

2017 SEATTLE
CHINATOWN-
INTERNATIONAL DISTRICT
PUBLIC SAFETY
SURVEY REPORT

Contents

Introduction	2
Demographics & Community Connections	2
Table 1. Respondents Demographics (n=423)	2
Table 2. Respondents Connections to Chinatown-International District (n=422).....	3
The Respondents & Law Enforcement.....	3
Table 3. How Often Respondent Sees Officers Patrolling CID in Non-Emergency Situations	4
Table 4. Do Respondents Trust the Police? (n=396)	4
Table 5: Do Respondents Trust Police Across Demographics	4
Table 6. Respondents' agreement with statement "The police do a good job keeping CID safe"	4
Table 7: Respondent's Agreement with Statement "The police do a good job of keeping the CID Safe" Across Demographics	5
Safety & Security in the CID	6
Table 8. Where Respondents Would Go If Threatened (n=422)*	6
Table 9. Respondent's Agreement with Statement: "The Chinatown-International District is a safe place to live and/or work in."	6
Table 10: How True is Statement to Respondent's Experience: "I feel anxiety or stress because I feel unsafe going outside in the Chinatown-International District" (n=402)	7
Table 11. How Safe Do Respondents Feel Walking in the CID?	7
Table 12: Respondent's Agreement with the Below Statements	8
Table 13: Respondents' Agreement with Statement "Streets and public areas in the CID are cleaner than they were one-year ago" Across Demographics	8
Table 14: Respondents' Agreement with Statement "Streets and public areas in the CID are safer than they were one-year ago" Across Demographics	9
Table 15: Respondent's Agreement That Streets are Safer by Length of Affiliation with CID (n=393)	9
Table 16. How Often Respondents Worry About the Below in the CID (0=Never Worries-5=Always Worries)	10
Table 17. Average Response Across Demographics About Whether Respondent Worries About the Below in the CID (0=Never Worries-5=Always Worries)	10
Table 18. How Safe Respondents Feel in CID Areas (0=Never Safe-5=Always Safe)	11
Table 19. Average Response Across Demographics About How Safe Respondent Feels in the Below Areas (0=Unsafe-5=Safe)	11
Witnessing & Reporting Criminal Activity.....	12
Table 20. How Often Did Respondents Observe Below Behaviors When In Chinatown-International District (n=396)*	14
Table 21. Respondents Crime Witness & Reporting Behaviors by Primary Language	15
Table 22. Respondents Crime Witness & Reporting Behaviors by Age	16
Table 23. Respondents Crime Witness & Reporting Behaviors by Gender	17

Introduction

This report presents the results of the 2017 Chinatown-International District (CID) Public Safety Survey, which was a collaboration between the Seattle Chinatown International District Preservation and Development Authority (SCIDpda) and the InterIm Community Development Association (InterIm CDA). The survey was distributed between January and March 2017 within Seattle's Chinatown, Japantown, and Little Saigon, to respondents who lived, worked, visited, and/or identified as community members. The surveys were provided in English, Chinese and Vietnamese in both print and electronic formats and were distributed through avenues such as community businesses, community centers, and residences. In addition to the presentation of this year's results, where applicable, last year's results are provided to provide context as to whether safety and security in the CID have improved over the last year.

Demographics & Community Connections

In Table 1, basic demographic information about those who responded to the survey are presented for the 423 individuals who responded to the survey. The largest age group represented was those 55 years and over, which made up 40% of the respondents, followed by those 19 to 35 (31.2%), 36 to 54 (25.3%), and those under 18 (3.5%). Other highlights from the demographics table show that two-thirds of the respondents were female, approximately 50% selected English as their primary language, and almost 70% were proficient in English.

Table 1. Respondents Demographics (n=423)

		n	%
Age	Under 18	15	3.5
	19-35	132	31.2
	36-54	107	25.3
	55 and over	169	40.0
Gender	Female	279	66.0
	Male	133	31.4
	Transgender	5	1.2
	Other	6	1.4
Primary Language	Chinese	148	35.0
	English	211	49.9
	Vietnamese	28	6.6
	Other	36	8.5
English Proficiency	English Speaking	292	69.0
	Limited English Speaking	81	19.1
	Non-English Speaking	50	11.8

The respondents were also asked about their connections to the CID (Table 2). For their main affiliation (of which they could select multiple categories), approximately equal numbers identified as either being employed by a business within the CID or being a resident in one of its neighborhoods. In addition, about sixteen per cent and fifteen per cent of respondents were visitors or non-resident community members, respectively. Of those who completed the survey, nearly 40% have been affiliated with the CID for more than 10 years, the category with the highest response rate. Less than 10% of respondents who took the survey had been affiliated with the CID for less than a year. Finally, in order to understand how the survey respondents traveled through the CID, they were asked if automobile, bicycling, public transit, walking or other were their primary modes of transportation. The majority selected walking (50.2%), followed by public transit (24.6%), automobile (21.3%), other (2.4%), and bicycling (1.4%).

Table 2. Respondents Connections to Chinatown-International District (n=422)

		n	%
Main Affiliation	Building/Property Owner	15	3.6
	Building/Property Manager	7	1.7
	Business Owner	17	4.0
	Employee	163	38.6
	Resident	161	38.2
	Non-Resident Community Member	63	14.9
	Visitor	68	16.1
	Other	19	4.5
Length of Affiliation	Less than 1 year	41	9.7
	1-2 years	64	15.2
	3-5 years	80	19.0
	6-10 years	72	17.1
	Longer than 10 years	165	39.1
Travel w/in CID	Automobile	90	21.3
	Bicycling	6	1.4
	Public Transit	104	24.6
	Walking	212	50.2
	Other	10	2.4

The Respondents & Law Enforcement

Table 3 through Table 6 report the results of questions related to law enforcement. Within Table 3, we see the distribution of results for respondents answering the question, how often do they see officers patrolling in the CID in non-emergency situations. This is akin to community policing or routine patrol, where law enforcement is not responding to a 911 emergency call. In 2017, more than 55% respondents stated that they saw officers sometimes, often, or all of the time in the neighborhood. This is an increase from the 2016 survey, whose results are also included in Table 3 for the same question, which found that only slightly more than 37% respondents saw law enforcement patrolling the CID in non-emergency situations sometimes, often, or all of the time. Asked whether they trust police, 63.9% of respondents answered yes. When this is broken down across demographics (Table 5), individuals over the age of 35 trusted law enforcement more often, as did males. Interestingly, those whose primary language was not English, trusted police officer more often. However, those who were proficient in speaking English trusted police more often than those whose English proficiency was limited or could not speak English at all.

Table 3. How Often Respondent Sees Officers Patrolling CID in Non-Emergency Situations

	2017		2016	
	n	%	n	%
All of the time	9	2.3	2	0.6
Often	56	14.1	22	7.1
Sometimes	162	40.9	93	29.8
Rarely	130	32.8	143	45.8
Never	39	9.8	52	16.7
Total	396	100.0	312	100.0

Table 4. Do Respondents Trust the Police? (n=396)

	n	%
Yes	253	63.9
No	53	13.4
Not Sure	90	22.7

Table 5: Do Respondents Trust Police Across Demographics

		Yes		No		Not Sure		Total	
		n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
All		253	63.9	53	13.4	90	22.7	396	100.0
Age	Under 18	8	53.3	3	20.0	4	26.7	15	100.0
	19-35	51	44.0	31	26.7	34	29.3	116	100.0
	36-54	63	63.0	10	10.0	27	27.0	100	100.0
	55 and over	131	79.4	9	5.5	25	15.2	165	100.0
Gender	Female	164	62.4	35	13.3	64	24.3	263	100.0
	Male	87	70.7	12	9.8	24	19.5	123	100.0
	Transgender	0	0.0	3	75.0	1	25.0	4	100.0
	Other	2	33.3	3	50.0	1	16.7	6	100.0
Primary Language	Chinese	98	67.6	14	9.7	33	22.8	145	100.0
	English	108	57.1	35	18.5	46	24.3	189	100.0
	Vietnamese	21	77.8	1	3.7	5	18.5	27	100.0
	Other	26	74.3	3	8.6	6	17.1	35	100.0
English Speaking	Proficient	39	81.3	3	6.3	6	12.5	48	100.0
	Limited	52	65.0	6	7.5	22	27.5	80	100.0
	None	162	60.4	44	16.4	62	23.1	268	100.0

Table 6. Respondents' agreement with statement "The police do a good job keeping CID safe"

	2017 (n=396)		2016 (n=312)	
	n	%	n	%
Agree	60	15.2	16	5.1
Somewhat agree	77	19.4	39	12.5
Neither agree nor disagree	101	25.5	55	17.6
Somewhat disagree	70	17.7	82	26.3
Disagree	60	15.2	85	27.2
Don't Know	28	7.1	35	11.2

Table 7: Respondent's Agreement with Statement "The police do a good job of keeping the CID Safe" Across Demographics

		Agree				Somewhat agree				Neither agree nor disagree				Somewhat disagree				Disagree				Total			
		2017		2016		2017		2016		2017		2016		2017		2016		2017		2016		2017		2016	
		n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
All		60	16.3	16	6.1	77	20.9	39	14.9	101	27.4	55	21.1	70	19.0	82	31.4	60	16.3	85	32.6	368	100	261	100
Age	Under 18	2	13.3	0	0.0	5	33.3	0	0.0	5	33.3	3	37.5	2	13.3	4	50.0	1	6.7	1	12.5	15	100	8	100
	19-35	6	5.4	2	2.7	15	13.5	9	12.2	35	31.5	12	16.2	26	23.4	24	32.4	29	26.1	29	39.2	111	100	74	100
	36-54	12	13.3	5	6.3	18	20.0	11	13.9	30	33.3	17	21.5	17	18.9	24	30.4	13	14.4	27	34.2	90	100	79	100
	55 and over	40	26.3	9	9.0	39	25.7	19	19.0	31	20.4	23	23.0	25	16.4	30	30.0	17	11.2	28	28.0	152	100	100	100
Gender	Female	39	16.1	5	3.3	52	21.5	24	15.9	70	28.9	31	20.5	42	17.4	44	29.1	39	16.1	52	34.4	242	100	151	100
	Male	21	18.1	11	10.4	23	19.8	13	12.3	28	24.1	24	22.6	27	23.3	37	34.9	17	14.7	32	30.2	116	100	106	100
	Transgender	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	50.0	1	25.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	50.0	3	75.0	0	0.0	4	100	2	100
	Other	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	33.3	1	50.0	2	33.3	0	0.0	1	16.7	0	0.0	1	16.7	1	50.0	6	100	2	100
Primary Language	Chinese	25	19.2	7	11.1	29	22.3	13	20.6	42	32.3	21	33.3	18	13.8	18	28.6	16	12.3	11	17.5	130	100	63	100
	English	12	6.7	6	3.5	34	19.1	19	11.0	43	24.2	31	17.9	47	26.4	54	31.2	42	23.6	69	39.9	178	100	173	100
	Vietnamese	9	26.5	2	14.3	8	23.5	4	28.6	6	17.6	1	7.1	2	5.9	7	50.0	9	26.5	2	14.3	34	100	14	100
	Other	14	29.8	1	9.1	6	12.8	3	27.3	10	21.3	2	18.2	3	6.4	3	27.3	14	29.8	3	27.3	47	100	11	100
English Speaking	Proficient	29	11.5	6	2.8	48	19.0	25	11.6	66	26.1	37	17.1	57	22.5	70	32.4	53	20.9	78	36.1	253	100	216	100
	Limited	13	16.7	3	9.1	19	24.4	6	18.2	24	30.8	11	33.3	9	11.5	7	21.2	13	16.7	6	18.2	78	100	33	100
	None	18	41.9	7	25.0	10	23.3	8	28.6	11	25.6	7	25.0	4	9.3	5	17.9	0	0.0	1	3.6	43	100	28	100

Table 6 and Table 7 present information as to whether the respondents agreed with the statement “The police do a good job keeping the CID safe.” Comparing the responses to this question, which are presented in Table 6, between the 2017 and 2016 survey we see that more individuals agreed, somewhat agreed, or neither agreed or disagreed to this statement in 2017 (15.2% vs 5.1%, 19.4% vs 12.5%, 25.5% vs 17.6%, respectively). When looking at differences across demographics, several results that should be highlighted because of their differences across years. In the age category, the largest shift in how individuals responded to the survey appears to have been in the 55 and over category, with these individuals agreeing with the statement 26.3% of the time in 2017, yet only 9.0% of the time in 2016. Similarly, they disagreed with the statement only 11.2% of the time in 2017, an almost 17 point change from the 28% who disagreed in 2016. For gender, females increased their agreement to 16.1% of the time from only a 3.3% agreement in 2016 and disagreed with the statement only 16.1% of the time in 2017, compared to 34.4% of the time in 2016. For the primary language and English speaking categories, although the differences are not as extreme, on average, each group was more likely to agree with the statement that the police do a good job of keeping the CID safe in 2017 when compared to 2016.

Safety & Security in the CID

Tables 8 through 14 report on questions related to individual’s thoughts on safety and security in the Chinatown-International District. In Table 8, we find that if the respondent felt threatened, the majority would go to a nearby restaurant or business. Less than 20% would go to the home of a friend or family member, however, this could possibly be for two reasons: (1) their social networks do not live in the CID or (2) they would not want to also endanger their family and friends. Not only are restaurants and business more likely to be closer in proximity, but they also contain witnesses who can potentially intervene and/or contact law enforcement for assistance.

Table 8. Where Respondents Would Go If Threatened (n=422)*

	n	%
Restaurant	232	55.0
Business/Store	226	53.6
Office	136	32.2
Home	110	26.1
Friend of Family's Home	72	17.1
Library	133	31.5
Community Space	164	38.9
Health Clinic	136	32.2
None of the Above	23	5.5

*Respondent could select all applicable locations

Table 9. Respondent's Agreement with Statement: "The Chinatown-International District is a safe place to live and/or work in."

	2017		2016	
	n	%	n	%
Agree	60	14.9	37	11.6
Somewhat Agree	94	23.4	76	23.8
Neutral	82	20.4	42	13.1
Somewhat Disagree	97	24.1	99	30.9
Disagree	59	14.7	66	19.4
Don't know	10	2.5	4	1.3
Total	402	100.0	320	100.0

Table 10: How True is Statement to Respondent's Experience: "I feel anxiety or stress because I feel unsafe going outside in the Chinatown-International District" (n=402)

	2017		2016	
	n	%	n	%
Very True	40	10.0	26	8.1
True	48	11.9	45	14.1
Somewhat True	187	46.5	155	48.4
Not True	127	31.6	94	29.4
Total	402	100.0	320	100.0

Table 11. How Safe Do Respondents Feel Walking in the CID?

	12:01AM-4:49AM		5:00AM-11:00AM		11:01AM-5:00PM		5:01PM-12:00AM	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Very Safe	24	6.2	32	8.2	64	16.3	23	5.8
Safe	15	3.8	94	24.0	180	45.8	53	13.5
Neutral	83	21.3	143	36.6	113	28.8	114	28.9
Unsafe	95	24.4	98	25.1	29	7.4	140	35.5
Very Unsafe	173	44.4	24	6.1	7	1.8	64	16.2
Total	390	100.0	391	100.0	393	100.0	394	100.0

Table 9 presents data on whether the respondent agreed with the statement that the CID is a safe place to live and/or work in. In 2017, more than 38% of respondents either agreed or somewhat agreed with this statement, a slight increase from the more than 35% who did in 2016. However, only 38.8% disagreed or somewhat disagreed in 2017, a decrease from the more than 50% who did in 2016. When asked whether the following statement is true, "I feel anxiety or stress because I feel unsafe going outside in the Chinatown-International District," 21.9% said true or very true, only a slight decrease from 22.2% in 2016 (Table 10). Table 11 shows that 44.4% felt very unsafe between midnight and 5:00am and safest between 11:01 AM and 5:00 PM.

Next, Tables 12 through 15 present data from both the 2017 and 2016 surveys on how much a respondent agrees with the following two statements: (1) Streets and public areas in the CID are safer than they were one-year ago, and (2) Streets and public areas in the CID are cleaner than they were one-year ago. Potential differences in responses are then examined across respondent demographics. Across all 2017 respondents, 31.8% agreed or somewhat agreed that the streets were safer, while 41% agreed or somewhat agreed that they were cleaner. In both categories, this is an increase from 2016's respondents who only agreed in some form that the streets were safer 16% of the time and agreed in some form that they were cleaner 26.4% of the time. To further examine which demographics helped drive these changes, we look at Tables 13 and 14. For the statement regarding whether the CID streets and public areas were cleaner than a year ago (Table 13), respondents who were 55 and over had the largest difference between years, with larger proportions being more likely to agree and less likely to disagree with that statement in 2017 than who did so in 2016. This pattern was similar for males and individuals whose primary language was English. Results between 2017 and 2016 respondents' agreement to the statement about whether the CID was safer than a year ago also showed differences across demographics. Once again, respondents 55 years and older were much more likely than any other age group to agree that the neighborhood was safer in 2017 compared to 2016. Similarly, so were individuals whose primary language was Vietnamese, although primary English language respondents somewhat agreed (as opposed to agreed) with the statement much more often in 2017 when compared to 2016. Finally, Table 15 shows that, for the most part, the longer an individual has been affiliated with the CID, the more likely they were to believe it was safer than a year ago.

Table 12: Respondent's Agreement with the Below Statements

	Streets and public areas in the CID are safer than they were one-year ago				Streets and public areas in the CID are cleaner than they were one-year ago			
	2017		2016		2017		2016	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Agree	36	9.2	12	3.9	60	15.3	18	5.9
Somewhat agree	89	22.6	37	12.1	101	25.7	60	19.5
Neither agree nor disagree	101	25.7	74	24.1	71	18.1	55	17.9
Somewhat disagree	48	12.2	48	15.6	47	12.0	49	16.0
Disagree	60	15.3	92	30.0	73	18.6	95	30.9
Don't Know	59	15.0	44	14.3	41	10.4	30	9.8
Total	393	100.0	307	100.0	393	100.0	307	100.0

Table 13: Respondents' Agreement with Statement "Streets and public areas in the CID are cleaner than they were one-year ago" Across Demographics

		Agree				Somewhat agree				Neither agree nor disagree				Somewhat disagree				Disagree				Total			
		2017		2016		2017		2016		2017		2016		2017		2016		2017		2016		2017		2016	
		n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
All		60	17.0	18	6.9	101	28.7	60	23.0	71	20.2	55	21.1	47	13.4	49	18.8	73	20.7	95	36.4	352	100	261	100
Age	Under 18	1	8.3	0	0.0	5	41.7	0	0.0	2	16.7	3	37.5	3	25.0	4	50.0	1	8.3	1	12.5	12	100	8	100
	19-35	7	7.4	4	5.4	32	33.7	10	13.5	22	23.2	14	18.9	13	13.7	17	23.0	21	22.1	26	35.1	95	100	74	100
	36-54	11	11.6	6	7.6	29	30.5	14	17.7	21	22.1	19	24.1	14	14.7	17	21.5	20	21.1	29	36.7	95	100	79	100
	55 and over	41	27.3	8	8.0	35	23.3	36	36.0	26	17.3	19	19.0	17	11.3	11	11.0	31	20.7	39	39.0	150	100	100	100
Gender	Female	35	15.0	9	6.0	67	28.8	35	23.2	46	19.7	30	19.9	30	12.9	30	19.9	55	23.6	57	37.7	233	100	151	100
	Male	24	21.8	9	8.5	32	29.1	25	23.6	22	20.0	23	21.7	17	15.5	19	17.9	15	13.6	36	34.0	110	100	106	100
	Transgender	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	25.0	0	0.0	2	50.0	2	100	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	25.0	0	0.0	4	100	2	100
	Other	1	20.0	0	0.0	1	20.0	0	0.0	1	20.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	40.0	2	100	5	100	2	100
Primary Language	Chinese	21	15.6	8	12.7	42	31.1	24	38.1	24	17.8	9	14.3	14	10.4	12	19.0	34	25.2	22	34.9	135	100	63	100
	English	23	14.5	8	4.6	44	27.7	30	17.3	35	22.0	43	24.9	25	15.7	34	19.7	32	20.1	60	34.7	159	100	173	100
	Vietnamese	8	29.6	2	14.3	9	33.3	3	21.4	3	11.1	2	14.3	4	14.8	1	7.1	3	11.1	7	50.0	27	100	14	100
	Other	8	25.8	0	0.0	6	19.4	3	27.3	9	29.0	1	9.1	4	12.9	2	18.2	4	12.9	6	54.5	31	100	11	100
English Speaking	Proficient	36	15.3	8	3.8	66	28.0	37	17.5	50	21.2	48	22.7	38	16.1	43	20.4	46	19.5	75	35.5	236	100	211	100
	Limited	9	12.3	4	11.8	22	30.1	9	26.5	14	19.2	5	14.7	6	8.2	3	8.8	22	30.1	13	38.2	73	100	34	100
	None	15	34.9	6	18.8	13	30.2	14	43.8	7	16.3	2	6.3	3	7.0	3	9.4	5	11.6	7	21.9	43	100	32	100

Table 14: Respondents' Agreement with Statement "Streets and public areas in the CID are safer than they were one-year ago" Across Demographics

		Agree				Somewhat agree				Neither agree nor disagree				Somewhat disagree				Disagree				Total			
		2017		2016		2017		2016		2017		2016		2017		2016		2017		2016		2017		2016	
		n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
All		36	10.8	12	4.6	89	26.6	37	14.2	101	30.2	74	28.4	48	14.4	48	18.4	60	18.0	92	35.2	334	100	261	100
Age	Under 18	2	16.7	0	0.0	4	33.3	2	25.0	3	25.0	4	50.0	2	16.7	1	12.5	1	8.3	1	12.5	12	100	8	100
	19-35	5	5.4	3	4.1	27	29.3	7	9.5	34	37.0	15	20.3	15	16.3	22	29.7	11	12.0	20	27.0	92	100	74	100
	36-54	4	4.7	6	7.6	19	22.4	11	13.9	31	36.5	23	29.1	13	15.3	16	20.3	18	21.2	29	36.7	85	100	79	100
	55 and over	25	17.2	3	3.0	39	26.9	17	17.0	33	22.8	32	32.0	18	12.4	9	9.0	30	20.7	42	42.0	145	100	100	100
Gender	Female	19	8.7	5	3.3	54	24.7	16	10.6	71	32.4	45	29.8	29	13.2	25	16.6	46	21.0	61	40.4	219	100	151	100
	Male	10	10.0	7	6.6	32	32.0	20	18.9	26	26.0	29	27.4	18	18.0	22	20.8	14	14.0	30	28.3	100	100	106	100
	Transgender	1	20.0	0	0.0	1	20.0	1	50.0	2	40.0	0	0.0	1	20.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	5	100	2	100
	Other	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	50.0	0	0.0	2	50.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	50.0	0	0.0	1	50.0	4	100	2	100
Primary Language	Chinese	11	8.6	4	6.3	31	24.2	12	19.0	33	25.8	22	34.9	18	14.1	12	19.0	35	27.3	20	31.7	128	100	63	100
	English	11	7.2	6	3.5	44	28.9	17	9.8	51	33.6	48	27.7	28	18.4	35	20.2	18	11.8	63	36.4	152	100	173	100
	Vietnamese	7	28.0	2	14.3	4	16.0	3	21.4	9	36.0	2	14.3	0	0.0	1	7.1	5	20.0	5	35.7	25	100	14	100
	Other	7	24.1	0	0.0	10	34.5	5	45.5	8	27.6	2	18.2	2	6.9	0	0.0	2	6.9	4	36.4	29	100	11	100
English Speaking	Proficient	20	9.0	6	3.0	60	27.0	25	12.4	71	32.0	55	27.2	35	15.8	40	19.8	36	16.2	76	37.6	222	100	202	100
	Limited	6	8.6	3	8.8	14	20.0	5	14.7	21	30.0	11	32.4	9	12.9	5	14.7	20	28.6	10	29.4	70	100	34	100
	None	10	23.8	3	11.1	15	35.7	7	25.9	9	21.4	8	29.6	4	9.5	3	11.1	4	9.5	6	22.2	42	100	27	100

Table 15: Respondent's Agreement That Streets are Safer by Length of Affiliation with CID (n=393)

Years Affiliated	Less than 1		1-2		3-5		6-10		More than 10	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Agree	1	2.8	6	10.0	10	13.9	17	25.4	26	16.5
Somewhat agree	4	11.1	15	25.0	20	27.8	21	31.3	41	25.9
Neither agree nor disagree	5	13.9	11	18.3	11	15.3	10	14.9	34	21.5
Somewhat disagree	3	8.3	8	13.3	11	15.3	4	6.0	21	13.3
Disagree	4	11.1	16	26.7	11	15.3	14	20.9	28	17.7
Don't Know	19	52.8	4	6.7	9	12.5	1	1.5	8	5.1
Total	36	100.0	60	100.0	72	100.0	67	100.0	158	100.0

Table 16. How Often Respondents Worry About the Below in the CID (0=Never Worries-5=Always Worries)

	Never (0)		1		2		3		4		Always (5)		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Someone breaking into your home/work and stealing or damaging things	65	19.1	63	18.5	35	10.3	62	18.2	45	13.2	71	20.8	341	100.0
Someone stealing your vehicle, something from or off it, or damaging it	48	14.9	26	8.0	18	5.6	48	14.9	57	17.6	126	39.0	323	100.0
Someone stealing from you in a public place	49	13.4	60	16.3	47	12.8	66	18.0	53	14.4	92	25.1	367	100.0
Somebody you know being sexually assaulted	69	19.8	66	18.9	51	14.6	64	18.3	33	9.5	66	18.9	349	100.0
Somebody you know being physically attacked	49	13.5	60	16.5	53	14.6	69	19.0	52	14.3	81	22.3	364	100.0

Table 17. Average Response Across Demographics About Whether Respondent Worries About the Below in the CID (0=Never Worries-5=Always Worries)

		Someone breaking into your home/work and stealing or damaging things		Someone stealing your vehicle something from or off it, or damaging it		Someone stealing from you in a public place		Somebody you know being sexually assaulted		Somebody you know being physically attacked	
		2017	2016	2017	2016	2017	2016	2017	2016	2017	2016
All		2.5	2.4	3.3	2.9	2.8	2.5	2.4	2.2	2.7	2.8
Age	Under 18	1.9	2.3	2.2	2.4	1.9	3.0	2.1	1.5	2.1	1.9
	19-35	2.1	2.1	3.2	3.1	2.6	2.5	2.4	2.5	2.7	2.8
	36-54	2.6	2.6	3.4	2.9	2.9	2.6	2.5	2.2	2.9	2.8
	55 and over	2.8	2.5	3.4	2.7	3.0	2.4	2.2	2.1	2.7	2.8
Gender	Female	2.7	2.3	3.5	2.9	3.0	2.5	2.6	2.3	2.9	2.7
	Male	2.2	2.6	3.0	2.9	2.4	2.5	1.9	2.1	2.3	2.9
	Transgender	1.5	1.5	0.0	2.0	2.5	1.5	1.7	1.5	3.5	4.0
	Other	1.7	5.0	3.0	5.0	1.3	3.5	3.3	3.5	2.3	3.5
Primary Language	Chinese	3.3	2.9	3.8	3.0	3.7	2.8	3.0	2.1	3.1	2.7
	English	2.1	2.1	3.3	2.8	2.4	2.4	2.2	2.2	2.6	2.8
	Vietnamese	2.3	3.2	2.8	3.5	2.8	2.8	2.2	2.6	2.9	2.6
	Other	1.7	3.1	2.1	2.2	1.9	2.1	1.4	2.2	1.7	2.6
English Speaking	Proficient	2.3	2.3	3.2	2.9	2.5	2.5	2.2	2.3	2.6	2.9
	Limited	3.1	3.3	3.9	3.4	3.6	3.3	2.8	2.4	3.0	3.0
	None	2.9	2.4	3.0	1.9	3.6	1.8	2.5	1.6	2.9	1.9

Table 18. How Safe Respondents Feel in CID Areas (0=Never Safe-5=Always Safe)

	Never (0)		1		2		3		4		Always (5)		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Japantown	20	6.1	34	10.4	47	14.4	105	32.2	78	23.9	42	12.9	326	100.0
Chinatown	39	10.1	42	10.9	54	14.0	127	32.8	82	21.2	43	11.1	387	100.0
Little Saigon	36	10.8	49	14.7	62	18.6	92	27.6	55	16.5	39	11.7	333	100.0
I-5 Underpass	80	22.2	78	21.6	74	20.5	50	13.9	40	11.1	39	10.8	361	100.0
Danny Woo Garden/ Kobe Terrace Park	47	15.4	49	16.0	58	19.0	65	21.2	44	14.4	43	14.1	306	100.0

Table 19. Average Response Across Demographics About How Safe Respondent Feels in the Below Areas (0=Unsafe-5=Safe)

		Japantown		Chinatown		Little Saigon		I-5 Underpass		Danny Woo Garden/ Kobe Terrace Park	
		2017	2016	2017	2016	2017	2016	2017	2016	2017	2016
All		3.0	2.9	2.8	2.7	2.6	2.5	2.0	1.9	2.6	2.1
Age	Under 18	3.3	2.9	3.3	3.4	2.9	2.3	2.7	2.6	3.0	3.3
	19-35	3.1	3.1	2.9	2.8	2.7	2.5	1.9	1.8	2.5	2.3
	36-54	2.9	2.8	2.6	2.7	2.5	2.5	1.9	1.9	2.3	2.1
	55 and over	2.9	2.7	2.8	2.6	2.6	2.5	2.2	2.0	2.4	2.0
Gender	Female	2.9	2.9	2.7	2.7	2.5	2.6	2.0	1.9	2.4	2.1
	Male	3.1	2.9	3.0	2.7	2.8	2.4	2.2	1.9	2.6	2.0
	Transgender	3.3	1.0	3.0	1.0	3.0	1.0	1.8	0.5	2.5	1.0
	Other	4.0	2.5	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.5	2.6	1.5	2.5	2.0
Primary Language	Chinese	2.6	2.7	2.4	2.7	2.3	2.5	1.9	2.1	2.2	2.2
	English	3.2	3.0	3.0	2.7	2.7	2.5	2.0	1.7	2.6	2.1
	Vietnamese	2.8	2.4	2.9	2.5	2.9	2.4	1.8	2.5	2.5	2.5
	Other	3.4	2.4	3.1	2.2	3.1	2.3	2.7	1.9	3.0	1.9
English Speaking	Proficient	3.1	2.9	2.8	2.7	2.6	2.5	2.0	1.8	2.5	2.0
	Limited	2.7	2.9	2.7	2.6	2.6	2.3	2.0	2.1	2.3	2.4
	None	2.7	2.8	2.6	3.1	2.4	2.9	2.1	2.5	2.2	2.3

Next, we evaluate how often respondents worry about being victims of certain types of criminal activity in the CID (Table 16). In 2017, those who completed the survey were always worried about someone stealing or damaging their vehicle or stealing something from it 39% of the time. In addition, 25.1% of respondents were always worried about someone stealing something from them in public, 22.3% were always worried about someone they know being physically attacked, 20.8% were always worried that someone would break into their home or work to steal or damage things, and 18.9% were always worried that somebody they know would be sexually assaulted. To break these responses down across demographics, as well as to compare between 2017 and 2016, we took the average response for these questions, where 0 meant that the respondent never worried and 5 meant they always worried. Put another way, the closer the average is to 5, the more individuals worried about that type of victimization, and the closer the average is to 0, the less they worried. When comparing across all respondents who took the survey in 2017 and 2016 (Table 17), we find that in all cases, except somebody you know being physically attacked, respondents worried more often about the varying types of victimization occurring to them or someone they know. Some of the largest year to year differences were found for those who had not proficiency in speaking English, with a 1.1 and 1.8 point increase in worrying that someone would steal/damage their car and steal from them in a public place, respectively. It appears that this may be driven by individuals whose primary language is Chinese, as they also had a relatively large increase in how much they worried from 2016 to 2017 for the aforementioned categories. Interestingly, those whose primary language was Vietnamese had a relatively large decrease in the amount they worried about someone breaking into their home or work to steal/damage something and someone stealing or damaging their vehicle.

Finally, for this section on safety and security in the CID, respondents were asked how safe they feel in different areas in the CID. Respondents selected how safe they felt on a scale from 0 to 5, with those who never felt safe coded as a 0 and those who always felt safe were coded as a 5. Although Table 18 displays the breakdown across all of the possible responses, Table 19 averages those responses and then breaks them down across demographics and compares between survey years. On average, respondents felt safest in Japantown and least safe in the I-5 underpass areas in 2017. However, respondents felt slightly safer in all of the CID areas in 2017 when compared to 2016, with the largest increase in feelings of safety occurring in the Danny Woo Garden and Kobe Terrace Park. Examining differences in demographics we find that when comparing respondents across their primary language, there was a 0.3 point decrease in feelings of safety for Chinese language speakers in Chinatown, yet a 0.5 point increase for Vietnamese language speakers in Little Saigon. English and other language speakers appear to have driven the increase in perceptions of safety in the Danny Woo Garden and Kobe Terrace Park.

Witnessing & Reporting Criminal Activity

In this final section, Tables 20 through 23 present data on crimes that respondents have witnessed, whether they reported the crimes and, if not, why did they not report. The most prevalent criminal or deviant behavior witnessed at least once a week by respondents was public intoxication (31.1%), followed closely by trespassing or loitering (30.3%). To better understand whether respondents observe any of the listed behaviors at all of the last year, we can look at the “Never” column in Table 20. Here we see, based on the percentage that never saw specific behaviors, that more than 70% of respondents witnessed dangerous behaviors due to drug and/or alcohol abuse, aggressive panhandling, trespassing/loitering, public urination, and public intoxication. Many of these are quality of life offenses that leave citizens feeling unsafe and insecure in their neighborhoods when they witness these behaviors.

Table 21 presents crime witness and reporting behaviors across the respondent’s primary language. Almost 36% of individuals whose primary language was Chinese witnessed a non-violent crime in the past year, compare to 41%, 29%, and 22% for English, Vietnamese, and other languages, respectively. Rates of witnessing violent crimes were lower, with Vietnamese (25%) and another primary language (19.4%) respondents have the largest proportion of individuals witnessing violent crimes, followed by Chinese (12.8%) and English (11.4%). Of those who witnessed criminal behaviors, the majority of all languages across both crime types did not report with Vietnamese language respondent reporting on no violent crimes that they witnessed and 86.8% of Chinese language respondents not reporting on non-violent crimes

they witnessed. For the Chinese language respondents, the top reason for not reporting on a non-violent crime was a concern for personal safety and for violent crimes also a concern for personal safety, but also the fact that someone else called. For English language respondents, it was a belief that the incident was not an emergency if it was non-violent and for violent crimes, it was a tie between a belief that the police would not follow-up and that someone else called. Although there were fewer Vietnamese respondents who witnessed a crime, the top reason for those who did witness but did not report to the police a concern for safety specific to non-violent crimes and a belief that the police wouldn't follow up or someone else called for violent crimes.

Table 22 takes the same data but examines it across age categories instead of primary language. Respondents who were older than 35 more often witnessed non-violent criminal behavior, while respondents 35 or younger more often witnessed violent crimes in the CID. Once again, respondents, regardless of their age group, were more likely to not report a non-violent crime when compared to violent crimes. However, for all age categories and crime types (except the under 18 category which had very few respondents), the majority of respondents did not report the crimes they witnessed. When assessing reasons for non-reporting of non-violent crimes, the number one reasons were a belief that the police couldn't do anything for those 19 to 35, a belief that the crime witnessed was not an emergency for those 36 and older. For non-reporting for violent crimes, the number one reason for respondents ages 19 through 35 was not wanting to get involved and for those 36 to 54 it was a tie between a belief that the police wouldn't follow up and that someone else called. In addition, for those 55 and older, the number one reason for not reporting a violent crime was a concern for their own safety and also the fact that someone else called.

Finally, Table 23 examines witnessing and reporting behaviors across gender. Once again, individuals in most categories witnessed non-violent crimes more often than violent crimes and between females and males, these proportions are similar. Males were more likely to report on the violent and non-violent crimes that they witnessed. In addition, the top reason for not reporting non-violent crimes for males was a belief that it was not an emergency, a belief that the police couldn't do anything for females, and for transgenders a three way tie between a belief that the police wouldn't follow up, the crime was not an emergency, and a lack of trust in law enforcement. For violent crimes, females most often chose the fact that someone else called as the reason for non reporting, while males most often stated that they didn't want to get involved.

Table 20. How Often Did Respondents Observe Below Behaviors When In Chinatown-International District (n=396)*

	At Least Once a Week		At Least Once a Month		Every Few Months		Once in the Past Year		Never	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Dangerous Behavior Due to Alcohol / Drug Abuse	65	16.4	69	17.4	93	23.5	52	13.1	117	29.5
Aggressive Panhandling	84	21.2	87	22.0	64	16.2	47	11.9	114	28.8
Drug Dealing	50	12.6	56	14.1	63	15.9	51	12.9	176	44.4
Robbery/Mugging	9	2.3	24	6.1	57	14.4	61	15.4	245	61.9
Trespassing/Loitering	120	30.3	65	16.4	67	16.9	43	10.9	101	25.5
Public Urination	96	24.2	61	15.4	74	18.7	50	12.6	115	29.0
Gun Violence	3	0.8	5	1.3	23	5.8	55	13.9	310	78.3
Drug Usage	52	13.1	55	13.9	69	17.4	62	15.7	158	39.9
Public Intoxication	123	31.1	55	13.9	81	20.5	42	10.6	95	24.0
Car Prowls	38	9.6	43	10.9	65	16.4	56	14.1	194	49.0
Burglary/Break-in	13	3.3	27	6.8	45	11.4	65	16.4	246	62.1
Vehicle Theft	13	3.3	23	5.8	37	9.3	53	13.4	270	68.2
Graffiti	75	18.9	53	13.4	61	15.4	47	11.9	160	40.4
Prostitution	22	5.6	23	5.8	48	12.1	42	10.6	261	65.9
Illegal Dumping	82	20.7	47	11.9	63	15.9	34	8.6	170	42.9
Shoplifting	21	5.3	20	5.1	48	12.1	46	11.6	261	65.9

*Respondent could select all applicable behaviors

Table 21. Respondents Crime Witness & Reporting Behaviors by Primary Language

		Chinese (n=148)		English (n=211)		Vietnamese (n=28)		Other (n=36)	
		n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Witnessed	Non-Violent	53	35.8	86	40.8	8	28.6	8	22.2
	Violent	19	12.8	24	11.4	7	25.0	7	19.4
Not Reported	Non-Violent	46	86.8	60	69.8	4	50.0	5	62.5
	Violent	14	73.7	13	54.2	7	100.0	3	42.9
Police Wouldn't Follow Up	Non-Violent	9	19.6	23	38.3	0	0.0	0	0.0
	Violent	3	21.4	4	30.8	1	14.3	1	33.3
Too Busy	Non-Violent	5	10.9	9	15.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	Violent	0	0.0	2	15.4	0	0.0	1	33.3
911 Wouldn't Take Serious	Non-Violent	2	4.3	6	10.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	Violent	1	7.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	33.3
Didn't Want Involved	Non-Violent	6	13.0	8	13.3	1	25.0	1	20.0
	Violent	3	21.4	3	23.1	0	0.0	3	100.0
Concerned for Safety	Non-Violent	12	26.1	7	11.7	2	50.0	1	20.0
	Violent	4	28.6	3	23.1	0	0.0	1	33.3
Not an Emergency	Non-Violent	7	15.2	29	48.3	0	0.0	0	0.0
	Violent	0	0.0	2	15.4	0	0.0	1	33.3
Someone Else Called	Non-Violent	3	6.5	5	8.3	1	25.0	1	20.0
	Violent	4	28.6	4	30.8	1	14.3	2	66.7
Don't Trust Police	Non-Violent	2	4.3	4	6.7	1	25.0	0	0.0
	Violent	0	0.0	1	7.7	0	0.0	0	0.0
Police Couldn't Do Anything	Non-Violent	6	13.0	25	41.7	0	0.0	1	20.0
	Violent	2	14.3	3	23.1	0	0.0	2	66.7
Police Don't Speak Language	Non-Violent	8	17.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	Violent	1	7.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0

Table 22. Respondents Crime Witness & Reporting Behaviors by Age

		Under 18		19-35		36-54		55 and Over	
		n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Witnessed	Non-Violent	4	26.7	46	34.8	41	38.3	64	37.9
	Violent	3	20.0	19	14.4	14	13.1	21	12.4
Not Reported	Non-Violent	1	25.0	36	78.3	28	68.3	50	78.1
	Violent	3	100.0	11	57.9	8	57.1	15	71.4
Police Wouldn't Follow Up	Non-Violent	0	0.0	14	38.9	10	35.7	8	16.0
	Violent	1	33.3	3	27.3	3	37.5	2	13.3
Too Busy	Non-Violent	0	0.0	8	22.2	4	14.3	2	4.0
	Violent	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	25.0	1	6.7
911 Wouldn't Take Serious	Non-Violent	0	0.0	4	11.1	1	3.6	3	6.0
	Violent	1	33.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	6.7
Didn't Want Involved	Non-Violent	0	0.0	6	16.7	4	14.3	6	12.0
	Violent	0	0.0	4	36.4	2	25.0	3	20.0
Concerned for Safety	Non-Violent	0	0.0	7	19.4	6	21.4	9	18.0
	Violent	1	33.3	2	18.2	0	0.0	5	33.3
Not an Emergency	Non-Violent	0	0.0	12	33.3	11	39.3	13	26.0
	Violent	0	0.0	2	18.2	1	12.5	0	0.0
Someone Else Called	Non-Violent	0	0.0	3	8.3	3	10.7	4	8.0
	Violent	1	33.3	2	18.2	3	37.5	5	33.3
Don't Trust Police	Non-Violent	0	0.0	6	16.7	0	0.0	1	2.0
	Violent	1	33.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Police Couldn't Do Anything	Non-Violent	0	0.0	16	44.4	5	17.9	11	22.0
	Violent	0	0.0	2	18.2	1	12.5	4	26.7
Police Don't Speak Language	Non-Violent	0	0.0	1	2.8	2	7.1	5	10.0
	Violent	0	0.0	1	9.1	0	0.0	0	0.0

Table 23. Respondents Crime Witness & Reporting Behaviors by Gender

		Female		Male		Transgender		Other	
		n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Witnessed	Non-Violent	103	36.9	48	36.1	4	80.0	0	0.0
	Violent	38	13.6	17	12.8	1	20.0	1	16.7
Not Reported	Non-Violent	77	74.8	34	70.8	4	100.0	0	0.0
	Violent	26	68.4	9	52.9	1	100.0	1	100.0
Police Wouldn't Follow Up	Non-Violent	19	24.7	10	29.4	3	75.0	0	0.0
	Violent	8	30.8	1	11.1	0	0.0	0	0.0
Too Busy	Non-Violent	9	11.7	4	11.8	1	25.0	0	0.0
	Violent	3	11.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
911 Wouldn't Take Serious	Non-Violent	7	9.1	1	2.9	0	0.0	0	0.0
	Violent	1	3.8	1	11.1	0	0.0	0	0.0
Didn't Want Involved	Non-Violent	9	11.7	5	14.7	2	50.0	0	0.0
	Violent	6	23.1	3	33.3	0	0.0	0	0.0
Concerned for Safety	Non-Violent	16	20.8	4	11.8	2	50.0	0	0.0
	Violent	7	26.9	1	11.1	0	0.0	0	0.0
Not an Emergency	Non-Violent	21	27.3	12	35.3	3	75.0	0	0.0
	Violent	2	7.7	1	11.1	0	0.0	0	0.0
Someone Else Called	Non-Violent	8	10.4	2	5.9	0	0.0	0	0.0
	Violent	11	42.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Don't Trust Police	Non-Violent	4	5.2	0	0.0	3	75.0	0	0.0
	Violent	1	3.8	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Police Couldn't Do Anything	Non-Violent	22	28.6	8	23.5	2	50.0	0	0.0
	Violent	4	15.4	2	22.2	0	0.0	1	100.0
Police Don't Speak Language	Non-Violent	7	9.1	1	2.9	0	0.0	0	0.0
	Violent	0	0.0	1	11.1	0	0.0	0	0.0