

James Bay Resident Responses in the GVHA Reputational Survey

Summary Document
July, 2011

Contents:

Introduction	1
James Bay Resident Responses – Overview	2
Highlights – General Public Responses for James Bay	4
Detailed Analysis Comparing James Bay Responses to Other Areas	7

(Note: Summary Document contains pages 1-6 only)



James Bay Neighbourhood Association

234 Menzies St
Victoria, B.C., V8V 2G7

www.jbna.org

James Bay Resident Responses in the GVHA Reputational Survey

Introduction:

The 2010 Greater Victoria Harbour Authority (GVHA) Reputational Survey Final Report II (January 2011), conducted by R.A. Malatest & Associates Ltd., was released by GVHA in April of this year. The report, available on the GVHA web-site, presents survey results but does not provide an analysis of the information gathered from residents of James Bay.

The residents section of the survey involved 851 respondents, 200 (or 23.5%) of whom are James Bay residents. Other residents surveyed included 210 from other Victoria neighbourhoods, 176 from Esquimalt, and 265 from the broader region within the Capital Regional District (CRD).

Additional sections of the survey focused on other groups including clients, community groups, and member agencies and regulatory bodies.

GVHA has shared the data from the residents section of the survey with JBNA. In turn, JBNA has assessed the data and identified the areas where residents of James Bay expressed a significantly different response from other residents within the CRD.

The criterion that has been used for identifying those differences is:

- a James Bay response percentage which is either more than 10 points higher than the All Other response percentage, or
- greater than or equal to 1.5 times the All Other response percentage, or both.¹

The residents survey was composed of 23 questions, with one question requiring four responses and parts, and four questions requiring three responses and parts; in all, there were up to 39 responses per resident plus opportunities to provide comments.

In addition to identifying significant differences in survey responses, the JBNA review included categorization of the many resident comments.

¹ Of the nine questions identified as showing significant differences, Q5 and Q6 satisfy the first of these criteria, Q7, Q8A, Q9 and Q14 satisfy the second criterion, and Q18A, Q18C, and Q21A satisfy both criteria. The differences are, wherever necessary, based upon the summed percentages.

James Bay Resident Responses - Overview:

For much of the survey, which explored views on the role of GVHA within the context of its mandate, residents of James Bay (JB) and residents beyond James Bay expressed a similar level of satisfaction or dissatisfaction with GVHA performance, including facility maintenance/management, communications, and harbour leadership.

However, *“Several comments cite a lack of awareness/understanding of GVHA and what they do, particularly residents.”*² This lack of awareness of responsibilities and authority within the harbour was highlighted by the many comments about the mega-yacht marina,³ which is not related to GVHA operations or land/waterlot holdings.

The residents section of survey responses, when analysed by area, suggests that residents of James Bay are considerably more “in touch” with GVHA activities than residents elsewhere, with more than double the ‘contact with GVHA’ interactions than other residents. JB residents were also more forthcoming in providing suggestions throughout the survey. 71.5% of JB residents surveyed, which compares to 56.7% of other residents surveyed, provided comments (167 in all) on opportunities for improving management of GVHA properties.⁴

JB residents self-identified the JBNA as a residents association more frequently than other areas. 11 JB respondents (5.5%) identified JBNA while the Esquimalt Residents Association and VicWest were each identified by one resident (0.3%). No other JB community organization was identified in the JB responses.

The Malatest report suggests that 53.65% of those in all groups measured *“are supportive of GVHA’s performances in fulfilling its mandate. Clients were significantly more supportive of GVHA performance than were other survey groups.”*

This conclusion complements a GVHA weakness identified within the Malatest report, namely that stakeholders and clients with a direct interest in the harbour’s development have been the focus of attention while other stakeholders and the community have not been provided an appropriate role in the development and communication of future harbour initiatives.

Indeed, the Malatest report also found that *“Maintaining the Victoria Harbour as a working harbour achieved the highest rating among the four goals identified, while acting in the best interests of the Victoria Harbour received the lowest rating.”*

² Statements in *italics* are direct quotations from the Malatest Report.

³ The mega-yacht marina was a controversial topic in 2010.

⁴ This statement accepts that the number of residents (n=512) providing suggestions gave more than 512 responses (Malatest report Sec 5.4 page 30).

Although overall management of the harbour properties, particularly Fisherman's Wharf and Inner Harbour properties, was rated as positive among all survey groups, there are distinct differences between JB resident responses and all other resident responses.

Overall, 23.6% of JB residents, compared to 16.2% of other residents, were dissatisfied with GVHA's 'balancing' of social, environmental and economic impacts in Victoria's Harbour.

Page 26 of the Malatest report suggests that 92% of Ogden Point clients were satisfied with management of cruise tourism services while 66% of all residents were satisfied. Casual users of GVHA properties, such as residents beyond JB, are most satisfied with management of the Ogden Point facility. By examining the number of respondents dissatisfied with operations at the Ogden Point facility, contrasts between JB resident responses and responses from residents beyond JB were identified in management of cruise tourism, commercial development at Ogden Point, and management of the Ogden Point facility.

Residents who indicated dissatisfaction with GVHA management of properties were asked to provide comments. Regarding Ogden Point, dissatisfied residents (30% overall) identified factors which Malatest grouped under Service Quality (30%), Commercial Development (25%), Environment (18%), Transportation (15%), and Land Use (10%). The JBNA grouping of JB resident comments reveals even more emphasis on environmental issues (including transportation): Environmental Concerns (48%), Site Improvements (39%) and other concerns (14%).

In another opportunity to provide comments, namely how to improve management of GVHA properties, the Malatest report suggests that 10% of comments from all residents were on the environment. In contrast, 16% of JB comments were on the environment. Since JB residents make up 23.5% of the total residents, residents beyond JB are only half as concerned as JB residents about the environmental impacts of GVHA operations.

The Malatest report concludes that "*what has become clear is the level of satisfaction experienced by those who benefit from the Victoria Harbour*", and further that "*Residents and users enjoy the activities and amenities ... businesses benefit through the use of port facilities*". This conclusion complements JBNA cruise ship impact studies which identify particular business interests which gain from GVHA activities, while others, particularly adjacent residents, bear social and environmental costs associated with these activities.

Highlights - General Public Responses for James Bay:

Numerical Section

1. There are significant differences between the James Bay responses (n =200) and all other public responses (n = 651) for some of the questions asked.
2. There is a much higher proportion of “no response” or “don’t know” answers among the other public responses than among the James Bay responses.
3. The questions where the James Bay responses differ significantly from the all other public responses include Q5, Q6, Q7, Q8A, Q9, Q14, Q18A, Q18C, and Q21A.
4. Q5: Have you heard of GVHA?
Yes, JB 91%, all other 81%.
5. Q6: How familiar are you with the role of GVHA?
Very: JB 18%, all other 9%;
Somewhat: JB 65%, all other 60%;
Sum: JB 82.4%, all other 68.9%.
6. Q7: Are you involved with a Resident’s Association that interacts with GVHA?
Yes: JB 11%, all other 2%.
7. Q8A: What is the name of the Residents’ Association, after dropping answers (like condominium associations) that do not pertain to community or neighbourhood associations?
JBNA 5.5%, all other 0.3%.
8. Q9: In the past years, how many times have you been in contact with GVHA, either directly or through a Residents’ Association?
One: JB 4%, all other 2%;
2-5: JB 7%, all other 3%;
> 5: JB 4%, all other 2%;
Sum: JB 15.5%, all other 6.5%.
9. Q14: GVHA commits to incorporating and balancing the social, environmental and economic impacts of their activities on Victoria Harbour?
Strongly disagree: JB 6%, all other 3%;
Disagree: JB 18%, all other 14%;
Sum: JB 23.6%, all other 16.2%.
10. Q18A: How satisfied are you with GVHA’s management or support of cruise tourism at Ogden Point?
Very dissatisfied: JB 11%, all other 4%;
Dissatisfied: JB 13%, all other 9%;
Sum: JB 23.8%, all other 13.0%.

11. Q18C: How satisfied are you with GVHA's management or support of commercial development at Ogden Point?

Very dissatisfied: JB 8%, all other 4%;
Dissatisfied: JB 23%, all other 17%;
Sum: JB 31.6%, all other 21.1%.

12. Q21A: How satisfied are you with GVHA's overall management of the Ogden Point marina facilities?

Very dissatisfied: JB 6%, all other 2%;
Dissatisfied: JB 15%, all other 9%;
Sum: JB 21.5%, all other 11.0%.

13. On the whole, James Bay respondents are more familiar with GVHA operations than other public respondents, and more dissatisfied with some categories of these operations, especially those connected with Ogden Point.

Comments Section

1. James Bay respondents were more prone to provide comments related to their numerical answers than all other respondents.

2. The James Bay comments bear considerable similarity to the comments received in the responses to the 2009 James Bay residents survey (n = 573).

3. Q17: You mentioned that you disagree that GVHA is fulfilling their mandate. Would you please explain? (JB comments only.)

Environmental concerns: 39%
Organizational concerns: 16%
Communications concerns: 16%
Other concerns: 29%
31 JB response concerns (non-GVHA items like mega-yacht marina omitted)

4. Q22A: You indicated that you were dissatisfied with the overall management of Ogden Point. Please explain. (JB comments only.)

Environmental concerns: 48%
Site improvement concerns: 39%
Other concerns: 14%
44 JB response concerns

5. Q22B: You indicated that you were dissatisfied with the overall management of Fisherman's Wharf. Please explain. (JB comments only.)

Site improvement concerns: 80%
Other concerns: 20%
15 JB response concerns

6. Q22C: You indicated that you were dissatisfied with the overall management of the Inner Harbour (excluding sea planes and parking lots). Please explain. (JB comments only.)

Site improvement concerns: 50%

Other concerns: 50%

14 JB response concerns (non-GVHA items omitted)

7. Q23: Do you have any suggestions or comments to improve the overall management of Victoria Harbour? (JB comments only.)

Site improvement suggestions: 44%

Environmental suggestions: 16%

Communications suggestions: 12%

Organizational suggestions: 6%

Other suggestions: 22%

122 JB suggestions (non-GVHA items like mega-yacht marina omitted)

8. In summary, two basic areas dominate the comments section: environmental issues and site improvement issues. Organizational and communications issues come third.