox"/>	Unsure
<input type="checkbox"/>	No response

PREVIOUS HOUSING SITUATION

Q11. What type of housing did you live in immediately before (the day before) moving in here?	
<input type="checkbox"/>	SRO hotel/rooming house (Name _____)
<input type="checkbox"/>	A private suite in a house (garden, basement or other)
<input type="checkbox"/>	A room in a place shared with others
<input type="checkbox"/>	Private apartment (low rise/high rise building)
<input type="checkbox"/>	Lived or stayed with friends or family members (including parent/s)
<input type="checkbox"/>	Emergency shelter
<input type="checkbox"/>	Homeless/on the street
<input type="checkbox"/>	An entire house you rented or owned
<input type="checkbox"/>	Subsidized housing (non-profit, co-op or public housing)
<input type="checkbox"/>	Housing with on-site staff to help you (Supported housing)
<input type="checkbox"/>	Jail
<input type="checkbox"/>	Hospital
<input type="checkbox"/>	Recovery house
<input type="checkbox"/>	Other (Please explain _____)

Q12. What was your **main** reason for moving from your previous housing?

Q13. Where was your previous housing located?

- | | |
|--------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Downtown Eastside (where _____) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | City of Vancouver--not DTES (where _____) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Lower Mainland—not City of Vancouver (where _____) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Elsewhere in B.C.—not Lower Mainland (where _____) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Outside of B.C. (where _____) |

Q14. Have you experienced any changes in your life in the past year that affected your housing? (eg. relationship breakdown, fight with roommate, loss of job, health issues, eviction)

- | | |
|--------------------------|-----------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Yes (Please describe _____) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | No |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Unsure |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | No response |

Q15. How many times have you moved in the last year? (_____ times)

Q16. Have you been evicted in the past year?

- | | |
|--------------------------|-----------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Yes (Please describe _____) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | No |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | No response |

HISTORY OF HOMELESSNESS

Q17. Have you ever used an emergency shelter?

- | | |
|--------------------------|-------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Yes |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | No |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | No response |

Q17(a). If yes, how many times did this happen in the past year? (_____ times)

Q18. Have you ever stayed with family or friends because you did not have your own place ('sofa surfed')?

Yes

No

No response

Q18 (a) If yes, how many times did this happen in the past year? (_____ times)

Q19. Have you ever slept on the street, in a park, in a vehicle ('slept rough')?

Yes

No

No response

Q19 (a) If yes, how many times did this happen in the past year? (_____ times)

Q20. Have you ever lived in subsidized (social) housing? (**ASK ONLY SRO RESIDENTS**)

Yes (If yes, why did you leave? _____)

No

Unsure

Q20(a). Have you ever applied to live in subsidized (social) housing? (**ASK ONLY SRO RESIDENTS**)

Yes (If yes, how long ago? _____)

No

Unsure

ABOUT YOU

Q21. What gender do you identify as?

Male

Female

Transgendered

Q22 (a). Where were you born? _____

Q22 (b). What is your age? _____

Q22 (c). In what town or city did you go to Elementary School? _____

Q22 (d). If you went to High School, in what town or city? _____

Q22 (e). What was your age when you first left home? _____

Q23 Why did you first move to the DTES **and** where did you move from? (Please try to reply in terms of major life events like jobs, relationships, family issues, health issues).

Why? _____

Where from? _____

Q 24. Have you ever been in public care such as a foster home, group home, prison, or long-term mental health institution like Riverview?

Yes _____

No

No response

Q25. Please indicate your ethnic background.

Asian _____

Black _____

Caucasian/White _____

First Nations _____

Hispanic _____

Other _____

No response

Q26. Are you a new immigrant or a refugee?

New immigrant (how long have you lived in Canada _____ yrs)

Refugee (how long have you lived in Canada _____ yrs)

Not applicable

No response

Q27. Which best describes your household?

Single person

Two or more unrelated persons sharing accommodation

Couple without children

Couple with children

Single parent family with children

Other (Please specify _____)

Q28. Have you previously been married?	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes
<input type="checkbox"/>	No
<input type="checkbox"/>	No response
Q28 (a). Do you have any children?	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes (Please specify how many children 18 or younger _____)
<input type="checkbox"/>	No
<input type="checkbox"/>	No response
Q28 (b). Are you in contact with your child/ren?	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes, regularly
<input type="checkbox"/>	Only sometimes/some of them
<input type="checkbox"/>	No

Q29. Where do you mostly get or buy your food? _____
Q29 (a). Where do you mostly get or buy your clothes? _____

ABOUT YOUR EDUCATION, INCOME AND EMPLOYMENT	
Q30. What is the highest educational level you have completed ?	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Elementary school (Grade completed _____)
<input type="checkbox"/>	High school (Grade completed _____)
<input type="checkbox"/>	Trade or vocational school
<input type="checkbox"/>	College/University
<input type="checkbox"/>	Have not completed any schooling
<input type="checkbox"/>	No response

Q31. Over the past year, what was the main source of income for your household?	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Employment
<input type="checkbox"/>	Employment insurance
<input type="checkbox"/>	Income Assistance
<input type="checkbox"/>	Federal Pension (Senior or Disability)
<input type="checkbox"/>	Retirement income and private pensions
<input type="checkbox"/>	Grey economy (sex trade, drugs, under the table employment, binning, etc.)
<input type="checkbox"/>	Student loans
<input type="checkbox"/>	Other (Please specify) _____

Q 32. Are you able to work?	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes
<input type="checkbox"/>	No
<input type="checkbox"/>	Unsure
<input type="checkbox"/>	No response

Q 32 (a). Do you work?	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes
<input type="checkbox"/>	No
<input type="checkbox"/>	Unsure
<input type="checkbox"/>	No response

Q32 (b). If yes, please describe how you earn your income?	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Full time regular employment
<input type="checkbox"/>	Part time regular employment
<input type="checkbox"/>	Through 'labour ready'/temp agencies
<input type="checkbox"/>	Squeeging, panhandling, binning, collecting bottles/cans _____
<input type="checkbox"/>	Sex trade work
<input type="checkbox"/>	Volunteer
<input type="checkbox"/>	Other _____

Q33. Approximately what was your total income for last year from all sources? \$ _____

GENERAL HEALTH STATUS

Q34. How would you rate your health?	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Excellent
<input type="checkbox"/>	Very good
<input type="checkbox"/>	Average
<input type="checkbox"/>	Poor
<input type="checkbox"/>	Terrible
<input type="checkbox"/>	No response

Q35. How is your health compared to one year ago?	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Much better
<input type="checkbox"/>	Somewhat better
<input type="checkbox"/>	About the same
<input type="checkbox"/>	Somewhat worse
<input type="checkbox"/>	Much worse
<input type="checkbox"/>	Unsure
<input type="checkbox"/>	No response

Q36. Do you face any of the following health challenges? (Check all that apply)	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Physical limitations (e.g. chronic pain, mobility challenges)
<input type="checkbox"/>	Mental health challenges
<input type="checkbox"/>	Alcohol addiction (if yes, at what age did you begin? _____)
<input type="checkbox"/>	Drug use/addiction (if yes, at what age did you begin? _____)
<input type="checkbox"/>	T.B., Hep C or HIV/AIDS
<input type="checkbox"/>	Diabetes
<input type="checkbox"/>	Fetal Alcohol Syndrome
<input type="checkbox"/>	Brain injury
<input type="checkbox"/>	I have no health challenges
<input type="checkbox"/>	No response

Q37(a). Do you smoke?	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes, a lot/regularly
<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes, only a bit/occasionally
<input type="checkbox"/>	No
<input type="checkbox"/>	No response

Q37(b). Do you use drugs?	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes, a lot/regularly
<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes, only a bit/occasionally
<input type="checkbox"/>	No
<input type="checkbox"/>	No response

Q38. If you are a drug user, which drug you use the most? _____	
Q38(a). If yes, how much does your drug use cost per day? \$ _____	

Q 39. Have you been to Emergency in the past year?	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes (# of times _____)
<input type="checkbox"/>	No
<input type="checkbox"/>	Unsure

Q40. Have you been hospitalized overnight in the past year?	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes (# of times _____)
<input type="checkbox"/>	No
<input type="checkbox"/>	Unsure

Q41. Do you believe your health has been negatively affected by living in the Downtown Core?	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes (Please describe how _____)
<input type="checkbox"/>	No
<input type="checkbox"/>	Unsure
<input type="checkbox"/>	No response

PATTERNS OF SERVICE USE AND COMMUNITY SUPPORTS

Q42. Please indicate which of the following government support programs you have used in the past year, and how often. Please also provide us with comments on the programs you use.

	A. USE		B.FREQUENCY			C. COMMENTS
	Yes	No	Often	Some -times	Not often	
Income support (Benefits, Disability)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Job training, skills development	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Food bank or meal program	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Safe injection site	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Mental health or addiction services	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Health Clinic	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Hospital	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Community centres (eg. Carnegie)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
On site (in bldg) services/supports	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Other _____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

Q43. (ONLY FOR THOSE NOT ON IA) Have you tried to get Income Assistance in the past year?

Yes

No

Unsure

No response

Q43(a). If not, why not?
If yes, please explain what happened.

Q44. What are the things you most need help with right now? [PROBE: USE PROMPTS SUCH AS ACCESS TO INCOME SUPPORT, HEALTH CARE, EMOTIONAL SUPPORT, FINDING A JOB, SKILLS TRAINING, HOUSING...]

1. _____ Is help available? Yes No Unsure

2. _____ Is help available? Yes No Unsure

3. _____ Is help available? Yes No Unsure

Q45. Thank you for taking the time to complete the survey. Do you have any other thoughts or observations that you would like to share with us?