

## **Emergency preparedness and resilience: Community-based fact sheets, 2014**

by Jillian Boyce, Shana Conroy and Dyna Ibrahim



---

## How to obtain more information

For information about this product or the wide range of services and data available from Statistics Canada, visit our website, [www.statcan.gc.ca](http://www.statcan.gc.ca).

You can also contact us by

email at [STATCAN.infostats-infostats.STATCAN@canada.ca](mailto:STATCAN.infostats-infostats.STATCAN@canada.ca)

telephone, from Monday to Friday, 8:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m., at the following numbers:

- Statistical Information Service 1-800-263-1136
- National telecommunications device for the hearing impaired 1-800-363-7629
- Fax line 1-514-283-9350

### Depository Services Program

- Inquiries line 1-800-635-7943
- Fax line 1-800-565-7757

## Standards of service to the public

Statistics Canada is committed to serving its clients in a prompt, reliable and courteous manner. To this end, Statistics Canada has developed standards of service that its employees observe. To obtain a copy of these service standards, please contact Statistics Canada toll-free at 1-800-263-1136. The service standards are also published on [www.statcan.gc.ca](http://www.statcan.gc.ca) under “Contact us” > “Standards of service to the public.”

## Note of appreciation

Canada owes the success of its statistical system to a long-standing partnership between Statistics Canada, the citizens of Canada, its businesses, governments and other institutions. Accurate and timely statistical information could not be produced without their continued co-operation and goodwill.

## Standard table symbols

The following symbols are used in Statistics Canada publications:

- . not available for any reference period
- .. not available for a specific reference period
- ... not applicable
- 0 true zero or a value rounded to zero
- 0<sup>s</sup> value rounded to 0 (zero) where there is a meaningful distinction between true zero and the value that was rounded
- <sup>P</sup> preliminary
- <sup>r</sup> revised
- X suppressed to meet the confidentiality requirements of the *Statistics Act*
- <sup>E</sup> use with caution
- F too unreliable to be published
- \* significantly different from reference category ( $p < 0.05$ )

Published by authority of the Minister responsible for Statistics Canada

© Minister of Industry, 2016

All rights reserved. Use of this publication is governed by the Statistics Canada [Open Licence Agreement](#).

**An HTML version is also available.**

*Cette publication est aussi disponible en français.*

---



# Emergency preparedness and resilience: Community-based fact sheets, 2014

---

by **Jillian Boyce, Shana Conroy** and **Dyna Ibrahim**

Emergencies and disasters are capable of causing significant and devastating negative impacts—be they social, economic or environmental—in the communities they strike. At the community level, preparedness and resilience are particularly important as emergencies and disasters are often community events—experienced locally by residents and managed locally by municipalities, often in partnership with provincial and federal agencies. Municipal governments have a critical role in emergency and disaster preparedness and resilience as it is estimated that they are the first line of response to over 90% of emergencies and disasters in Canada (Federation of Canadian Municipalities 2006). Accordingly, municipalities have recognized the growing risks associated with natural and human-induced emergencies and disasters, and they have collectively acknowledged the importance of risk identification, prevention, preparedness and mitigation, in the community and at all levels of government (Federation of Canadian Municipalities 2006).

The Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience (SEPR), carried out for the first time in 2014, was developed in partnership with Defence Research and Development Canada's Centre for Security Science and Public Safety Canada. The purpose of the SEPR is to improve the understanding of community preparedness and resilience across Canada's provinces by collecting data related to the ability of residents and communities to prevent, prepare for, respond to and recover from major emergencies and disasters. Provincial and national estimates from the SEPR are available in two previously released Statistics Canada reports: "Emergency preparedness in Canada, 2014 ([www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/85-002-x/2015001/article/14234-eng.htm](http://www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/85-002-x/2015001/article/14234-eng.htm))" and "Canadians' experiences with emergencies and disasters, 2014 ([www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/85-002-x/2016001/article/14469-eng.htm](http://www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/85-002-x/2016001/article/14469-eng.htm)). In addition, Statistics Canada prepared an infographic, "Emergency preparedness and planning in Canada ([www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/11-627-m/11-627-m2015004-eng.htm](http://www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/11-627-m/11-627-m2015004-eng.htm))," to highlight results.

The focus for this analysis, however, is on community-level fact sheets that highlight results on preparedness and resilience. Each fact sheet outlines the following: risk awareness and anticipated sources of help in an emergency or disaster; prior lifetime experience with a major emergency or disaster; emergency planning, precautionary and fire safety behaviours; and, social networks and sense of belonging. The fact sheets are divided into five regions: the Atlantic provinces, Quebec, Ontario, the Prairie provinces and British Columbia.<sup>1</sup> There are 63 community-level fact sheets, and there is one additional fact sheet per province with results from residents of smaller communities.

## Reference

Federation of Canadian Municipalities. 2006. *Emergency: Municipalities Missing from Disaster Planning*. (accessed September 12, 2016).

## Note

<sup>1</sup> Given the differences in the way of life in the territories compared to elsewhere in Canada, in conjunction with the unique challenges related to data collection in the territories (e.g., high turnover of telephone numbers, high population mobility and the remoteness of many communities), residents of the Yukon, Northwest Territories and Nunavut were excluded from the survey population. However, in 2014, Statistics Canada also partnered with Public Safety Canada and Defence Research and Development Canada's Centre for Security Science to complete a feasibility study to help determine the appropriate content and best method of collecting similar information on emergency preparedness and resilience in the territories.



## Fact sheet

# Community of St. John's (CMA), Newfoundland and Labrador

---

In 2014, information on the emergency preparedness of people living in the Census Metropolitan Area<sup>1</sup> of St. John's was collected through the Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada (SEPR).<sup>2</sup> This fact sheet presents information on the risk awareness and level of emergency preparedness of the residents of St. John's, which could help improve the understanding of community resilience in the event of an emergency.<sup>3,4</sup>

### Risk awareness and anticipated sources of help in an emergency or disaster

- Winter storms (including blizzards, ice storms and extreme cold) (97%), extended power outages lasting 24 hours or longer (96%), wildfires or forest fires (59%) and hurricanes (58%) were named by residents of St. John's as the emergencies or disasters most likely to occur within their community.
- Radio news was named as the source of information residents would turn to first in most emergencies or disasters. More specifically, in the event of a weather-related emergency or natural disaster (47%), an extended power outage lasting 24 hours or longer (40%), an industrial or transportation accident (39%), a riot or civil unrest (38%<sup>E</sup>) or an act of terrorism or terrorist threat (32%<sup>E</sup>), news on the radio was the source that the people of St. John's would turn to first for information or assistance (Table 1.1).
- Radio news was the second most common source for initial help and information in the event of a contamination or shortage of water or food (32%), following local government (33%). Radio news was also the second choice in the event of an outbreak of a serious illness or a life-threatening disease (23%), following seeking help or information from a hospital, clinic, doctor or other medical professional (44%).

### Prior lifetime experience with a major emergency or disaster<sup>5</sup>

- More than half of people (56%) in St. John's have experienced a major emergency or disaster in Canada in a community where they were living at the time. For most (82%), this emergency or disaster was significant enough to have resulted in severe disruptions to their daily activities.
- Extended power outages lasting 24 hours or longer (75%) were the most commonly experienced emergencies or disasters, followed by winter storms (including blizzards and ice storms) (26%) and hurricanes (21%).
- The most common types of disruption to daily activities endured by people in St. John's who experienced emergencies included a need to miss work or school (74%), an inability to use electrical appliances (73%) and a need to miss an appointment or a planned activity (63%). Conversely, the least common types of disruptions experienced were an inability to communicate with people outside of the household (12%<sup>E</sup>), an inability to use roads or transportation within the community (18%) and a need to evacuate the home (19%).
- Most (91%) people who experienced an emergency or disaster were able to resume their daily activities within one week of the event (29% within 24 hours, 31% within one to two days, 23% within three to five days, and 8%<sup>E</sup> within six to seven days).
- Half (49%) of residents who had experienced an emergency or disaster received help during or immediately following the event, many of whom turned to family (42%) for the help, followed by neighbours (24%<sup>E</sup>) and local government (16%<sup>E</sup>).

- Nearly one in five (18%) people in St. John's who experienced major emergencies or disasters which were significant enough to disrupt their regular daily routine also endured a loss of property or some kind of a financial impact. Experiencing other types of long-term implications was rare.

## Emergency planning, precautionary and fire safety behaviours

- Nearly three-quarters (73%) of the residents of St. John's lived in households that were engaged in at least two emergency planning activities,<sup>6</sup> with almost half (45%) living in households with three or four such activities (Table 1.2). Almost one in ten (9%<sup>E</sup>) people in St. John's lived in a household that had not participated in any emergency planning activities.
- Most (73%) residents lived in a household with at least two precautionary measures<sup>7</sup> taken in case of an emergency, with more than one-third (38%) living in a household with three or four such measures. Conversely, 7%<sup>E</sup> lived in a household with no precautionary measures in place.
- The majority (98%) of residents reported living in a household with a working smoke detector, and 82% reported living in a household with a working fire extinguisher (Table 1.3). Less than half (42%) stated that they had a working carbon monoxide detector in their household. However, just over one-third (37%) of the residents stated that they had implemented all three fire safety measures within their households.
- The types of emergency planning activities, precautionary and fire safety measures taken by residents of St. John's did not frequently differ from the behaviours of Newfoundland and Labrador's residents overall. There were, however, some differences when compared to residents of Canada's 10 provinces overall. For example, the proportion of residents of St. John's who had a wind-up or battery-operated radio (84%) or a working fire extinguisher in their home (82%) was significantly higher than Canadians as a whole (58% and 66%, respectively). Conversely, St. John's residents were less likely to have a working carbon monoxide detector (42%) when compared to Canadians in general (60%).<sup>8</sup>
- Generally, while residents of St. John's (37%) were less likely than those in Canada (42%) to have all three fire safety measures in place in their homes, they were more likely to be engaged in three (25%) or four (13%) precautionary measures (20% and 7%, respectively). There were no significant differences between residents of St. John's and Newfoundland and Labrador, or between St. John's residents and Canadians in terms of the number of emergency planning activities taken.

## Social networks and sense of belonging

- More than half (58%) of St. John's residents had a strong sense of belonging<sup>9</sup> to their community.
- Most (89%) residents described the neighbourhood they lived in as a place where neighbours generally help each other.<sup>10</sup> Of those who did not describe their neighbourhood this way, nearly three-quarters (73%) still described it as a place where neighbours would at least help each other in an emergency.<sup>11</sup>
- Many residents had a large network of support in the event of an emergency or disaster, with more than five people to turn to for help if physically injured (70%), for emotional support (68%), in case of a home evacuation (65%), or for financial help (31%). However, 7%<sup>E</sup> reported that they had no one to turn to for financial help.
- High levels of self-efficacy and social support, as well as civic engagement, were sometimes associated with a higher level of emergency preparedness (Table 1.4).

## Data tables

**Table 1.1**  
Most commonly anticipated sources of initial help and information, by type of emergency or disaster, residents of St. John's, Newfoundland and Labrador, 2014

Most common sources of initial help and information by type of emergency or disaster	percent
<b>Weather-related emergency or natural disaster</b>	
News- Radio	47
News- Internet	16

Local government	13
<b>Extended power outages</b>	
News- Radio	40
Utility company	37
Family	8 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Outbreak of serious or life-threatening disease</b>	
Hospital, clinic, doctor or other medical professional	44
News- Radio	23
News- Internet	14 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Industrial or transportation accident</b>	
News- Radio	39
News- Internet	22
News- Television	17 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Contamination or shortage of water or food <sup>1</sup></b>	
Local government	33
News- Radio	32
Provincial government	15 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Act of terrorism or terrorist threat</b>	
News- Radio	32 <sup>E</sup>
Police/law enforcement	30 <sup>E</sup>
News- Television	25 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Rioting or civil unrest</b>	
News- Radio	38 <sup>E</sup>
Police/law enforcement	38 <sup>E</sup>
News- Television	26 <sup>E</sup>
<sup>E</sup> use with caution	
<sup>1</sup> Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% when respondents were asked about their likely sources of initial help and information.	
<b>Note:</b> Respondents who perceived their community was at risk for any form of emergency or disaster were then asked where they would turn to first for information or assistance in the event of the perceived emergency or disaster. Respondents could provide more than one response. Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.	
<b>Source:</b> Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.	

**Table 1.2**  
**Number of emergency planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents, community of St. John's, Newfoundland and Labrador, 2014**

Number of planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents	St. John's	Newfoundland and Labrador	Canada
	percent		
<b>Number of emergency planning activities</b>			
None	9 <sup>E</sup>	7	8
1 activity	16	15	17
2 activities	28	27	25
3 activities	23	27	27
4 activities	22	22	19
<b>Number of precautionary measures</b>			
None	7 <sup>E **</sup>	7	16
1 measure	19 <sup>**</sup>	19	27

2 measures	35 ***	31	28
3 measures	25 **	26	20
4 measures	13 **	16	7
<b>Number of fire safety measures <sup>1 2</sup></b>			
None	F	F	1
1 measure	11	11	14
2 measures	46 **	48	38
3 measures	37 **	38	42
<p><sup>E</sup> use with caution  <sup>F</sup> too unreliable to be published</p> <p>** significantly different from Canada level estimate (p &lt; 0.05)</p> <p>*** significantly different from both provincial and Canada level estimates (p &lt; 0.05)</p> <p>1 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Canada'.</p> <p>2 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'St. John's'.</p> <p><b>Note:</b> Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents. Emergency planning activities include: an emergency exit plan, an emergency supply kit, photocopies/electronic copies of important documents and a list of emergency contact numbers. Precautionary measures include: a battery-operated or wind-up radio, an alternative heat source, a back-up generator and an alternative water source. Fire safety measures include a working smoke detector, a working carbon monoxide detector and a working fire extinguisher.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.</p>			

**Table 1.3**  
**Planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures residents engaged in, community of St. John's, Newfoundland and Labrador, 2014**

Residents whose households were involved in the following:	St. John's	Newfoundland and Labrador	Canada
	percent		
<b>Emergency planning activities</b>			
Emergency exit plan	64	63	60
Exit plan has been practised/reviewed in last 12 months <sup>1</sup>	50	50	46
Designated meeting place for household members <sup>2</sup>	35	39	33
Contact plan for household members <sup>2</sup>	58	56	55
Household emergency supply kit	50	51	47
Vehicle emergency supply kit <sup>3</sup>	62	61	59
Extra copies of important documents	49	51	53
List of emergency contact numbers	71 *	76	69
Plan for meeting special health needs <sup>4</sup>	79 **	72	62
<b>Precautionary measures</b>			
Wind-up or battery-operated radio	84 ***	75	58
Alternate heat source	54 **	57	48
Back-up generator	36 ***	44	23
Alternate water source	43 *	48	43
Other <sup>5</sup>	26 **	25	21
<b>Fire safety measures</b>			
Working smoke detector	98	99	98
Working carbon monoxide detector	42 **	42	60
Working fire extinguisher	82 **	84	66

\* significantly different from provincial level estimate (p < 0.05)

\*\* significantly different from Canada level estimate (p < 0.05)

\*\*\* significantly different from both provincial and Canada level estimates (p < 0.05)

1 Percentage based only on those indicating that they have an emergency exit plan.

2 Excludes Canadians living in single-person households.

3 Excludes those who reported that they lived in a household that did not have a vehicle.

4 Percentage based only on those indicating that they or someone in their household has special medical needs.

5 'Other precautionary measures' include having an escape/rescue plan for pets, extra supply of fuel, checking and replenishing emergency supplies, and keeping exits clear.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

**Table 1.4**

**High or moderately high levels of emergency planning, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents, by social and political involvement, community of St. John's, Newfoundland and Labrador, 2014**

Social and political involvement	Percentage of residents who had high or moderately high levels of...		
	Planning activities	Precautionary measures	Fire safety measures
	percent		
<b>Engagement in political activities <sup>1</sup></b>			
Yes †	48	39	35
No	36	34	38
<b>High level of civic engagement <sup>2</sup></b>			
Yes †	47	44	35
No <sup>7</sup>	42	30 *	36
<b>High level of social support <sup>3</sup></b>			
Yes <sup>7</sup> †	54	40	41
No	42 *	38	36
<b>Strong sense of belonging to community <sup>4</sup></b>			
Yes †	50	38	37
No <sup>7</sup>	40	39	38
<b>High neighbourhood trust <sup>5</sup></b>			
Yes †	51	43	42
No <sup>7</sup>	42	35	33
<b>High level of self-efficacy <sup>6</sup></b>			
Yes †	52	46	40
No <sup>7</sup>	39 *	30 *	33



- \* significantly different from reference category ( $p < 0.05$ )
  - † reference category
- 1 Includes individuals over the age of 17 years who are eligible to vote, and who have participated in or volunteered for political parties or events in the past 12 months, including municipal, provincial, or federal elections, or expressed views on political or social issues through signing a petition, contacting news agencies or politicians, or attended a meeting involving social or community issues.
  - 2 Civic engagement measures individuals over the age of 17 years who were involved in a recreational group or organization in the past 12 months, and includes engagement in political activities. A 'high level' is defined as having been involved in at least 4 activities in the past 12 months.
  - 3 A 'high level of social support' is defined as having five or more people whom that individual could turn to for help in an emergency if they are physically injured, require emotional support, shelter, and/or financial assistance.
  - 4 A 'strong sense of belonging to community' is rating one's own sense of belonging to their community as a 4 or a 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "very weak" and 5 "very strong".
  - 5 'High neighbourhood trust' is rating one's own trust in the people in one's neighbourhood as 4 or 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "cannot be trusted at all" and 5 represents "can be trusted a lot", as well as having a response of "very likely" when asked about the likelihood of someone in their neighbourhood returning a lost wallet or purse containing two hundred dollars with the money still inside.
  - 6 A 'high level of self-efficacy' is derived from having a high self-rating on a scale of 1 (poor) to 5 (excellent) for the following three categories: an ability to think clearly and solve day-to-day problems, to handle unexpected and difficult problems, and to figure out what to do if faced with an emergency situation.
  - 7 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Fire safety measures'.
- Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents. Households with 'moderately high' or 'high' levels of emergency planning engaged in 3 or 4 of the following: having an exit plan, an emergency supply kit, extra copies of important documents and an emergency contact list. 'Moderately high' or 'high' levels of precautionary measures include having 3 or 4 of the following: a wind-up or battery operated radio, a back-up generator, an alternate source of heat and additional water. 'Moderately high' or 'high' levels of fire safety measure include having all 3 of the following: a working smoke detector, a working fire extinguisher, and a working carbon monoxide detector.
- Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

## Notes

E use with caution

- 1 A Census Metropolitan Area (CMA) or a Census Agglomeration (CA) is formed by one or more adjacent municipalities centred on a population centre (known as the core). A CMA must have a total population of at least 100,000 of which 50,000 or more must live in the core. A CA must have a core population of at least 10,000. To be included in the CMA or CA, other adjacent municipalities must have a high degree of integration with the core as measured by commuting flows derived from census data.
- 2 The target population for the SEPR included all persons 15 years of age or older, residing in households in Canada's 10 provinces, excluding full-time residents of institutions (e.g. nursing homes, group homes, hospitals).
- 3 The SEPR covers three types of communities: Census Metropolitan Areas (CMAs), Census Agglomerations (CAs) with population greater than 50,000, and 'smaller communities' which include CAs with population 50,000 or less and those areas that fall outside of CMAs and CAs. All CMAs and CAs (with population greater than 50,000) were included in the SEPR. A sample of households were selected from smaller communities within each province to represent all households within the province in similar communities. Additional information on the SEPR and its sampling methodology can be found in the 'Survey description' section.
- 4 Throughout this fact sheet, responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.
- 5 This section focuses on personal experiences with emergencies or disasters that happened in Canada, in a community where the person was living at the time, and was significant enough to severely interrupt the individual's regular daily activities.
- 6 Emergency planning activities include: having an emergency exit plan, a household emergency supply kit, extra copies of important documents and an emergency contact list.

- 7 Precautionary measures include: having a wind-up or battery-operated radio, an alternate heat source such as a non-electric stove or heater or a wood-burning fireplace, a back-up generator and an alternative water source such as a well, tank or litres of stored water.
- 8 Unless otherwise specified, differences are statistically significant ( $p < 0.05$ ).
- 9 A 'strong sense of belonging to community' is rating one's own sense of belonging to their community as a 4 or a 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "very weak" and 5 "very strong".
- 10 A proportion (11%) of respondents were not asked questions regarding neighbourhood helpfulness in the event of an emergency and as such these cases are not included in the analysis on neighbourhood helpfulness in general or in the event of an emergency.
- 11 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% when respondents were asked about whether their neighbourhood is a place where neighbours would help each other if there is an emergency.



## Fact sheet

# Smaller communities of Newfoundland and Labrador

---

In 2014, information on the emergency preparedness of people living in 'smaller communities' of Newfoundland and Labrador was collected through the Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada (SEPR).<sup>1 2 3</sup> This fact sheet presents information on the risk awareness and level of emergency preparedness of the residents of Newfoundland and Labrador's smaller communities, which could help improve the understanding of community resilience in the event of an emergency.<sup>4</sup>

### Risk awareness and anticipated sources of help in an emergency or disaster

- Residents of smaller communities of Newfoundland and Labrador anticipated winter storms (including blizzards, ice storms and extreme cold) (95%), extended power outages lasting 24 hours or longer (85%), and wildfires or forest fires (62%) as the events most likely to occur within their communities.
- In smaller communities of Newfoundland and Labrador, the initial source of help that people would turn to depended on the type of emergency or disaster. In the event of a weather-related emergency or natural disaster, residents would most commonly turn to news on the radio (26%) or television (19%), while many would first turn to a utility company (50%) if faced with an extended power outage lasting 24 hours or longer (Table 1.1). People commonly anticipated turning to police first if an act of terrorism or terrorist threat (49%<sup>E</sup>), rioting or civil unrest (49%<sup>E</sup>) or an industrial or transportation accident (27%<sup>E</sup>) was to occur. In the event of an outbreak of a serious or life-threatening disease, residents would commonly first turn to a hospital, clinic, doctor or other medical professional (63%). Local government (49%) was most commonly anticipated to be the initial source of help if faced with a contamination or shortage of water or food.

### Prior lifetime experience with a major emergency or disaster<sup>5</sup>

- Over one-third (38%) of people living in smaller communities of Newfoundland and Labrador have experienced a major emergency or disaster in Canada in a community where they were living at the time. For most (80%), this emergency or disaster was significant enough to have resulted in severe disruptions to their daily activities.
- Extended power outages lasting 24 hours or longer (48%) were the most common emergencies or disasters experienced by residents. Wildfires or forest fires (18%<sup>E</sup>) and hurricanes (17%<sup>E</sup>) followed, but experiences with these types of emergencies were less widespread.
- The most common types of disruption to daily activities were an inability to use electrical appliances (65%), a need to boil drinking water or drink bottled water (56%), a need to miss school or work (51%), or miss an appointment or a planned activity (51%). Impacts that were more severe but less common were the inability to use roads or transportation within the community (24%<sup>E</sup>) and home evacuations (18%<sup>E</sup>), both experienced by less than a quarter of affected residents.
- Three out of four (76%) residents of Newfoundland and Labrador's smaller communities who endured major emergencies were able to resume their daily activities within one week of the event; more than half (56%) of residents were able to resume activities in two days or less.
- More than half (59%) of residents affected by emergencies and disasters received help during or immediately following the emergency. Family members (35%<sup>E</sup>) and neighbours (19%<sup>E</sup>) were the most common sources of help.

- Nearly one in five (18%<sup>E</sup>) residents of Newfoundland and Labrador's smaller communities who experienced major emergencies or disasters that were significant enough to disrupt their regular daily activities also endured a loss of property or some kind of a financial impact. Experiencing other types of long-term implications such as emotional, psychological, physical or health consequences was rare.

## Emergency planning, precautionary and fire safety behaviours

- More than three-quarters (78%) of people living in smaller communities of Newfoundland and Labrador lived in households that were engaged in at least two emergency planning activities,<sup>6</sup> with approximately half (52%) living in households with three or four such activities (Table 1.2). A small proportion (6%<sup>E</sup>) of residents did not have any emergency planning activities in place in their homes.
- About three out of four (72%) residents lived in households with at least two precautionary measures<sup>7</sup> taken in case of an emergency, with less than half (44%) living in a household with three or four such measures. Less than one in ten (8%<sup>E</sup>) lived in a household with no precautionary measures in place.
- Almost all (99%) residents reported living in a household with a working smoke detector, and 85% reported living in a household with a working fire extinguisher (Table 1.3). Less than half (42%) stated that they had a working carbon monoxide detector in their household. About two in five (39%) people stated that they had implemented all three fire safety measures within their households.
- Generally, the number of planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents of the smaller communities of Newfoundland and Labrador did not vary significantly from the province as a whole. However, there were some differences in the types of activities and measures residents were engaged in. For example, residents of smaller communities were less likely to have had a wind-up or battery-operated radio when compared to Newfoundland and Labrador's proportion (69% versus 75%), though they were slightly more likely to have an alternate water source than the province as a whole (50% versus 48%).<sup>8</sup>
- The number of measures taken in the event of an emergency frequently differed between residents of smaller communities of Newfoundland and Labrador and those residing in Canada's 10 provinces. For example, the proportion of residents in smaller communities of Newfoundland and Labrador (18%) who were engaged in all four precautionary measures was more than double that of the overall Canadian proportion (7%).

## Social networks and sense of belonging

- Close to three-quarters (73%) of people in Newfoundland and Labrador's smaller communities had a strong sense of belonging<sup>9</sup> to their community.
- Most (94%) residents believed the neighbourhood they lived in was a place where neighbours generally help each other.<sup>10</sup> Of those who did not describe their neighbourhood this way, more than three-quarters (78%) still described it as a place where neighbours would help each other in an emergency.<sup>11</sup>
- More than two-thirds of residents had a large network of support in the event of an emergency or disaster, with more than five people to turn to for help if physically injured (71%), for emotional support (68%) or in case of a home evacuation (69%). About one in three (36%) had more than five people they could turn to if financial help was needed. However, 9% reported that they had no one to turn to for financial help.
- High levels of self-efficacy and neighbourhood trust, as well as civic engagement and involvement in political activities were sometimes associated with a higher level of emergency preparedness (Table 1.4).

## Data tables

Table 1.1

Most commonly anticipated sources of initial help and information, by type of emergency or disaster, residents of smaller communities of Newfoundland and Labrador, 2014

Most common sources of initial help and information by type of emergency or disaster	percent
<b>Weather-related emergency or natural disaster</b>	
News- Radio	26

News- Television	19
News- Internet	16
<b>Extended power outages</b>	
Utility company	50
News- Radio	18
Family	11 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Outbreak of serious or life-threatening disease</b>	
Hospital, clinic, doctor or other medical professional	63
News- Television	14 <sup>E</sup>
News- Radio	11 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Industrial or transportation accident</b>	
Police/law enforcement	27 <sup>E</sup>
News- Internet	19 <sup>E</sup>
Local government	17 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Contamination or shortage of water or food</b>	
Local government	49
News- Radio	16 <sup>E</sup>
News- Internet	10 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Act of terrorism or terrorist threat</b>	
Police/law enforcement	49 <sup>E</sup>
News- Radio	32 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Rioting or civil unrest</b>	
Police/law enforcement	49 <sup>E</sup>
<sup>E</sup> use with caution	
<b>Note:</b> Respondents who perceived their community was at risk for any form of emergency or disaster were then asked where they would turn to first for information or assistance in the event of the perceived emergency or disaster. Respondents could provide more than one response. Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.	
<b>Source:</b> Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.	

**Table 1.2**  
**Number of emergency planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents, smaller communities of Newfoundland and Labrador, 2014**

Number of planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents	Smaller communities of Newfoundland and Labrador	Newfoundland and Labrador	Canada
	percent		
<b>Number of emergency planning activities</b>			
None	6 <sup>E</sup>	7	8
1 activity	14 **	15	17
2 activities	26	27	25
3 activities	29	27	27
4 activities	23	22	19
<b>Number of precautionary measures</b>			
None	8 <sup>E</sup> **	7	16
1 measure	20 **	19	27
2 measures	28 *	31	28
3 measures	26 **	26	20
4 measures	18 **	16	7

Number of fire safety measures <sup>1</sup>				
None		F	F	1
1 measure		10 **	11	14
2 measures		49 **	48	38
3 measures		39	38	42

<sup>E</sup> use with caution  
<sup>F</sup> too unreliable to be published

\* significantly different from provincial level estimate (p < 0.05)

\*\* significantly different from Canada level estimate (p < 0.05)

<sup>1</sup> Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Canada'.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents. Emergency planning activities include: an emergency exit plan, an emergency supply kit, photocopies/electronic copies of important documents and a list of emergency contact numbers. Precautionary measures include: a battery-operated or wind-up radio, an alternative heat source, a back-up generator and an alternative water source. Fire safety measures include a working smoke detector, a working carbon monoxide detector and a working fire extinguisher.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

**Table 1.3**  
**Planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures residents engaged in, smaller communities of Newfoundland and Labrador, 2014**

Residents whose households were involved in the following:	Smaller communities of Newfoundland and Labrador	Newfoundland and Labrador	Canada
	percent		
<b>Emergency planning activities</b>			
Emergency exit plan	63	63	60
Exit plan has been practised/reviewed in last 12 months <sup>1</sup>	50	50	46
Designated meeting place for household members <sup>2</sup>	41 **	39	33
Contact plan for household members <sup>2</sup>	55	56	55
Household emergency supply kit	51	51	47
Vehicle emergency supply kit <sup>3</sup>	61	61	59
Extra copies of important documents	52	51	53
List of emergency contact numbers	80 ***	76	69
Plan for meeting special health needs <sup>4 6</sup>	67	72	62
<b>Precautionary measures</b>			
Wind-up or battery-operated radio	69 ***	75	58
Alternate heat source	59 **	57	48
Back-up generator	48 ***	44	23
Alternate water source	50 ***	48	43
Other <sup>5</sup>	25	25	21
<b>Fire safety measures</b>			
Working smoke detector	99	99	98
Working carbon monoxide detector	42 **	42	60
Working fire extinguisher	85 **	84	66

\*\* significantly different from Canada level estimate (p < 0.05)

\*\*\* significantly different from both provincial and Canada level estimates (p < 0.05)

1 Percentage based only on those indicating that they have an emergency exit plan.

2 Excludes Canadians living in single-person households.

3 Excludes those who reported that they lived in a household that did not have a vehicle.

4 Percentage based only on those indicating that they or someone in their household has special medical needs.

5 'Other precautionary measures' include having an escape/rescue plan for pets, extra supply of fuel, checking and replenishing emergency supplies, and keeping exits clear.

6 Responses of don't know/not stated greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Smaller communities of Newfoundland and Labrador'.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

**Table 1.4**

**High or moderately high levels of emergency planning, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents, by social and political involvement, smaller communities of Newfoundland and Labrador, 2014**

Social and political involvement	Percentage of residents who had high or moderately high levels of...		
	Planning activities	Precautionary measures	Fire safety measures
	percent		
<b>Engagement in political activities <sup>1</sup></b>			
Yes †	54	45	36
No	38 <sup>E *</sup>	29 <sup>E *</sup>	36 <sup>E</sup>
<b>High level of civic engagement <sup>2</sup></b>			
Yes †	55	47	36
No	45	35 *	37
<b>High level of social support <sup>3</sup></b>			
Yes †	57	48	40
No	49	43	38
<b>Strong sense of belonging to community <sup>4</sup></b>			
Yes †	54	45	38
No	46	42	40
<b>High neighbourhood trust <sup>5</sup></b>			
Yes †	58	48	39
No	45 *	40	37
<b>High level of self-efficacy <sup>6</sup></b>			
Yes †	58	41	36
No	45 *	47	41

<sup>E</sup> use with caution

\* significantly different from reference category ( $p < 0.05$ )

† reference category

- 1 Includes individuals over the age of 17 years who are eligible to vote, and who have participated in or volunteered for political parties or events in the past 12 months, including municipal, provincial, or federal elections, or expressed views on political or social issues through signing a petition, contacting news agencies or politicians, or attended a meeting involving social or community issues.
- 2 Civic engagement measures individuals over the age of 17 years who were involved in a recreational group or organization in the past 12 months, and includes engagement in political activities. A 'high level' is defined as having been involved in at least 4 activities in the past 12 months.
- 3 A 'high level of social support' is defined as having five or more people whom that individual could turn to for help in an emergency if they are physically injured, require emotional support, shelter, and/or financial assistance.
- 4 A 'strong sense of belonging to community' is rating one's own sense of belonging to their community as a 4 or a 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "very weak" and 5 "very strong".
- 5 'High neighbourhood trust' is rating one's own trust in the people in one's neighbourhood as 4 or 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "cannot be trusted at all" and 5 represents "can be trusted a lot", as well as having a response of "very likely" when asked about the likelihood of someone in their neighbourhood returning a lost wallet or purse containing two hundred dollars with the money still inside.
- 6 A 'high level of self-efficacy' is derived from having a high self-rating on a scale of 1 (poor) to 5 (excellent) for the following three categories: an ability to think clearly and solve day-to-day problems, to handle unexpected and difficult problems, and to figure out what to do if faced with an emergency situation.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents. Households with 'moderately high' or 'high' levels of emergency planning engaged in 3 or 4 of the following: having an exit plan, an emergency supply kit, extra copies of important documents and an emergency contact list. 'Moderately high' or 'high' levels of precautionary measures include having 3 or 4 of the following: a wind-up or battery operated radio, a back-up generator, an alternate source of heat and additional water. 'Moderately high' or 'high' levels of fire safety measure include having all 3 of the following: a working smoke detector, a working fire extinguisher, and a working carbon monoxide detector.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

## Notes

<sup>E</sup> use with caution

- 1 The SEPR covers three types of communities: Census Metropolitan Areas (CMAs), Census Agglomerations (CAs) with population greater than 50,000, and 'smaller communities' which include CAs with population 50,000 or less and those areas that fall outside of CMAs and CAs. All CMAs and CAs (with population greater than 50,000) were included in the SEPR. A sample of households were selected from smaller communities within each province to represent all households within the province in similar communities. Additional information on the SEPR and its sampling methodology can be found in the 'Survey description' section.
- 2 A Census Metropolitan Area (CMA) or a Census Agglomeration (CA) is formed by one or more adjacent municipalities centred on a population centre (known as the core). A CMA must have a total population of at least 100,000 of which 50,000 or more must live in the core. A CA must have a core population of at least 10,000. To be included in the CMA or CA, other adjacent municipalities must have a high degree of integration with the core as measured by commuting flows derived from census data.
- 3 The target population for the SEPR included all persons 15 years of age or older, residing in households in Canada's 10 provinces, excluding full-time residents of institutions (e.g. nursing homes, group homes, hospitals).
- 4 Throughout this fact sheet, responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.
- 5 This section focuses on personal experiences with emergencies or disasters that happened in Canada, in a community where the person was living at the time, and was significant enough to severely interrupt the individual's regular daily activities.
- 6 Emergency planning activities include: having an emergency exit plan, a household emergency supply kit, extra copies of important documents and an emergency contact list.



- 7 Precautionary measures include: having a wind-up or battery-operated radio, an alternate heat source such as a non-electric stove or heater or a wood-burning fireplace, a back-up generator and an alternative water source such as a well, tank or litres of stored water.
- 8 Unless otherwise specified, differences are statistically significant ( $p < 0.05$ ).
- 9 A 'strong sense of belonging to community' is rating one's own sense of belonging to their community as a 4 or a 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "very weak" and 5 "very strong".
- 10 A proportion (14%) of respondents were not asked questions regarding neighbourhood helpfulness in the event of an emergency and as such these cases are not included in the analysis on neighbourhood helpfulness in general or in the event of an emergency.
- 11 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were equal to 18% when respondents were asked about whether their neighbourhood is a place where neighbours would help each other if there is an emergency.



## Fact sheet

# Community of Charlottetown (CA), Prince Edward Island

---

In 2014, information on the emergency preparedness of people living in the Census Agglomeration<sup>1</sup> of Charlottetown was collected through the Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada (SEPR).<sup>2</sup> This fact sheet presents information on the risk awareness and level of emergency preparedness of the residents of Charlottetown, which could help improve the understanding of community resilience in the event of an emergency.<sup>3,4</sup>

### Risk awareness and anticipated sources of help in an emergency or disaster

- Residents of Charlottetown anticipated winter storms (including blizzards, ice storms and extreme cold) (95%), extended power outages lasting 24 hours or longer (75%), and hurricanes (63%) as the events most likely to occur within their community.
- Residents named news on the radio as the source of initial help and information that they would turn to in most emergencies or disasters. More specifically, in the event of an industrial or transportation accident (39%), a riot or civil unrest (39%<sup>E</sup>), a weather-related emergency or natural disaster (38%), an act of terrorism or terrorist threat (36%<sup>E</sup>), or a contamination or shortage of water or food (28%), news on the radio was the source that people in Charlottetown would turn to first for information or assistance (Table 1.1).
- News on the radio was the second most common source of initial help and information in the event of an extended power outage lasting 24 hours or longer (31%), following contacting a utility company (41%). In the event of an outbreak of a serious illness or a life-threatening disease, a hospital, clinic, doctor or other medical professional (32%) was reported as the most common source of initial help, followed by news on the internet (24%).

### Prior lifetime experience with a major emergency or disaster<sup>5</sup>

- One in three (34%) residents of Charlottetown have personally experienced a major emergency or disaster in Canada in a community where they were living at the time. For more than three-quarters (78%) of them, this emergency or disaster was significant enough to have resulted in severe disruptions to their daily activities.
- Hurricanes (44%) and winter storms which include blizzards and ice storms (43%) were the emergencies or disasters most commonly experienced by residents, followed by extended power outages lasting 24 hours or longer (22%<sup>E</sup>).
- The most common types of disruption to daily activities which happened as a result of emergencies included a need to miss work or school (73%), an inability to use electrical appliances (67%) and a need to miss an appointment or a planned activity (56%). More severe types of disruptions included the inability to use roads or transportation within the community, experienced by nearly half of individuals affected by an emergency (47%), and the need to evacuate the home, experienced by one in ten (10%<sup>E</sup>) people.
- The majority (85%) of residents who had experienced a major emergency were able to resume their daily activities within one week of the event (11%<sup>E</sup> within 24 hours, 37% within one to two days, 28% within three to five days, and 9%<sup>E</sup> within six to seven days).
- Half (51%) of residents who were affected by a major emergency or disaster received help during or immediately following the event, most often from family (45%) or neighbours (33%<sup>E</sup>).
- One-third (34%) of people in Charlottetown who were affected by major emergencies or disasters that were significant enough to disrupt their regular daily activities experienced a loss of property or some kind of a financial impact.

## Emergency planning, precautionary and fire safety behaviours

- Two in three (67%) people in Charlottetown lived in households that were engaged in at least two emergency planning activities,<sup>6</sup> with about four in ten (42%) living in households with three or four such activities (Table 1.2). One in ten (10%) residents lived in a household that had not engaged in any emergency planning activities.
- Many (64%) residents lived in a household with at least two precautionary measures<sup>7</sup> taken in the event of an emergency, with one-quarter (26%) living in a household with three or four such measures. Conversely, one in ten (10%<sup>E</sup>) people lived in a household with no precautionary measures set in place.
- Most (98%) residents reported living in a household with a working smoke detector, and 72% reported living in a household with a working fire extinguisher (Table 1.3). Less than half (44%) stated that they had a working carbon monoxide detector in their household. About one in three (35%) residents stated that they had all three fire safety measures within their households.
- The number of emergency planning activities taken by residents of Charlottetown did not differ significantly from Prince Edward Island as a whole or from Canada's 10 provinces. Although the proportion of residents of Charlottetown (10%<sup>E</sup>) who had no precautionary measures was significantly higher than that of the province (7%), this proportion was significantly lower than residents of Canada (16%). Residents of Charlottetown were less likely to have had all three fire safety measures when compared to the overall proportion of Canadians (35% versus 42%).<sup>8</sup>
- There were some significant differences in the types of measures and activities taken between residents of Charlottetown and the province of Prince Edward Island, as well as between those in Charlottetown and residents of Canada in general. For example, residents of Charlottetown were less likely to have had an emergency exit plan (61%) or an alternate water source (44%) when compared to the provincial proportions (65% and 53%, respectively). When compared to Canadians, residents of Charlottetown who indicated that they have someone in their household with special medical needs were significantly more likely to have an emergency plan set in place for meeting special health needs (74% versus 62%).

## Social networks and sense of belonging

- More than half (60%) of Charlottetown's residents had a strong sense of belonging<sup>9</sup> to their community.
- The majority (91%) of residents described the neighbourhood they lived in as a place where neighbours generally help each other.<sup>10</sup> Of those who did not describe their neighbourhood this way, most (90%) still described it as a place where neighbours would help each other in an emergency.<sup>11</sup>
- Close to three-quarters of residents had a large network of support in the event of an emergency or disaster, with more than five people to turn to for help if physically injured (73%) or for emotional support (72%). In the event of a home evacuation (66%), two-thirds of residents had at least five people to turn to, compared to about one-third for financial support (35%). However, 8%<sup>E</sup> reported that they had no one to turn to for financial help.
- High levels of sense of belonging, self-efficacy, social support as well as civic engagement were often associated with a higher level of emergency preparedness (Table 1.4).

## Data tables

Table 1.1

Most commonly anticipated sources of initial help and information, by type of emergency or disaster, residents of Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island, 2014

Most common sources of initial help and information by type of emergency or disaster	percent
<b>Weather-related emergency or natural disaster</b>	
News- Radio	38
News- Internet	27
News- Television	17
<b>Extended power outages</b>	
Utility company	41
News- Radio	31

Family	12 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Outbreak of serious or life-threatening disease</b>	
Hospital, clinic, doctor or other medical professional	32
News- Internet	24
News- Radio	23
<b>Industrial or transportation accident</b>	
News- Radio	39
News- Internet	22
Police/law enforcement	14 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Contamination or shortage of water or food</b>	
News- Radio	28
News- Internet	23
Local government	17 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Act of terrorism or terrorist threat</b>	
News- Radio	36 <sup>E</sup>
News- Internet	34 <sup>E</sup>
Police/law enforcement	20 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Rioting or civil unrest <sup>1</sup></b>	
News- Radio	39 <sup>E</sup>
News- Internet	30 <sup>E</sup>
<sup>E</sup> use with caution	
1 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% when respondents were asked about their likely sources of initial help and information.	
<b>Note:</b> Respondents who perceived their community was at risk for any form of emergency or disaster were then asked where they would turn to first for information or assistance in the event of the perceived emergency or disaster. Respondents could provide more than one response. Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.	
<b>Source:</b> Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.	

**Table 1.2**  
**Number of emergency planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents, community of Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island, 2014**

Number of planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents	Charlottetown	Prince Edward Island	Canada
	percent		
<b>Number of emergency planning activities</b>			
None	10	10	8
1 activity	21	19	17
2 activities	25	25	25
3 activities	25	26	27
4 activities	17	17	19
<b>Number of precautionary measures</b>			
None	10 <sup>E</sup> ***	7	16
1 measure	24	21	27
2 measures	38 ***	33	28
3 measures	22	25	20
4 measures	4 <sup>E</sup> ***	13	7
<b>Number of fire safety measures <sup>1</sup></b>			
None	F	F	1

1 measure	18 **	16	14
2 measures	43	45	38
3 measures	35 **	35	42
<p><sup>E</sup> use with caution  <sup>F</sup> too unreliable to be published</p> <p>** significantly different from Canada level estimate (p &lt; 0.05)</p> <p>*** significantly different from both provincial and Canada level estimates (p &lt; 0.05)</p> <p>1 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Canada'.</p> <p><b>Note:</b> Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents. Emergency planning activities include: an emergency exit plan, an emergency supply kit, photocopies/electronic copies of important documents and a list of emergency contact numbers. Precautionary measures include: a battery-operated or wind-up radio, an alternative heat source, a back-up generator and an alternative water source. Fire safety measures include a working smoke detector, a working carbon monoxide detector and a working fire extinguisher.  <b>Source:</b> Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.</p>			

**Table 1.3**  
**Planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures residents engaged in, community of Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island, 2014**

Residents whose households were involved in the following:	Charlottetown	Prince Edward Island	Canada
	percent		
<b>Emergency planning activities</b>			
Emergency exit plan	61 *	65	60
Exit plan has been practised/reviewed in last 12 months <sup>1</sup>	43	45	46
Designated meeting place for household members <sup>2</sup>	34	36	33
Contact plan for household members <sup>2</sup>	51	51	55
Household emergency supply kit	42	45	47
Vehicle emergency supply kit <sup>3</sup>	53 **	56	59
Extra copies of important documents	49	47	53
List of emergency contact numbers	64 **	63	69
Plan for meeting special health needs <sup>4</sup>	74 **	72	62
<b>Precautionary measures</b>			
Wind-up or battery-operated radio	75 **	78	58
Alternate heat source	44 *	53	48
Back-up generator	20 *	29	23
Alternate water source	44 *	53	43
Other <sup>5</sup>	25	24	21
<b>Fire safety measures</b>			
Working smoke detector	98	98	98
Working carbon monoxide detector	44 **	42	60
Working fire extinguisher	72 ***	75	66

\* significantly different from provincial level estimate (p < 0.05)

\*\* significantly different from Canada level estimate (p < 0.05)

\*\*\* significantly different from both provincial and Canada level estimates (p < 0.05)

1 Percentage based only on those indicating that they have an emergency exit plan.

2 Excludes Canadians living in single-person households.

3 Excludes those who reported that they lived in a household that did not have a vehicle.

4 Percentage based only on those indicating that they or someone in their household has special medical needs.

5 'Other precautionary measures' include having an escape/rescue plan for pets, extra supply of fuel, checking and replenishing emergency supplies, and keeping exits clear.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

**Table 1.4**

**High or moderately high levels of emergency planning, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents, by social and political involvement, community of Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island, 2014**

Social and political involvement	Percentage of residents who had high or moderately high levels of...		
	Planning activities	Precautionary measures	Fire safety measures
	percent		
<b>Engagement in political activities <sup>1</sup></b>			
Yes †	41	27	36
No	47 <sup>E</sup>	F	F
<b>High level of civic engagement <sup>2</sup></b>			
Yes †	43	29	37
No	40	15 <sup>E</sup> *	27
<b>High level of social support <sup>3</sup></b>			
Yes †	52	30	43
No	37 *	24	31 *
<b>Strong sense of belonging to community <sup>4</sup></b>			
Yes †	47	28	39
No	35 *	22	28 *
<b>High neighbourhood trust <sup>5</sup></b>			
Yes †	41	28	38
No	44	24	33
<b>High level of self-efficacy <sup>6</sup></b>			
Yes †	50	28	38
No	35 *	24	33

<sup>E</sup> use with caution

<sup>F</sup> too unreliable to be published

\* significantly different from reference category ( $p < 0.05$ )

† reference category

- 1 Includes individuals over the age of 17 years who are eligible to vote, and who have participated in or volunteered for political parties or events in the past 12 months, including municipal, provincial, or federal elections, or expressed views on political or social issues through signing a petition, contacting news agencies or politicians, or attended a meeting involving social or community issues.
- 2 Civic engagement measures individuals over the age of 17 years who were involved in a recreational group or organization in the past 12 months, and includes engagement in political activities. A 'high level' is defined as having been involved in at least 4 activities in the past 12 months.
- 3 A 'high level of social support' is defined as having five or more people whom that individual could turn to for help in an emergency if they are physically injured, require emotional support, shelter, and/or financial assistance.
- 4 A 'strong sense of belonging to community' is rating one's own sense of belonging to their community as a 4 or a 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "very weak" and 5 "very strong".
- 5 'High neighbourhood trust' is rating one's own trust in the people in one's neighbourhood as 4 or 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "cannot be trusted at all" and 5 represents "can be trusted a lot", as well as having a response of "very likely" when asked about the likelihood of someone in their neighbourhood returning a lost wallet or purse containing two hundred dollars with the money still inside.
- 6 A 'high level of self-efficacy' is derived from having a high self-rating on a scale of 1 (poor) to 5 (excellent) for the following three categories: an ability to think clearly and solve day-to-day problems, to handle unexpected and difficult problems, and to figure out what to do if faced with an emergency situation.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents. Households with 'moderately high' or 'high' levels of emergency planning engaged in 3 or 4 of the following: having an exit plan, an emergency supply kit, extra copies of important documents and an emergency contact list. 'Moderately high' or 'high' levels of precautionary measures include having 3 or 4 of the following: a wind-up or battery operated radio, a back-up generator, an alternate source of heat and additional water. 'Moderately high' or 'high' levels of fire safety measure include having all 3 of the following: a working smoke detector, a working fire extinguisher, and a working carbon monoxide detector.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

## Notes

<sup>E</sup> use with caution

- 1 A Census Metropolitan Area (CMA) or a Census Agglomeration (CA) is formed by one or more adjacent municipalities centred on a population centre (known as the core). A CMA must have a total population of at least 100,000 of which 50,000 or more must live in the core. A CA must have a core population of at least 10,000. To be included in the CMA or CA, other adjacent municipalities must have a high degree of integration with the core as measured by commuting flows derived from census data.
- 2 The target population for the SEPR included all persons 15 years of age or older, residing in households in Canada's 10 provinces, excluding full-time residents of institutions (e.g. nursing homes, group homes, hospitals).
- 3 The SEPR covers three types of communities: Census Metropolitan Areas (CMAs), Census Agglomerations (CAs) with population greater than 50,000, and 'smaller communities' which include CAs with population 50,000 or less and those areas that fall outside of CMAs and CAs. All CMAs and CAs (with population greater than 50,000) were included in the SEPR. A sample of households were selected from smaller communities within each province to represent all households within the province in similar communities. Additional information on the SEPR and its sampling methodology can be found in the 'Survey description' section.
- 4 Throughout this fact sheet, responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.
- 5 This section focuses on personal experiences with emergencies or disasters that happened in Canada, in a community where the person was living at the time, and was significant enough to severely interrupt the individual's regular daily activities.
- 6 Emergency planning activities include: having an emergency exit plan, a household emergency supply kit, extra copies of important documents and an emergency contact list.

- 7 Precautionary measures include: having a wind-up or battery-operated radio, an alternate heat source such as a non-electric stove or heater or a wood-burning fireplace, a back-up generator and an alternative water source such as a well, tank or litres of stored water.
- 8 Unless otherwise specified, differences are statistically significant ( $p < 0.05$ ).
- 9 A 'strong sense of belonging to community' is rating one's own sense of belonging to their community as a 4 or a 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "very weak" and 5 "very strong".
- 10 A proportion (16%) of respondents were not asked questions regarding neighbourhood helpfulness in the event of an emergency and as such these cases are not included in the analysis on neighbourhood helpfulness in general or in the event of an emergency.
- 11 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% when respondents were asked about whether their neighbourhood is a place where neighbours would help each other if there is an emergency.





## Fact sheet Smaller communities of Prince Edward Island

---

In 2014, information on the emergency preparedness of people living in 'smaller communities' of Prince Edward Island was collected through the Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada (SEPR).<sup>1 2 3</sup> This fact sheet presents information on the risk awareness and level of emergency preparedness of the residents of Prince Edward Island's smaller communities, which could help improve the understanding of community resilience in the event of an emergency.<sup>4</sup>

### Risk awareness and anticipated sources of help in an emergency or disaster

- Residents of smaller communities of Prince Edward Island anticipated winter storms (including blizzards, ice storms and extreme cold) (97%), extended power outages lasting 24 hours or longer (78%) and hurricanes (49%) as the events most likely to occur within their communities. Additionally, nearly half (46%) of residents believed storm surges or tsunamis are likely to occur.
- Residents anticipated first turning to news on the radio as a source of help and information in the event of a weather-related emergency or natural disaster (38%), a contamination or shortage of water or food (26%<sup>E</sup>), and an industrial or transportation accident (24%<sup>E</sup>) (Table 1.1).
- In the event of an extended power outage lasting 24 hours or longer, people in Prince Edward Island's smaller communities would commonly first turn to their utility company (49%). If faced with an outbreak of a serious or life-threatening disease, they commonly anticipated turning to hospitals, clinics, doctors or medical professionals (49%) first. The police were the most commonly anticipated source of initial help if faced with rioting or civil unrest (48%<sup>E</sup>), as well as an act of terrorism or terrorist threat (38%<sup>E</sup>).

### Prior lifetime experience with a major emergency or disaster<sup>5</sup>

- More than one-quarter (27%) of residents of smaller communities of Prince Edward Island have experienced a major emergency or disaster in Canada in a community they were living in at the time of the event. For many (83%), this emergency or disaster was significant enough to have resulted in severe disruptions to their daily activities.
- Winter storms including blizzards and ice storms (47%) were the type of emergency or disaster most commonly experienced by residents. Extended power outages lasting 24 hours or longer (32%<sup>E</sup>) and hurricanes (22%<sup>E</sup>) were the other emergencies most commonly reported.
- Missing work or school (72%) was the most common type of disruption to daily activities endured by those in smaller communities of Prince Edward Island who had experienced emergencies or disasters. This was followed by an inability to use electrical appliances (67%), missing appointments or planned activities (65%) and an inability to use water at home for tasks (62%). About half (52%) of residents who had been affected by a major emergency or disaster were unable to use roads or transportation within their community, while less than a quarter (21%) had to evacuate their homes.
- Most (86%) residents who had experienced major emergencies were able to resume their daily activities within one week of the event; half (51%) of residents were able to resume their activities in two days or less.
- About half (51%) of residents who had been affected by emergencies or disasters received help during or immediately following the event, most often from family members (35%<sup>E</sup>) and neighbours (31%<sup>E</sup>).

- Nearly one-third (31%<sup>E</sup>) of residents of smaller communities of Prince Edward Island who were affected by major emergencies or disasters that were significant enough to disrupt their regular daily activities endured a loss of property or another financial impact. Other types of long-term implications such as emotional, psychological, physical or health consequences were rare.

## Emergency planning, precautionary and fire safety behaviours

- Seven in ten (70%) residents of smaller communities of Prince Edward Island lived in households that were engaged in at least two emergency planning activities,<sup>6</sup> with more than four in ten (44%) living in households with three or four such activities (Table 1.2). One in ten (10%<sup>E</sup>) people lived in a household that had not engaged in any emergency planning activities.
- Three out of four (76%) residents lived in a household with at least two precautionary measures<sup>7</sup> taken in the event of an emergency, with about half (48%) living in a household with three or four such measures. A small proportion (4%<sup>E</sup>) of people lived in a household with no precautionary measures in place.
- Almost all (97%) residents stated that they had a working smoke detector in their homes. About three-quarters (78%) stated that they had a working fire extinguisher, and less than half (41%) stated that they had a working carbon monoxide detector in their household (Table 1.3). About one in three (35%) residents stated that they had all three fire safety measures within their households.
- The proportion of residents in smaller communities of Prince Edward Island who had no precautionary measures set in place (4%<sup>E</sup>) was significantly lower than that of those living in the province (7%) and of Canada's 10 provinces as a whole (16%). The proportion of those within the smaller communities who had all four precautionary measures in place (20%) was significantly higher than Prince Edward Island residents overall (13%), as well as among residents of Canada (7%). Residents of smaller communities of Prince Edward Island were less likely than the Canadian population to have all three fire safety measures within their households (35% and 42%, respectively). There were no significant differences in the number of emergency planning activities taken by residents of smaller communities compared to the province as a whole or Canadians in general.<sup>8</sup>
- There were some significant differences between residents of smaller communities of Prince Edward Island and both the province overall and Canada in general in terms of the types of activities and measures taken in the event of an emergency. For example, residents of smaller communities were more likely to have an emergency exit plan (69%), an alternate water source (60%) and a working fire extinguisher (78%) when compared to residents of Prince Edward Island in general (65%, 53% and 75%, respectively) as well as when compared to residents of Canada (60%, 43% and 66%, respectively).

## Social networks and sense of belonging

- Three in five (60%) people living in smaller communities of Prince Edward Island had a strong sense of belonging<sup>9</sup> to their community.
- The majority (94%) of residents described the neighbourhood they lived in as a place where neighbours generally help each other.<sup>10</sup> Of those who did not describe their neighbourhood this way, most (80%) still described it as a place where neighbours would help each other in an emergency.<sup>11</sup>
- Approximately two-thirds of residents had a large network of support in the event of an emergency or disaster, with more than five people to turn to for help if they had to evacuate their home (70%), if physically injured (68%) or for emotional support (65%). In the event of an emergency, less than one-third had such a network for financial support (31%), and 8%<sup>E</sup> said there was no one they could turn to for financial help.<sup>12</sup>
- High levels of sense of belonging, self-efficacy, neighbourhood trust and social support were sometimes associated with a higher level of emergency preparedness (Table 1.4).

## Data tables

Table 1.1

Most commonly anticipated sources of initial help and information, by type of emergency or disaster, residents of smaller communities of Prince Edward Island, 2014

Most common sources of initial help and information by type of emergency or disaster	percent
<b>Weather-related emergency or natural disaster <sup>1</sup></b>	
News- Radio	38
News- Television	18
News- Internet	18
<b>Extended power outages</b>	
Utility company	49
News- Radio	21
Family	9 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Outbreak of serious or life-threatening disease</b>	
Hospital, clinic, doctor or other medical professional	49
News- Radio	14 <sup>E</sup>
News- Television	13 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Industrial or transportation accident <sup>1</sup></b>	
News- Radio	24 <sup>E</sup>
911	16 <sup>E</sup>
Police/law enforcement	15 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Contamination or shortage of water or food <sup>1</sup></b>	
News- Radio	26 <sup>E</sup>
Local government	23 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Act of terrorism or terrorist threat <sup>1</sup></b>	
Police/law enforcement	38 <sup>E</sup>
News- Television	27 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Rioting or civil unrest <sup>1</sup></b>	
Police/law enforcement	48 <sup>E</sup>
<sup>E</sup> use with caution	
<sup>1</sup> Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% when respondents were asked about their likely sources of initial help and information.	
<b>Note:</b> Respondents who perceived their community was at risk for any form of emergency or disaster were then asked where they would turn to first for information or assistance in the event of the perceived emergency or disaster. Respondents could provide more than one response. Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.	
<b>Source:</b> Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.	

**Table 1.2**  
**Number of emergency planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents, smaller communities of Prince Edward Island, 2014**

Number of planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents	Smaller communities of Prince Edward Island	Prince Edward Island	Canada
	percent		
<b>Number of emergency planning activities</b>			
None	10 <sup>E</sup>	10	8
1 activity	17	19	17
2 activities	26	25	25
3 activities	26	26	27
4 activities	18	17	19
<b>Number of precautionary measures</b>			
None	4 <sup>E ***</sup>	7	16
1 measure	19 <sup>**</sup>	21	27

2 measures	28 *	33	28
3 measures	28 **	25	20
4 measures	20 ***	13	7
<b>Number of fire safety measures <sup>1</sup></b>			
None	F	F	1
1 measure	14	16	14
2 measures	47 **	45	38
3 measures	35 **	35	42
<p><sup>E</sup> use with caution  <sup>F</sup> too unreliable to be published</p> <p>* significantly different from provincial level estimate (p &lt; 0.05)</p> <p>** significantly different from Canada level estimate (p &lt; 0.05)</p> <p>*** significantly different from both provincial and Canada level estimates (p &lt; 0.05)</p> <p><sup>1</sup> Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Canada'.</p> <p><b>Note:</b> Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents. Emergency planning activities include: an emergency exit plan, an emergency supply kit, photocopies/electronic copies of important documents and a list of emergency contact numbers. Precautionary measures include: a battery-operated or wind-up radio, an alternative heat source, a back-up generator and an alternative water source. Fire safety measures include a working smoke detector, a working carbon monoxide detector and a working fire extinguisher.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.</p>			

**Table 1.3**  
**Planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures residents engaged in, smaller communities of Prince Edward Island, 2014**

Residents whose households were involved in the following:	Smaller communities of Prince Edward Island	Prince Edward Island	Canada
	percent		
<b>Emergency planning activities</b>			
Emergency exit plan	69 ***	65	60
Exit plan has been practised/reviewed in last 12 months <sup>1</sup>	47	45	46
Designated meeting place for household members <sup>2</sup>	38	36	33
Contact plan for household members <sup>2</sup>	51	51	55
Household emergency supply kit	47	45	47
Vehicle emergency supply kit <sup>3</sup>	59	56	59
Extra copies of important documents	44 **	47	53
List of emergency contact numbers	62 **	63	69
Plan for meeting special health needs <sup>4</sup>	70	72	62
<b>Precautionary measures</b>			
Wind-up or battery-operated radio	81 **	78	58
Alternate heat source	61 ***	53	48
Back-up generator	38 ***	29	23
Alternate water source	60 ***	53	43
Other <sup>5</sup>	22	24	21
<b>Fire safety measures</b>			
Working smoke detector	97	98	98
Working carbon monoxide detector	41 **	42	60
Working fire extinguisher	78 ***	75	66

\*\* significantly different from Canada level estimate (p < 0.05)

\*\*\* significantly different from both provincial and Canada level estimates (p < 0.05)

1 Percentage based only on those indicating that they have an emergency exit plan.

2 Excludes Canadians living in single-person households.

3 Excludes those who reported that they lived in a household that did not have a vehicle.

4 Percentage based only on those indicating that they or someone in their household has special medical needs.

5 'Other precautionary measures' include having an escape/rescue plan for pets, extra supply of fuel, checking and replenishing emergency supplies, and keeping exits clear.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

**Table 1.4**

**High or moderately high levels of emergency planning, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents, by social and political involvement, smaller communities of Prince Edward Island, 2014**

Social and political involvement	Percentage of residents who had high or moderately high levels of...		
	Planning activities	Precautionary measures	Fire safety measures
	percent		
<b>Engagement in political activities <sup>1</sup></b>			
Yes †	44	46	36
No	42 <sup>E</sup>	43 <sup>E</sup>	28 <sup>E</sup>
<b>High level of civic engagement <sup>2</sup></b>			
Yes †	44	50	38
No	44	41	32
<b>High level of social support <sup>3</sup></b>			
Yes †	54	44	44
No	40 <sup>*</sup>	48	32
<b>Strong sense of belonging to community <sup>4</sup></b>			
Yes †	49	49	35
No	33 <sup>*</sup>	46	33
<b>High neighbourhood trust <sup>5</sup></b>			
Yes †	47	54	37
No	37	38 <sup>*</sup>	30
<b>High level of self-efficacy <sup>6</sup></b>			
Yes †	50	52	39
No	36 <sup>*</sup>	43	32

<sup>E</sup> use with caution

\* significantly different from reference category ( $p < 0.05$ )

† reference category

- 1 Includes individuals over the age of 17 years who are eligible to vote, and who have participated in or volunteered for political parties or events in the past 12 months, including municipal, provincial, or federal elections, or expressed views on political or social issues through signing a petition, contacting news agencies or politicians, or attended a meeting involving social or community issues.
- 2 Civic engagement measures individuals over the age of 17 years who were involved in a recreational group or organization in the past 12 months, and includes engagement in political activities. A 'high level' is defined as having been involved in at least 4 activities in the past 12 months.
- 3 A 'high level of social support' is defined as having five or more people whom that individual could turn to for help in an emergency if they are physically injured, require emotional support, shelter, and/or financial assistance.
- 4 A 'strong sense of belonging to community' is rating one's own sense of belonging to their community as a 4 or a 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "very weak" and 5 "very strong".
- 5 'High neighbourhood trust' is rating one's own trust in the people in one's neighbourhood as 4 or 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "cannot be trusted at all" and 5 represents "can be trusted a lot", as well as having a response of "very likely" when asked about the likelihood of someone in their neighbourhood returning a lost wallet or purse containing two hundred dollars with the money still inside.
- 6 A 'high level of self-efficacy' is derived from having a high self-rating on a scale of 1 (poor) to 5 (excellent) for the following three categories: an ability to think clearly and solve day-to-day problems, to handle unexpected and difficult problems, and to figure out what to do if faced with an emergency situation.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents. Households with 'moderately high' or 'high' levels of emergency planning engaged in 3 or 4 of the following: having an exit plan, an emergency supply kit, extra copies of important documents and an emergency contact list. 'Moderately high' or 'high' levels of precautionary measures include having 3 or 4 of the following: a wind-up or battery operated radio, a back-up generator, an alternate source of heat and additional water. 'Moderately high' or 'high' levels of fire safety measure include having all 3 of the following: a working smoke detector, a working fire extinguisher, and a working carbon monoxide detector.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

## Notes

<sup>E</sup> use with caution

- 1 The SEPR covers three types of communities: Census Metropolitan Areas (CMAs), Census Agglomerations (CAs) with population greater than 50,000, and 'smaller communities' which include CAs with population 50,000 or less and those areas that fall outside of CMAs and CAs. All CMAs and CAs (with population greater than 50,000) were included in the SEPR. A sample of households were selected from smaller communities within each province to represent all households within the province in similar communities. Additional information on the SEPR and its sampling methodology can be found in the 'Survey description' section.
- 2 A Census Metropolitan Area (CMA) or a Census Agglomeration (CA) is formed by one or more adjacent municipalities centred on a population centre (known as the core). A CMA must have a total population of at least 100,000 of which 50,000 or more must live in the core. A CA must have a core population of at least 10,000. To be included in the CMA or CA, other adjacent municipalities must have a high degree of integration with the core as measured by commuting flows derived from census data.
- 3 The target population for the SEPR included all persons 15 years of age or older, residing in households in Canada's 10 provinces, excluding full-time residents of institutions (e.g. nursing homes, group homes, hospitals).
- 4 Throughout this fact sheet, responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.
- 5 This section focuses on personal experiences with emergencies or disasters that happened in Canada, in a community where the person was living at the time, and was significant enough to severely interrupt the individual's regular daily activities.
- 6 Emergency planning activities include: having an emergency exit plan, a household emergency supply kit, extra copies of important documents and an emergency contact list.

- 7 Precautionary measures include: having a wind-up or battery-operated radio, an alternate heat source such as a non-electric stove or heater or a wood-burning fireplace, a back-up generator and an alternative water source such as a well, tank or litres of stored water.
- 8 Unless otherwise specified, differences are statistically significant ( $p < 0.05$ ).
- 9 A 'strong sense of belonging to community' is rating one's own sense of belonging to their community as a 4 or a 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "very weak" and 5 "very strong".
- 10 A proportion (28%) of respondents were not asked questions regarding neighbourhood helpfulness in the event of an emergency and as such these cases are not included in the analysis on neighbourhood helpfulness in general or in the event of an emergency.
- 11 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were equal to 14% when respondents were asked about whether their neighbourhood is a place where neighbours would help each other if there is an emergency.
- 12 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% when respondents were asked about the number of people they could turn to for help if financial support is needed.



## Fact sheet Community of Halifax (CMA), Nova Scotia

---

In 2014, information on the emergency preparedness of people living in the Census Metropolitan Area<sup>1</sup> of Halifax was collected through the Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada (SEPR).<sup>2</sup> This fact sheet presents information on the risk awareness and level of emergency preparedness of the residents of Halifax, which could help improve the understanding of community resilience in the event of an emergency.<sup>3,4</sup>

### **Risk awareness and anticipated sources of help in an emergency or disaster**

- People living in Halifax anticipated winter storms (including blizzards, ice storms and extreme cold) (97%), hurricanes (85%) and extended power outages lasting 24 hours or longer (83%) to be the events most likely to occur within their community.
- In the event of a weather-related emergency or natural disaster (40%), industrial or transportation accident (38%), act of terrorism or terrorist threat (38%), or contamination or shortage of water or food (29%), news on the radio was most frequently named by residents as the first source of information or assistance they would turn to (Table 1.1).
- News on the radio was the second most commonly anticipated source for initial help and information in the event of an extended power outage (25%), following utility companies (54%). In the event that an outbreak of a serious or life-threatening disease were to occur, hospitals, clinics, doctors or other medical professionals (37%) would commonly be the first sources of initial help and information, followed by news on the radio (27%). The police were the most common source of initial help in the event of rioting or civil unrest (35%<sup>E</sup>).

### **Prior lifetime experience with a major emergency or disaster<sup>5</sup>**

- Two-thirds (67%) of residents of Halifax have personally experienced a major emergency or disaster in Canada in a community where they were living at the time. For most (91%), this emergency or disaster was significant enough to have resulted in severe disruptions to their daily activities.
- Residents who were affected by major emergencies or disasters most commonly experienced hurricanes (70%), followed by winter storms (including blizzards and ice storms) (48%) and extended power outages lasting 24 hours or longer (15%<sup>E</sup>).
- Most residents who experienced emergencies or disasters were unable to use electrical appliances as a result (80%). Missing work or school (79%), the inability to heat or cool the home (58%), and the inability to use roads or transportation within the community were also some of the most common disruptions to daily life experienced by residents of Halifax as a result of major emergencies or disasters. Some of the more serious disruptions experienced included home evacuation (16%) and the inability to communicate with others outside the home (15%), both of which were less commonly experienced.
- Three-quarters (75%) of residents who were affected by a major emergency were able to resume their daily activities within one week of the event (7%<sup>E</sup> within 24 hours, 14% within one to two days, 36% within three to five days, and 19% within six to seven days).
- More than half (61%) of residents who experienced a major emergency or disaster received help during or immediately following the event. Neighbours (40%), family (39%) and friends (18%<sup>E</sup>) were common sources of assistance.



- Three in ten (30%) residents of Halifax who were affected by major emergencies or disasters which were significant enough to disrupt their regular daily activities experienced a loss of property or some kind of a financial impact. Long-term emotional or psychological consequences were experienced by 5%<sup>E</sup> of individuals affected by a major emergency or disaster.

## Emergency planning, precautionary and fire safety behaviours

- Seven in ten (71%) residents of Halifax lived in households that were engaged in at least two emergency planning activities,<sup>6</sup> with half (49%) living in households with three or four such activities (Table 1.2). Nearly one in ten (7%<sup>E</sup>) people had no emergency planning activities set in place.
- Six in ten (60%) residents lived in a household with at least two precautionary measures<sup>7</sup> taken in case of an emergency, with more than three in ten (34%) living in a household with three or four such measures. One in ten (11%) had no precautionary measures in place within their homes.
- The majority (98%) of residents reported living in a household with a working smoke detector, two-thirds (67%) stated that they had a working fire extinguisher, and less than half (43%) stated that they had a working carbon monoxide detector (Table 1.3). One-third (32%) of residents stated that they had implemented all three fire safety measures within their households.
- Although the proportion of residents of Halifax who had not taken any precautionary measures (11%) was significantly higher than the proportion among residents of Nova Scotia as a whole (7%), it was still significantly lower when compared to residents of Canada's 10 provinces (16%). Halifax had a significantly higher proportion of residents who had all four precautionary measures in place (11%) compared to the overall proportion of Canadians (7%). Contrarily, the proportion of residents who had implemented all three fire safety measures was significantly lower in Halifax (32%) than in Canada generally (42%). There were no differences in the number of emergency planning activities taken by Halifax residents compared to Nova Scotia as a whole or Canada in general.<sup>8</sup>
- In terms of the types of activities and measures taken, some of the differences between Halifax and Nova Scotia as a whole included having a back-up generator (27% versus 36%) and having a working fire extinguisher (67% versus 71%). Differences between residents of Halifax and Canadians in general included having an emergency exit plan (70% versus 60%) and having a working carbon monoxide detector (43% versus 60%).

## Social networks and sense of belonging

- Approximately half (55%) of residents of Halifax had a strong sense of belonging<sup>9</sup> to their community.
- The majority (85%) of residents described their neighbourhood as a place where neighbours generally help each other.<sup>10</sup> Of those who described their neighbourhood as a place where neighbours generally do not help each other, more than three-quarters (78%) still described it as a place where neighbours would help each other in an emergency.<sup>11</sup>
- In the event of an emergency or disaster, approximately two-thirds of residents had large networks of support of more than five people to turn to for emotional support (65%), for help if physically injured (63%) as well as in the event of a home evacuation (62%). More than a quarter had more than five people to turn to for financial help (29%).<sup>12</sup> However, 9% reported that they had no one to turn to for financial help.
- High levels of sense of belonging, self-efficacy and neighbourhood trust, social support as well as civic engagement and involvement in political activities were often associated with a higher level of emergency preparedness (Table 1.4).

## Data tables

**Table 1.1**  
Most commonly anticipated sources of initial help and information, by type of emergency or disaster, residents of Halifax, Nova Scotia, 2014

Most common sources of initial help and information by type of emergency or disaster	percent
<b>Weather-related emergency or natural disaster</b>	
News- Radio	40
News- Internet	23

News- Television	21
<b>Extended power outages</b>	
Utility company	54
News- Radio	25
News- Internet	9 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Outbreak of serious or life-threatening disease</b>	
Hospital, clinic, doctor or other medical professional	37
News- Radio	27
News- Television	25
<b>Industrial or transportation accident</b>	
News- Radio	38
News- Television	26
News- Internet	26
<b>Contamination or shortage of water or food <sup>1</sup></b>	
News- Radio	29
Local government	21
News- Internet	21 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Act of terrorism or terrorist threat</b>	
News- Radio	38
News- Television	32
Police/law enforcement	27
<b>Rioting or civil unrest</b>	
Police/law enforcement	35 <sup>E</sup>
News- Television	32
News- Radio	28 <sup>E</sup>
<sup>E</sup> use with caution	
1 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% when respondents were asked about their likely sources of initial help and information.	
<b>Note:</b> Respondents who perceived their community was at risk for any form of emergency or disaster were then asked where they would turn to first for information or assistance in the event of the perceived emergency or disaster. Respondents could provide more than one response. Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.	
<b>Source:</b> Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.	

**Table 1.2**  
**Number of emergency planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents, community of Halifax, Nova Scotia, 2014**

Number of planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents	Halifax	Nova Scotia	Canada
	percent		
<b>Number of emergency planning activities</b>			
None	7 <sup>E</sup>	9	8
1 activity	18	18	17
2 activities	22	21	25
3 activities	27	28	27
4 activities	22	21	19
<b>Number of precautionary measures</b>			
None	11 ***	7	16
1 measure	26 *	19	27

2 measures	26	27	28
3 measures	23	27	20
4 measures	11 ***	18	7
<b>Number of fire safety measures <sup>1 2</sup></b>			
None	F	1 <sup>E</sup>	1
1 measure	18 **	18	14
2 measures	43	42	38
3 measures	32 **	35	42
<sup>E</sup> use with caution <sup>F</sup> too unreliable to be published * significantly different from provincial level estimate (p < 0.05) ** significantly different from Canada level estimate (p < 0.05) *** significantly different from both provincial and Canada level estimates (p < 0.05) 1 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Canada'. 2 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Halifax'.  <b>Note:</b> Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents. Emergency planning activities include: an emergency exit plan, an emergency supply kit, photocopies/electronic copies of important documents and a list of emergency contact numbers. Precautionary measures include: a battery-operated or wind-up radio, an alternative heat source, a back-up generator and an alternative water source. Fire safety measures include a working smoke detector, a working carbon monoxide detector and a working fire extinguisher. <b>Source:</b> Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.			

**Table 1.3**  
**Planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures residents engaged in, community of Halifax, Nova Scotia, 2014**

Residents whose households were involved in the following:	Halifax	Nova Scotia	Canada
	percent		
<b>Emergency planning activities</b>			
Emergency exit plan	70 **	67	60
Exit plan has been practised/reviewed in last 12 months <sup>1</sup>	46	44	46
Designated meeting place for household members <sup>2</sup>	34	37	33
Contact plan for household members <sup>2</sup>	56	55	55
Household emergency supply kit	48	48	47
Vehicle emergency supply kit <sup>3</sup>	62	62	59
Extra copies of important documents	51	48	53
List of emergency contact numbers	66	67	69
Plan for meeting special health needs <sup>4</sup>	71	68	62
<b>Precautionary measures</b>			
Wind-up or battery-operated radio	76 **	77	58
Alternate heat source	46 *	57	48
Back-up generator	27 *	36	23
Alternate water source	45 *	55	43
Other <sup>5</sup>	28 **	28	21
<b>Fire safety measures</b>			
Working smoke detector	98	97	98
Working carbon monoxide detector <sup>6</sup>	43 **	43	60
Working fire extinguisher	67 *	71	66

\* significantly different from provincial level estimate (p < 0.05)

\*\* significantly different from Canada level estimate (p < 0.05)

1 Percentage based only on those indicating that they have an emergency exit plan.

2 Excludes Canadians living in single-person households.

3 Excludes those who reported that they lived in a household that did not have a vehicle.

4 Percentage based only on those indicating that they or someone in their household has special medical needs.

5 'Other precautionary measures' include having an escape/rescue plan for pets, extra supply of fuel, checking and replenishing emergency supplies, and keeping exits clear.

6 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Halifax'.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

**Table 1.4**

**High or moderately high levels of emergency planning, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents, by social and political involvement, community of Halifax, Nova Scotia, 2014**

Social and political involvement	Percentage of residents who had high or moderately high levels of...		
	Planning activities	Precautionary measures	Fire safety measures
	percent		
<b>Engagement in political activities <sup>1</sup></b>			
Yes <sup>†</sup>	52	38	34
No <sup>7</sup>	34 <sup>E*</sup>	20 <sup>E*</sup>	34 <sup>E</sup>
<b>High level of civic engagement <sup>2</sup></b>			
Yes <sup>†</sup>	54	40	35
No <sup>7</sup>	37 <sup>*</sup>	23 <sup>*</sup>	32
<b>High level of social support <sup>3</sup></b>			
Yes <sup>7†</sup>	63	41	35
No	44 <sup>*</sup>	31	31
<b>Strong sense of belonging to community <sup>4</sup></b>			
Yes <sup>7†</sup>	56	40	35
No	41 <sup>*</sup>	27 <sup>*</sup>	29
<b>High neighbourhood trust <sup>5</sup></b>			
Yes <sup>†</sup>	56	46	38
No <sup>7</sup>	45 <sup>*</sup>	26 <sup>*</sup>	28 <sup>*</sup>
<b>High level of self-efficacy <sup>6</sup></b>			
Yes <sup>7†</sup>	57	39	38
No <sup>7</sup>	42 <sup>*</sup>	30	27 <sup>*</sup>

<sup>E</sup> use with caution

\* significantly different from reference category ( $p < 0.05$ )

† reference category

- 1 Includes individuals over the age of 17 years who are eligible to vote, and who have participated in or volunteered for political parties or events in the past 12 months, including municipal, provincial, or federal elections, or expressed views on political or social issues through signing a petition, contacting news agencies or politicians, or attended a meeting involving social or community issues.
- 2 Civic engagement measures individuals over the age of 17 years who were involved in a recreational group or organization in the past 12 months, and includes engagement in political activities. A 'high level' is defined as having been involved in at least 4 activities in the past 12 months.
- 3 A 'high level of social support' is defined as having five or more people whom that individual could turn to for help in an emergency if they are physically injured, require emotional support, shelter, and/or financial assistance.
- 4 A 'strong sense of belonging to community' is rating one's own sense of belonging to their community as a 4 or a 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "very weak" and 5 "very strong".
- 5 'High neighbourhood trust' is rating one's own trust in the people in one's neighbourhood as 4 or 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "cannot be trusted at all" and 5 represents "can be trusted a lot", as well as having a response of "very likely" when asked about the likelihood of someone in their neighbourhood returning a lost wallet or purse containing two hundred dollars with the money still inside.
- 6 A 'high level of self-efficacy' is derived from having a high self-rating on a scale of 1 (poor) to 5 (excellent) for the following three categories: an ability to think clearly and solve day-to-day problems, to handle unexpected and difficult problems, and to figure out what to do if faced with an emergency situation.
- 7 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Fire safety measures'.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents. Households with 'moderately high' or 'high' levels of emergency planning engaged in 3 or 4 of the following: having an exit plan, an emergency supply kit, extra copies of important documents and an emergency contact list. 'Moderately high' or 'high' levels of precautionary measures include having 3 or 4 of the following: a wind-up or battery operated radio, a back-up generator, an alternate source of heat and additional water. 'Moderately high' or 'high' levels of fire safety measure include having all 3 of the following: a working smoke detector, a working fire extinguisher, and a working carbon monoxide detector.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

## Notes

<sup>E</sup> use with caution

- 1 A Census Metropolitan Area (CMA) or a Census Agglomeration (CA) is formed by one or more adjacent municipalities centred on a population centre (known as the core). A CMA must have a total population of at least 100,000 of which 50,000 or more must live in the core. A CA must have a core population of at least 10,000. To be included in the CMA or CA, other adjacent municipalities must have a high degree of integration with the core as measured by commuting flows derived from census data.
- 2 The target population for the SEPR included all persons 15 years of age or older, residing in households in Canada's 10 provinces, excluding full-time residents of institutions (e.g. nursing homes, group homes, hospitals).
- 3 The SEPR covers three types of communities: Census Metropolitan Areas (CMAs), Census Agglomerations (CAs) with population greater than 50,000, and 'smaller communities' which include CAs with population 50,000 or less and those areas that fall outside of CMAs and CAs. All CMAs and CAs (with population greater than 50,000) were included in the SEPR. A sample of households were selected from smaller communities within each province to represent all households within the province in similar communities. Additional information on the SEPR and its sampling methodology can be found in the 'Survey description' section.
- 4 Throughout this fact sheet, responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.
- 5 This section focuses on personal experiences with emergencies or disasters that happened in Canada, in a community where the person was living at the time, and was significant enough to severely interrupt the individual's regular daily activities.

- 6 Emergency planning activities include: having an emergency exit plan, a household emergency supply kit, extra copies of important documents and an emergency contact list.
- 7 Precautionary measures include: having a wind-up or battery-operated radio, an alternate heat source such as a non-electric stove or heater or a wood-burning fireplace, a back-up generator and an alternative water source such as a well, tank or litres of stored water.
- 8 Unless otherwise specified, differences are statistically significant ( $p < 0.05$ ).
- 9 A 'strong sense of belonging to community' is rating one's own sense of belonging to their community as a 4 or a 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "very weak" and 5 "very strong".
- 10 A proportion (16%) of respondents were not asked questions regarding neighbourhood helpfulness in the event of an emergency and as such these cases are not included in the analysis on neighbourhood helpfulness in general or in the event of an emergency.
- 11 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% when respondents were asked about whether their neighbourhood is a place where neighbours would help each other if there is an emergency.
- 12 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% when respondents were asked about the number of people they could turn to for help if financial support is needed.



## Fact sheet

# Community of Cape Breton (CA), Nova Scotia

---

In 2014, information on the emergency preparedness of people living in the Census Agglomeration<sup>1</sup> of Cape Breton was collected through the Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada (SEPR).<sup>2</sup> This fact sheet presents information on the risk awareness and level of emergency preparedness of the residents of Cape Breton, which could help improve the understanding of community resilience in the event of an emergency.<sup>3,4</sup>

### Risk awareness and anticipated sources of help in an emergency or disaster

- Most residents of Cape Breton anticipated winter storms (including blizzards, ice storms and extreme cold) as the event most likely to occur within their community (97%). Extended power outages lasting 24 hours or longer (71%), hurricanes (63%) and wildfires or forest fires (56%) were among the other events that residents thought were likely to occur within their community.
- In the event of a weather-related emergency or natural disaster (32%) or an industrial or transportation accident (23%<sup>E</sup>), residents named news on the radio as the source of initial help and information that they would commonly turn to (Table 1.1). A utility company (56%) would commonly be contacted first by residents in the event of an extended power outage. Hospitals, clinics, doctors or other medical professionals (48%) would be the first sources of initial help in the event of an outbreak of a serious illness or life-threatening disease, while in the event of a contamination or shortage of water or food, news on the television (16%<sup>E</sup>) was named as the most common source of initial help and information by residents. In the event of either rioting or civil unrest (44%<sup>E</sup>) or an act of terrorism or terrorist threat (37%<sup>E</sup>), people in Cape Breton would most commonly turn to police for help and information first.

### Prior lifetime experience with a major emergency or disaster<sup>5</sup>

- Nearly a quarter (22%) of residents of Cape Breton have personally experienced a major emergency or disaster in Canada in a community where they were living at the time. For most (82%), the emergency or disaster was significant enough to have resulted in severe disruptions to their daily activities.
- Winter storms which include blizzards and ice storms (45%) were the most commonly experienced emergency or disaster reported by residents, followed by extended power outages lasting 24 hours or longer (25%<sup>E</sup>) and hurricanes (23%<sup>E</sup>).
- Residents who had experienced a major emergency or disaster were often unable to use electrical appliances (67%), attend an appointment or a planned activity (65%) or attend school or work (58%). Almost half of residents who were affected by a major emergency were unable to use roads or transportation within their community as a result (44%<sup>E</sup>).
- The majority (84%) of residents who had experienced a major emergency or disaster were able to resume their daily activities within five days of the event (33%<sup>E</sup> within 24 hours, 31%<sup>E</sup> within one to two days and 20%<sup>E</sup> within three to five days).
- Close to half (46%) of residents who had been affected by an emergency or disaster received assistance during or immediately following the event. Family members (42%<sup>E</sup>) and neighbours (34%<sup>E</sup>) were most often the source of help.
- One in four (24%) individuals in Cape Breton affected by a major emergency or disaster, which was significant enough to have resulted in severe disruptions to their regular daily routines, experienced a loss of property or some other kind of a financial impact.

## Emergency planning, precautionary and fire safety behaviours

- Seven out of ten (69%) residents of Cape Breton lived in households that were engaged in at least two emergency planning activities,<sup>6</sup> with half (49%) living in households with three or four such activities (Table 1.2). One in ten (11%<sup>E</sup>) lived in a household that had not engaged in any emergency planning activities.
- Three quarters (75%) of residents lived in a household with at least two precautionary measures<sup>7</sup> taken in the event of an emergency, with four in ten (40%) living in a household with three or four such measures. A small proportion (6%<sup>E</sup>) of residents lived in a household with no precautionary measures set in place.
- Most (97%) residents reported living in a household with a working smoke detector, and 64% reported living in a household with a working fire extinguisher (Table 1.3). More than a third (38%) stated that they had a working carbon monoxide detector in their household. Less than one-third (29%) of the residents stated that they had taken all three fire safety measures within their households.
- The number of emergency planning activities taken by residents did not differ between Cape Breton and the province of Nova Scotia or Canada's 10 provinces as a whole. There were, however, some differences in the number of precautionary and fire safety measures taken. For example, the proportion of residents of Cape Breton who had not taken any precautionary measures (6%<sup>E</sup>) was significantly lower than the proportion of Canadians (16%), while the proportion that had taken all four precautionary measures was significantly higher in Cape Breton than in Canada (12%<sup>E</sup> versus 7%). The proportion of residents who had taken all three fire safety measures was significantly lower in Cape Breton (29%) than in Canada in general (42%).<sup>8</sup>
- There were some significant differences in the types of planning activities, precautionary and fire safety measures residents were engaged in compared to the province of Nova Scotia and Canada in general. Some of these differences include the proportion of residents who had a designated emergency meeting place for household members, which was significantly higher for residents of Cape Breton (45%) than for residents of Nova Scotia (37%) and for Canadian residents in general (33%). Conversely, the proportion of residents of Cape Breton who had a working carbon monoxide detector within their homes (38%) was significantly lower than the proportion of Canadians overall (60%).

## Social networks and sense of belonging

- Two-thirds (68%) of Cape Breton's residents had a strong sense of belonging<sup>9</sup> to their community.
- The majority (91%) of residents described the neighbourhood they lived in as a place where neighbours generally help each other.<sup>10</sup> Of those who did not describe their neighbourhood this way, most (91%) still described it as a place where neighbours would help each other in an emergency.
- Two-thirds of residents had a large network of support in the event of an emergency or disaster, with more than five people to turn to for help for emotional support (67%), if physically injured (64%) or in the event of a home evacuation (64%). More than a quarter (29%) had at least five people to turn to for financial support.<sup>11</sup> However, 8%<sup>E</sup> reported that they had no one to turn to for financial help.
- High levels of sense of belonging, social support as well as civic engagement and involvement in political activities were sometimes associated with a higher level of emergency preparedness (Table 1.4).

## Data tables

Table 1.1

Most commonly anticipated sources of initial help and information, by type of emergency or disaster, residents of Cape Breton, Nova Scotia, 2014

Most common sources of initial help and information by type of emergency or disaster	percent
<b>Weather-related emergency or natural disaster</b>	
News- Radio	32
News- Television	21
News- Internet	18
<b>Extended power outages</b>	



Utility company	56
News- Radio	18
Family	10 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Outbreak of serious or life-threatening disease</b>	
Hospital, clinic, doctor or other medical professional	48
News- Television	17 <sup>E</sup>
News- Radio	17 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Industrial or transportation accident <sup>1</sup></b>	
News- Radio	23 <sup>E</sup>
Police/law enforcement	19 <sup>E</sup>
News- Television	15 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Contamination or shortage of water or food <sup>1</sup></b>	
News- Television	16 <sup>E</sup>
Local government	15 <sup>E</sup>
News- Radio	13 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Act of terrorism or terrorist threat</b>	
Police/law enforcement	37 <sup>E</sup>
News- Television	24 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Rioting or civil unrest</b>	
Police/law enforcement	44 <sup>E</sup>
News- Radio	19 <sup>E</sup>
<sup>E</sup> use with caution	
1 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% when respondents were asked about their likely sources of initial help and information.	
<b>Note:</b> Respondents who perceived their community was at risk for any form of emergency or disaster were then asked where they would turn to first for information or assistance in the event of the perceived emergency or disaster. Respondents could provide more than one response. Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.	
<b>Source:</b> Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.	

**Table 1.2**  
**Number of emergency planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents, community of Cape Breton, Nova Scotia, 2014**

Number of planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents	Cape Breton	Nova Scotia	Canada
	percent		
<b>Number of emergency planning activities</b>			
None	11 <sup>E</sup>	9	8
1 activity	19	18	17
2 activities	20	21	25
3 activities	31	28	27
4 activities	18	21	19
<b>Number of precautionary measures</b>			
None	6 <sup>E</sup> **	7	16
1 measure	18 **	19	27
2 measures	35 ***	27	28
3 measures	28 **	27	20
4 measures	12 <sup>E</sup> ***	18	7
<b>Number of fire safety measures <sup>1</sup></b>			

None	F	1 <sup>E</sup>	1
1 measure	24 ***	18	14
2 measures	43	42	38
3 measures	29 **	35	42

<sup>E</sup> use with caution  
F too unreliable to be published

\*\* significantly different from Canada level estimate (p < 0.05)

\*\*\* significantly different from both provincial and Canada level estimates (p < 0.05)

1 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Canada'.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents. Emergency planning activities include: an emergency exit plan, an emergency supply kit, photocopies/electronic copies of important documents and a list of emergency contact numbers. Precautionary measures include: a battery-operated or wind-up radio, an alternate heat source, a back-up generator and an alternative water source. Fire safety measures include a working smoke detector, a working carbon monoxide detector and a working fire extinguisher.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

**Table 1.3**  
**Planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures residents engaged in, community of Cape Breton, Nova Scotia, 2014**

Residents whose households were involved in the following:	Cape Breton	Nova Scotia	Canada
	percent		
<b>Emergency planning activities</b>			
Emergency exit plan	64	67	60
Exit plan has been practised/reviewed in last 12 months <sup>1</sup>	47	44	46
Designated meeting place for household members <sup>2</sup>	45 ***	37	33
Contact plan for household members <sup>2</sup>	58	55	55
Household emergency supply kit	50	48	47
Vehicle emergency supply kit <sup>3</sup>	60	62	59
Extra copies of important documents	43 **	48	53
List of emergency contact numbers	66	67	69
Plan for meeting special health needs <sup>4</sup>	74 **	68	62
<b>Precautionary measures</b>			
Wind-up or battery-operated radio	73 **	77	58
Alternate heat source	50 *	57	48
Back-up generator	34 **	36	23
Alternate water source	63 ***	55	43
Other <sup>5</sup>	23	28	21
<b>Fire safety measures</b>			
Working smoke detector	97	97	98
Working carbon monoxide detector	38 **	43	60
Working fire extinguisher	64 *	71	66

\* significantly different from provincial level estimate (p < 0.05)

\*\* significantly different from Canada level estimate (p < 0.05)

\*\*\* significantly different from both provincial and Canada level estimates (p < 0.05)

1 Percentage based only on those indicating that they have an emergency exit plan.

2 Excludes Canadians living in single-person households.

3 Excludes those who reported that they lived in a household that did not have a vehicle.

4 Percentage based only on those indicating that they or someone in their household has special medical needs.

5 'Other precautionary measures' include having an escape/rescue plan for pets, extra supply of fuel, checking and replenishing emergency supplies, and keeping exits clear.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

**Table 1.4**

**High or moderately high levels of emergency planning, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents, by social and political involvement, community of Cape Breton, Nova Scotia, 2014**

Social and political involvement	Percentage of residents who had high or moderately high levels of...		
	Planning activities	Precautionary measures	Fire safety measures
	percent		
<b>Engagement in political activities <sup>1</sup></b>			
Yes †	51	40	30
No	24 <sup>E *</sup>	36 <sup>E</sup>	F
<b>High level of civic engagement <sup>2</sup></b>			
Yes †	54	46	34
No	34 <sup>*</sup>	25 <sup>E *</sup>	19 <sup>E *</sup>
<b>High level of social support <sup>3</sup></b>			
Yes †	68	46	34 <sup>E</sup>
No	43 <sup>*</sup>	40	28
<b>Strong sense of belonging to community <sup>4</sup></b>			
Yes †	55	41	29
No	38 <sup>*</sup>	42	31 <sup>E</sup>
<b>High neighbourhood trust <sup>5</sup></b>			
Yes †	49	47	29
No	51	37	30
<b>High level of self-efficacy <sup>6</sup></b>			
Yes †	55	43	32
No	43	39	25 <sup>E</sup>

<sup>E</sup> use with caution

<sup>F</sup> too unreliable to be published

\* significantly different from reference category ( $p < 0.05$ )

† reference category

- 1 Includes individuals over the age of 17 years who are eligible to vote, and who have participated in or volunteered for political parties or events in the past 12 months, including municipal, provincial, or federal elections, or expressed views on political or social issues through signing a petition, contacting news agencies or politicians, or attended a meeting involving social or community issues.
- 2 Civic engagement measures individuals over the age of 17 years who were involved in a recreational group or organization in the past 12 months, and includes engagement in political activities. A 'high level' is defined as having been involved in at least 4 activities in the past 12 months.
- 3 A 'high level of social support' is defined as having five or more people whom that individual could turn to for help in an emergency if they are physically injured, require emotional support, shelter, and/or financial assistance.
- 4 A 'strong sense of belonging to community' is rating one's own sense of belonging to their community as a 4 or a 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "very weak" and 5 "very strong".
- 5 'High neighbourhood trust' is rating one's own trust in the people in one's neighbourhood as 4 or 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "cannot be trusted at all" and 5 represents "can be trusted a lot", as well as having a response of "very likely" when asked about the likelihood of someone in their neighbourhood returning a lost wallet or purse containing two hundred dollars with the money still inside.
- 6 A 'high level of self-efficacy' is derived from having a high self-rating on a scale of 1 (poor) to 5 (excellent) for the following three categories: an ability to think clearly and solve day-to-day problems, to handle unexpected and difficult problems, and to figure out what to do if faced with an emergency situation.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents. Households with 'moderately high' or 'high' levels of emergency planning engaged in 3 or 4 of the following: having an exit plan, an emergency supply kit, extra copies of important documents and an emergency contact list. 'Moderately high' or 'high' levels of precautionary measures include having 3 or 4 of the following: a wind-up or battery operated radio, a back-up generator, an alternate source of heat and additional water. 'Moderately high' or 'high' levels of fire safety measure include having all 3 of the following: a working smoke detector, a working fire extinguisher, and a working carbon monoxide detector.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

## Notes

<sup>E</sup> use with caution

- 1 A Census Metropolitan Area (CMA) or a Census Agglomeration (CA) is formed by one or more adjacent municipalities centred on a population centre (known as the core). A CMA must have a total population of at least 100,000 of which 50,000 or more must live in the core. A CA must have a core population of at least 10,000. To be included in the CMA or CA, other adjacent municipalities must have a high degree of integration with the core as measured by commuting flows derived from census data.
- 2 The target population for the SEPR included all persons 15 years of age or older, residing in households in Canada's 10 provinces, excluding full-time residents of institutions (e.g. nursing homes, group homes, hospitals).
- 3 The SEPR covers three types of communities: Census Metropolitan Areas (CMAs), Census Agglomerations (CAs) with population greater than 50,000, and 'smaller communities' which include CAs with population 50,000 or less and those areas that fall outside of CMAs and CAs. All CMAs and CAs (with population greater than 50,000) were included in the SEPR. A sample of households were selected from smaller communities within each province to represent all households within the province in similar communities. Additional information on the SEPR and its sampling methodology can be found in the 'Survey description' section.
- 4 Throughout this fact sheet, responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.
- 5 This section focuses on personal experiences with emergencies or disasters that happened in Canada, in a community where the person was living at the time, and was significant enough to severely interrupt the individual's regular daily activities.
- 6 Emergency planning activities include: having an emergency exit plan, a household emergency supply kit, extra copies of important documents and an emergency contact list.

- 7 Precautionary measures include: having a wind-up or battery-operated radio, an alternate heat source such as a non-electric stove or heater, or a wood-burning fireplace, a back-up generator and an alternative water source such as a well, tank or litres of stored water.
- 8 Unless otherwise specified, differences are statistically significant ( $p < 0.05$ ).
- 9 A 'strong sense of belonging to community' is rating one's own sense of belonging to their community as a 4 or a 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "very weak" and 5 "very strong".
- 10 A proportion (18%) of respondents were not asked questions regarding neighbourhood helpfulness in the event of an emergency and as such these cases are not included in the analysis on neighbourhood helpfulness in general or in the event of an emergency.
- 11 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% when respondents were asked about the number of people they could turn to for help if financial support is needed.



## Fact sheet Smaller communities of Nova Scotia

---

In 2014, information on the emergency preparedness of people living in 'smaller communities' of Nova Scotia was collected through the Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada (SEPR).<sup>1 2 3</sup> This fact sheet presents information on the risk awareness and level of emergency preparedness of the residents of Nova Scotia's smaller communities, which could help improve the understanding of community resilience in the event of an emergency.<sup>4</sup>

### **Risk awareness and anticipated sources of help in an emergency or disaster**

- Most residents of smaller communities of Nova Scotia anticipated winter storms (including blizzards, ice storms and extreme cold) (94%) as the event most likely to occur in their community. Extended power outages lasting 24 hours or longer (81%), hurricanes (66%) and wildfires or forest fires (60%) were among the other emergencies or disasters most commonly named by residents as likely to occur within their communities.
- Residents anticipated turning to news on the radio first as a source of help and information in the event of an industrial or transportation accident (35%), a weather-related emergency or natural disaster (32%) or in the event of an act of terrorism or terrorist threat (31%<sup>E</sup>) (Table 1.1).
- In the event of an extended power outage lasting 24 hours or longer, people in Nova Scotia's smaller communities would commonly first turn to their utility company (64%). If faced with an outbreak of a serious or life-threatening disease, they would commonly first turn to hospitals, clinics, doctors or other medical professionals (56%). Local government (31%<sup>E</sup>) was named as the most common source of initial help and information in the event of a contamination or shortage of water or food, while the police (42%<sup>E</sup>) were the most commonly anticipated source of initial help if faced with rioting or civil unrest.

### **Prior lifetime experience with a major emergency or disaster<sup>5</sup>**

- One in three (34%) residents of smaller communities of Nova Scotia have been affected by a major emergency or disaster in Canada in a community where they were living at the time. For many (83%), the emergency or disaster was significant enough to have resulted in severe disruptions to their daily activities.
- An extended power outage lasting 24 hours or longer (40%) was the most frequently experienced emergency or disaster named by residents, followed by winter storms including blizzards and ice storms (39%), and hurricanes (37%).
- Three-quarters (73%) of residents who have experienced a major emergency or disaster were unable to use electrical appliances as a result. Other common types of disruption to daily activities included missing school or work (69%), having to boil drinking water or drink bottled water (56%) and an inability to use water at home for regular tasks (51%). More serious disruptions as a result of a major emergency or disaster included the inability to use roads or transportation within the community (40%). Home evacuation or the inability to communicate with others outside the home were less common disruptions, each experienced by about one in eight (13%<sup>E</sup>) people.
- Most (87%) residents of smaller communities of Nova Scotia who were affected by major emergencies were able to resume their daily activities within one week of the event (18%<sup>E</sup> within 24 hours, 28% within one to two days, 24% within three to five days and 18%<sup>E</sup> within six to seven days).
- Nearly half (45%) of residents who experienced emergencies or disasters received help during or immediately following the event. Neighbours (38%<sup>E</sup>) and family members (31%<sup>E</sup>) were the most common sources of assistance.

- More than a third (37%) of residents of Nova Scotia's smaller communities who were affected by major emergencies or disasters, which were significant enough to have disrupted their regular daily routines, endured a loss of property or another financial impact as a result.

## Emergency planning, precautionary and fire safety behaviours

- Nearly three-quarters (71%) of residents of smaller communities of Nova Scotia lived in households that were engaged in at least two emergency planning activities,<sup>6</sup> with half (49%) living in households with three or four such activities (Table 1.2). One in ten (10%) people lived in a household that had not engaged in any emergency planning activities.
- The majority (82%) of residents lived in households with at least two precautionary measures<sup>7</sup> in place, with more than half (55%) living in a household with three or four such measures. A small proportion (5%<sup>E</sup>) of people lived in a household with no precautionary measures in place.
- Almost all (97%) residents stated that they had a working smoke detector in their homes, about three-quarters (77%) stated that they had a working fire extinguisher, and less than half (43%) stated that they had a working carbon monoxide detector in their household (Table 1.3). More than a third (38%) of residents stated that they had all three fire safety measures within their households.
- There were some differences between residents of the smaller communities of Nova Scotia and residents of the province as a whole when it came to the number of precautionary and fire safety measures taken. The same was true when residents of Nova Scotia's smaller communities were compared to all residents of Canada's 10 provinces. For example, residents of the smaller communities (25%) were significantly more likely to have taken all four precautionary measures when compared to Nova Scotia in general (18%) and Canada overall (7%).<sup>8</sup>
- In terms of the types of activities and measures residents were involved in, there were significant differences between the smaller communities of Nova Scotia compared to the province overall and Canada. For example, residents of Nova Scotia's smaller communities were significantly more likely to have an alternate heat source (70%) compared to Nova Scotia as a whole (57%) and Canada overall (48%). Residents of the smaller communities of Nova Scotia were less likely to have a working carbon monoxide detector within their homes (43%) compared to the national proportion (60%).

## Social networks and sense of belonging

- Two-thirds (68%) of residents of smaller communities of Nova Scotia had a strong sense of belonging<sup>9</sup> to their community.
- A majority (92%) of residents described the neighbourhood they lived in as a place where neighbours generally help each other.<sup>10</sup> Of those who did not describe their neighbourhood this way, most (89%) still described it as a place where neighbours would help each other in an emergency.
- The majority of residents had a large network of people to turn to for support. Specifically, in the event of an emergency, residents had more than five people to turn to for help if physically injured (67%), for emotional support (65%) or in case of home evacuation (62%). About a quarter (28%) had such a network for financial support.<sup>11</sup> However, 10% reported that they had no one to turn to for financial help.
- High levels of neighbourhood trust and social support were sometimes associated with a higher level of emergency preparedness (Table 1.4).

## Data tables

**Table 1.1**

**Most commonly anticipated sources of initial help and information, by type of emergency or disaster, residents of smaller communities of Nova Scotia, 2014**

Most common sources of initial help and information by type of emergency or disaster	percent
<b>Weather-related emergency or natural disaster</b>	
News- Radio	32
News- Television	19

News- Internet	17
<b>Extended power outages</b>	
Utility company	64
News- Radio	13
Family	7 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Outbreak of serious or life-threatening disease</b>	
Hospital, clinic, doctor or other medical professional	56
News- Television	16 <sup>E</sup>
News- Internet	15 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Industrial or transportation accident</b>	
News- Radio	35
First responders	19 <sup>E</sup>
Police/law enforcement	17 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Contamination or shortage of water or food</b>	
Local government	31 <sup>E</sup>
News- Radio	18 <sup>E</sup>
Not-for-profit/charitable organization	10 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Act of terrorism or terrorist threat</b>	
News- Radio	31 <sup>E</sup>
News- Television	28 <sup>E</sup>
Police/law enforcement	24 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Rioting or civil unrest</b>	
Police/law enforcement	42 <sup>E</sup>
News- Radio	30 <sup>E</sup>
<sup>E</sup> use with caution	
<b>Note:</b> Respondents who perceived their community was at risk for any form of emergency or disaster were then asked where they would turn to first for information or assistance in the event of the perceived emergency or disaster. Respondents could provide more than one response. Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.	
<b>Source:</b> Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.	

**Table 1.2**  
**Number of emergency planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents, smaller communities of Nova Scotia, 2014**

Number of planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents	Smaller communities of Nova Scotia	Nova Scotia	Canada
	percent		
<b>Number of emergency planning activities</b>			
None	10	9	8
1 activity	18	18	17
2 activities	22	21	25
3 activities	28	28	27
4 activities	21	21	19
<b>Number of precautionary measures</b>			
None	5 <sup>E ***</sup>	7	16
1 measure	13 <sup>***</sup>	19	27
2 measures	27	27	28
3 measures	30 <sup>**</sup>	27	20
4 measures	25 <sup>***</sup>	18	7



Number of fire safety measures <sup>1</sup>				
None		F	1 <sup>E</sup>	1
1 measure		16	18	14
2 measures		41	42	38
3 measures		38 <sup>*</sup>	35	42

<sup>E</sup> use with caution  
<sup>F</sup> too unreliable to be published

<sup>\*</sup> significantly different from provincial level estimate (p < 0.05)

<sup>\*\*</sup> significantly different from Canada level estimate (p < 0.05)

<sup>\*\*\*</sup> significantly different from both provincial and Canada level estimates (p < 0.05)

<sup>1</sup> Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Canada'.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents. Emergency planning activities include: an emergency exit plan, an emergency supply kit, photocopies/electronic copies of important documents and a list of emergency contact numbers. Precautionary measures include: a battery-operated or wind-up radio, an alternate heat source, a back-up generator and an alternative water source. Fire safety measures include a working smoke detector, a working carbon monoxide detector and a working fire extinguisher.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

**Table 1.3**  
**Planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures residents engaged in, smaller communities of Nova Scotia, 2014**

Residents whose households were involved in the following:	Smaller communities of Nova Scotia	Nova Scotia	Canada
	percent		
<b>Emergency planning activities</b>			
Emergency exit plan	66 <sup>**</sup>	67	60
Exit plan has been practised/reviewed in last 12 months <sup>1</sup>	41	44	46
Designated meeting place for household members <sup>2</sup>	38	37	33
Contact plan for household members <sup>2</sup>	54	55	55
Household emergency supply kit	48	48	47
Vehicle emergency supply kit <sup>3</sup>	62	62	59
Extra copies of important documents	46 <sup>**</sup>	48	53
List of emergency contact numbers	69	67	69
Plan for meeting special health needs <sup>4</sup>	64	68	62
<b>Precautionary measures</b>			
Wind-up or battery-operated radio	78 <sup>**</sup>	77	58
Alternate heat source	70 <sup>***</sup>	57	48
Back-up generator	45 <sup>***</sup>	36	23
Alternate water source	64 <sup>***</sup>	55	43
Other <sup>5</sup>	30 <sup>**</sup>	28	21
<b>Fire safety measures</b>			
Working smoke detector	97	97	98
Working carbon monoxide detector	43 <sup>**</sup>	43	60
Working fire extinguisher	77 <sup>***</sup>	71	66

\*\* significantly different from Canada level estimate (p < 0.05)

\*\*\* significantly different from both provincial and Canada level estimates (p < 0.05)

1 Percentage based only on those indicating that they have an emergency exit plan.

2 Excludes Canadians living in single-person households.

3 Excludes those who reported that they lived in a household that did not have a vehicle.

4 Percentage based only on those indicating that they or someone in their household has special medical needs.

5 'Other precautionary measures' include having an escape/rescue plan for pets, extra supply of fuel, checking and replenishing emergency supplies, and keeping exits clear.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

**Table 1.4**

**High or moderately high levels of emergency planning, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents, by social and political involvement, smaller communities of Nova Scotia, 2014**

Social and political involvement	Percentage of residents who had high or moderately high levels of...		
	Planning activities	Precautionary measures	Fire safety measures
	percent		
<b>Engagement in political activities <sup>1</sup></b>			
Yes †	51	59	40
No	45	46	29 <sup>E</sup>
<b>High level of civic engagement <sup>2</sup></b>			
Yes †	54	60	38
No	43	51	37
<b>High level of social support <sup>3</sup></b>			
Yes <sup>7</sup> †	53	64	42
No	47	51 *	37
<b>Strong sense of belonging to community <sup>4</sup></b>			
Yes †	51	56	37
No	44	52	42
<b>High neighbourhood trust <sup>5</sup></b>			
Yes †	52	61	38
No	45	47 *	38
<b>High level of self-efficacy <sup>6</sup></b>			
Yes †	53	57	42
No	44	53	36

<sup>E</sup> use with caution

\* significantly different from reference category ( $p < 0.05$ )

† reference category

- 1 Includes individuals over the age of 17 years who are eligible to vote, and who have participated in or volunteered for political parties or events in the past 12 months, including municipal, provincial, or federal elections, or expressed views on political or social issues through signing a petition, contacting news agencies or politicians, or attended a meeting involving social or community issues.
- 2 Civic engagement measures individuals over the age of 17 years who were involved in a recreational group or organization in the past 12 months, and includes engagement in political activities. A 'high level' is defined as having been involved in at least 4 activities in the past 12 months.
- 3 A 'high level of social support' is defined as having five or more people whom that individual could turn to for help in an emergency if they are physically injured, require emotional support, shelter, and/or financial assistance.
- 4 A 'strong sense of belonging to community' is rating one's own sense of belonging to their community as a 4 or a 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "very weak" and 5 "very strong".
- 5 'High neighbourhood trust' is rating one's own trust in the people in one's neighbourhood as 4 or 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "cannot be trusted at all" and 5 represents "can be trusted a lot", as well as having a response of "very likely" when asked about the likelihood of someone in their neighbourhood returning a lost wallet or purse containing two hundred dollars with the money still inside.
- 6 A 'high level of self-efficacy' is derived from having a high self-rating on a scale of 1 (poor) to 5 (excellent) for the following three categories: an ability to think clearly and solve day-to-day problems, to handle unexpected and difficult problems, and to figure out what to do if faced with an emergency situation.
- 7 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Fire safety measures'.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents. Households with 'moderately high' or 'high' levels of emergency planning engaged in 3 or 4 of the following: having an exit plan, an emergency supply kit, extra copies of important documents and an emergency contact list. 'Moderately high' or 'high' levels of precautionary measures include having 3 or 4 of the following: a wind-up or battery operated radio, a back-up generator, an alternate source of heat and additional water. 'Moderately high' or 'high' levels of fire safety measure include having all 3 of the following: a working smoke detector, a working fire extinguisher, and a working carbon monoxide detector.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

## Notes

<sup>E</sup> use with caution

- 1 The SEPR covers three types of communities: Census Metropolitan Areas (CMAs), Census Agglomerations (CAs) with population greater than 50,000, and 'smaller communities' which include CAs with population 50,000 or less and those areas that fall outside of CMAs and CAs. All CMAs and CAs (with population greater than 50,000) were included in the SEPR. A sample of households were selected from smaller communities within each province to represent all households within the province in similar communities. Additional information on the SEPR and its sampling methodology can be found in the 'Survey description' section.
- 2 A Census Metropolitan Area (CMA) or a Census Agglomeration (CA) is formed by one or more adjacent municipalities centred on a population centre (known as the core). A CMA must have a total population of at least 100,000 of which 50,000 or more must live in the core. A CA must have a core population of at least 10,000. To be included in the CMA or CA, other adjacent municipalities must have a high degree of integration with the core as measured by commuting flows derived from census data.
- 3 The target population for the SEPR included all persons 15 years of age or older, residing in households in Canada's 10 provinces, excluding full-time residents of institutions (e.g., nursing homes, group homes, hospitals).
- 4 Throughout this fact sheet, responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.
- 5 This section focuses on personal experiences with emergencies or disasters that happened in Canada, in a community where the person was living at the time, and was significant enough to severely interrupt the individual's regular daily activities.

- 6 Emergency planning activities include: having an emergency exit plan, a household emergency supply kit, extra copies of important documents and an emergency contact list.
- 7 Precautionary measures include: having a wind-up or battery-operated radio, an alternate heat source such as a non-electric stove or heater or a wood-burning fireplace, a back-up generator and an alternative water source such as a well, tank or litres of stored water.
- 8 Unless otherwise specified, differences are statistically significant ( $p < 0.05$ ).
- 9 A 'strong sense of belonging to community' is rating one's own sense of belonging to their community as a 4 or a 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "very weak" and 5 "very strong".
- 10 A proportion (12%) of respondents were not asked questions regarding neighbourhood helpfulness in the event of an emergency and as such these cases are not included in the analysis on neighbourhood helpfulness in general or in the event of an emergency.
- 11 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% when respondents were asked about the number of people they could turn to for help if financial support is needed.



## Fact sheet

# Community of Moncton (CMA), New Brunswick

---

In 2014, information on the emergency preparedness of people living in the Census Metropolitan Area<sup>1</sup> of Moncton was collected through the Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience (SEPR).<sup>2</sup> This fact sheet presents information on the risk awareness and the level of emergency preparedness of the residents of Moncton, which could help improve the understanding of community resilience in the event of an emergency.<sup>3,4</sup>

### **Risk awareness and anticipated sources of help in an emergency or disaster**

- Residents of Moncton anticipated winter storms (including blizzards, ice storms and extreme cold) (97%), extended power outages lasting 24 hours or longer (83%) and wildfires or forest fires (65%) to be the events most likely to occur within their community.
- In the event of a weather-related emergency or natural disaster (30%) or an industrial or transportation accident (28%), residents anticipated turning to news on the radio as their first source for information or assistance (Table 1.1). Residents would most commonly turn to the police in the event of an act of terrorism or terrorist threat (47%) or rioting or civil unrest (42%). Residents would commonly turn to their utility company (60%) in the event of an extended power outage, to local government (27%) in the event of a contamination or shortage of water or food, and to a hospital, clinic, doctor or other medical professional (50%) if there was an outbreak of a serious or life-threatening disease.

### **Prior lifetime experience with a major emergency or disaster<sup>5</sup>**

- One in three residents of Moncton (32%) have experienced a major emergency or disaster in Canada in a community where they were living at the time. For about two-thirds (68%) of them, the emergency or disaster was significant enough to have resulted in severe disruptions to their daily activities.
- Winter storms (including blizzards and ice storms) (48%) and extended power outages lasting 24 hours or longer (40%) were the major emergencies or disasters most commonly experienced by residents.
- The inability to use electrical appliances (62%), missing school or work (59%) and missing appointments or planned activities (53%) were among some of the most common disruptions to daily life experienced by residents of Moncton who were affected by a major emergency or disaster. Fewer people experienced more serious disruptions such as the need to evacuate their home (32%), and the inability to use roads or transportation within the community (35%) or communicate outside of the home (11%<sup>E</sup>).
- The majority of residents of Moncton who were affected by major emergencies (86%) were able to resume their daily activities within one week of the event (17%<sup>E</sup> within 24 hours, 30% within one to two days, 30% within three to five days, and 9%<sup>E</sup> within six to seven days).
- Less than half (48%) of residents who experienced a major emergency or disaster received help during or immediately following the event, most commonly from family (51%) or neighbours (21%<sup>E</sup>).
- More than a quarter (29%) of residents of Moncton who experienced an emergency or disaster which was significant enough to have severely disrupted their regular daily routine also experienced a loss of property or some kind of a financial impact as a result. Other types of long-term implications were rare.

### **Emergency planning, precautionary and fire safety behaviours**

- Close to three-quarters (73%) of residents of Moncton lived in households that were engaged in at least two emergency planning activities,<sup>6</sup> with less than half (42%) living in households with three or four such activities (Table 1.2). One in ten (10%) people had no emergency planning activities set in place.
- Half (52%) of residents lived in a household with at least two precautionary measures<sup>7</sup> taken in case of an emergency, while a quarter (24%) lived in a household with three or four such measures. One in six (17%) people had no precautionary measures in place within their homes.
- The majority (97%) of residents reported living in a household with a working smoke detector, two-thirds (66%) stated that they had a working fire extinguisher, and about a third (35%) stated that they had a working carbon monoxide detector (Table 1.3). One in four residents stated that they had implemented all three fire safety measures within their households (25%).
- The number of emergency planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents of Moncton frequently differed from New Brunswick as well as from Canada's 10 provinces. Some of these differences included: the proportion of residents of Moncton who had all four emergency planning activities in place (15%), which was significantly lower than the overall proportion for New Brunswick as a whole as well as that of Canada's provinces in general (19% each); the proportion of residents of Moncton who had not taken any precautionary measures (17%), which was significantly higher than the provincial proportion (10%); and the proportion of residents of Moncton who had all three fire safety measures in place (25%), which was significantly lower than the proportion among residents of Canada overall (42%).<sup>8</sup>
- In addition, there were significant differences between residents of Moncton and residents of New Brunswick and Canada's provinces in general in terms of the types of activities and measures taken to prepare for the event of an emergency. For example, residents of Moncton were significantly more likely to have a vehicle emergency supply kit (65%) or a wind-up or battery-operated radio (64%) compared to residents of the Canadian provinces overall (59% and 58%, respectively). Conversely, they were less likely to have a household emergency supply kit (43%), an alternate water source (43%) or a working fire extinguisher (66%) compared to all residents of New Brunswick (48%, 56% and 72%, respectively). They were less likely to have an alternative heat source than both New Brunswick residents and Canadians overall.

## Social networks and sense of belonging

- About half (54%) of residents of Moncton had a strong sense of belonging<sup>9</sup> to their community.
- Most residents described their neighbourhood as a place where neighbours generally help each other (90%).<sup>10</sup> Of those who described their neighbourhood as a place where neighbours generally do not help each other, three-quarters (74%) still considered it to be a place where neighbours would help each other in an emergency.<sup>11</sup>
- Approximately two-thirds of residents had large networks of support of five people or more to turn to for emotional support (68%) or if physically injured (61%). More than half of the residents had a large network of support in the event of a home evacuation (58%). Less than a quarter of residents had more than five people to turn to for financial help (21%).<sup>12</sup> One in ten (10%) reported that they had no one to turn to for financial help.
- High levels of sense of belonging, self-efficacy, neighbourhood trust, social support as well as civic engagement were sometimes associated with a higher level of emergency preparedness (Table 1.4).

## Data tables

Table 1.1

Most commonly anticipated sources of initial help and information, by type of emergency or disaster, community of Moncton, New Brunswick, 2014

Most common sources of initial help and information by type of emergency or disaster	percent
<b>Weather-related emergency or natural disaster</b>	
News- Radio	30
News- Internet	26
News- Television	20
<b>Extended power outages</b>	

Utility company	60
News- Radio	13
News- Internet	11 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Outbreak of serious or life-threatening disease</b>	
Hospital, clinic, doctor or other medical professional	50
News- Radio	24
News- Internet	24
<b>Industrial or transportation accident</b>	
News- Radio	28
News- Internet	26
News- Television	22
<b>Contamination or shortage of water or food <sup>1</sup></b>	
Local government	27
News- Internet	19
News- Radio	19
<b>Act of terrorism or terrorist threat</b>	
Police/law enforcement	47
News- Television	24 <sup>E</sup>
News- Internet	22 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Rioting or civil unrest</b>	
Police/law enforcement	42
News- Internet	26 <sup>E</sup>
News- Radio	21 <sup>E</sup>
<sup>E</sup> use with caution	
1 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% when respondents were asked about their likely sources of initial help and information.	
<b>Note:</b> Respondents who perceived their community was at risk for any form of emergency or disaster were then asked where they would turn to first for information or assistance in the event of the perceived emergency or disaster. Respondents could provide more than one response. Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.	
<b>Source:</b> Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.	

**Table 1.2**

**Number of emergency planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents, community of Moncton, New Brunswick, 2014**

Number of planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents	Moncton	New Brunswick	Canada
	percent		
<b>Number of emergency planning activities</b>			
None	10	10	8
1 activity	15	15	17
2 activities	31 **	27	25
3 activities	27	28	27
4 activities	15 ***	19	19
<b>Number of precautionary measures</b>			
None	17 *	10	16
1 measure	29 *	24	27
2 measures	28	28	28
3 measures	16 ***	26	20

4 measures	8 <sup>E*</sup>	11	7
<b>Number of fire safety measures<sup>1 2</sup></b>			
None	F	1 <sup>E</sup>	1
1 measure	22 <sup>***</sup>	17	14
2 measures	45 <sup>**</sup>	50	38
3 measures	25 <sup>**</sup>	27	42
<sup>E</sup> use with caution <sup>F</sup> too unreliable to be published * significantly different from provincial level estimate (p < 0.05) ** significantly different from Canada level estimate (p < 0.05) *** significantly different from both provincial and Canada level estimates (p < 0.05) 1 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Canada'. 2 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Moncton'. <b>Note:</b> Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents. Emergency planning activities include: an emergency exit plan, an emergency supply kit, photocopies/electronic copies of important documents and a list of emergency contact numbers. Precautionary measures include: a battery-operated or wind-up radio, an alternative heat source, a back-up generator and an alternative water source. Fire safety measures include a working smoke detector, a working carbon monoxide detector and a working fire extinguisher. <b>Source:</b> Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.			

**Table 1.3**  
**Planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures residents engaged in, community of Moncton, New Brunswick, 2014**

Residents whose households were involved in the following:	Moncton	New Brunswick	Canada
	percent		
<b>Emergency planning activities</b>			
Emergency exit plan	61	65	60
Exit plan has been practised/reviewed in last 12 months <sup>1</sup>	46	46	46
Designated meeting place for household members <sup>2</sup>	30 <sup>*</sup>	38	33
Contact plan for household members <sup>2</sup>	53	53	55
Household emergency supply kit	43 <sup>*</sup>	48	47
Vehicle emergency supply kit <sup>3</sup>	65 <sup>**</sup>	61	59
Extra copies of important documents	52	51	53
List of emergency contact numbers	64 <sup>**</sup>	67	69
Plan for meeting special health needs <sup>4</sup>	63	66	62
<b>Precautionary measures</b>			
Wind-up or battery-operated radio	64 <sup>**</sup>	66	58
Alternate heat source	41 <sup>***</sup>	51	48
Back-up generator	20 <sup>*</sup>	30	23
Alternate water source	43 <sup>*</sup>	56	43
Other <sup>5</sup>	26 <sup>**</sup>	25	21
<b>Fire safety measures</b>			
Working smoke detector	97	98	98
Working carbon monoxide detector	35 <sup>**</sup>	35	60
Working fire extinguisher	66 <sup>*</sup>	72	66



\* significantly different from provincial level estimate (p < 0.05)

\*\* significantly different from Canada level estimate (p < 0.05)

\*\*\* significantly different from both provincial and Canada level estimates (p < 0.05)

1 Percentage based only on those indicating that they have an emergency exit plan.

2 Excludes Canadians living in single-person households.

3 Excludes those who reported that they lived in a household that did not have a vehicle.

4 Percentage based only on those indicating that they or someone in their household has special medical needs.

5 'Other precautionary measures' include having an escape/rescue plan for pets, extra supply of fuel, checking and replenishing emergency supplies, and keeping exits clear.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

**Table 1.4**

**High or moderately high levels of emergency planning, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents, by social and political involvement, community of Moncton, New Brunswick, 2014**

Social and political involvement	Percentage of residents who had high or moderately high levels of...		
	Planning activities	Precautionary measures	Fire safety measures
	percent		
<b>Engagement in political activities <sup>1</sup></b>			
Yes <sup>7 †</sup>	43	26	26
No	40	17 <sup>E</sup>	24 <sup>E</sup>
<b>High level of civic engagement <sup>2</sup></b>			
Yes <sup>†</sup>	46	28	27
No	37	17 <sup>E *</sup>	23
<b>High level of social support <sup>3</sup></b>			
Yes <sup>7 †</sup>	52	32	27 <sup>E</sup>
No	39 <sup>*</sup>	23	26
<b>Strong sense of belonging to community <sup>4</sup></b>			
Yes <sup>7 †</sup>	47	28	28
No	35 <sup>*</sup>	21	24
<b>High neighbourhood trust <sup>5</sup></b>			
Yes <sup>†</sup>	50	31	26
No <sup>7</sup>	36 <sup>*</sup>	20 <sup>*</sup>	26
<b>High level of self-efficacy <sup>6</sup></b>			
Yes <sup>†</sup>	51	25	23
No <sup>7</sup>	34 <sup>*</sup>	25	27

<sup>E</sup> use with caution

\* significantly different from reference category ( $p < 0.05$ )

† reference category

- 1 Includes individuals over the age of 17 years who are eligible to vote, and who have participated in or volunteered for political parties or events in the past 12 months, including municipal, provincial, or federal elections, or expressed views on political or social issues through signing a petition, contacting news agencies or politicians, or attended a meeting involving social or community issues.
- 2 Civic engagement measures individuals over the age of 17 years who were involved in a recreational group or organization in the past 12 months, and includes engagement in political activities. A 'high level' is defined as having been involved in at least 4 activities in the past 12 months.
- 3 A 'high level of social support' is defined as having five or more people whom that individual could turn to for help in an emergency if they are physically injured, require emotional support, shelter, and/or financial assistance.
- 4 A 'strong sense of belonging to community' is rating one's own sense of belonging to their community as a 4 or a 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "very weak" and 5 "very strong".
- 5 'High neighbourhood trust' is rating one's own trust in the people in one's neighbourhood as 4 or 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "cannot be trusted at all" and 5 represents "can be trusted a lot", as well as having a response of "very likely" when asked about the likelihood of someone in their neighbourhood returning a lost wallet or purse containing two hundred dollars with the money still inside.
- 6 A 'high level of self-efficacy' is derived from having a high self-rating on a scale of 1 (poor) to 5 (excellent) for the following three categories: an ability to think clearly and solve day-to-day problems, to handle unexpected and difficult problems, and to figure out what to do if faced with an emergency situation.
- 7 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Fire safety measures'.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents. Households with 'moderately high' or 'high' levels of emergency planning engaged in 3 or 4 of the following: having an exit plan, an emergency supply kit, extra copies of important documents and an emergency contact list. 'Moderately high' or 'high' levels of precautionary measures include having 3 or 4 of the following: a wind-up or battery operated radio, a back-up generator, an alternate source of heat and additional water. 'Moderately high' or 'high' levels of fire safety measure include having all 3 of the following: a working smoke detector, a working fire extinguisher, and a working carbon monoxide detector.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

## Notes

<sup>E</sup> use with caution

- 1 A Census Metropolitan Area (CMA) or a Census Agglomeration (CA) is formed by one or more adjacent municipalities centred on a population centre (known as the core). A CMA must have a total population of at least 100,000 of which 50,000 or more must live in the core. A CA must have a core population of at least 10,000. To be included in the CMA or CA, other adjacent municipalities must have a high degree of integration with the core as measured by commuting flows derived from census data.
- 2 The target population for the SEPR included all persons 15 years of age or older, residing in households in Canada's 10 provinces, excluding full-time residents of institutions (e.g. nursing homes, group homes, hospitals).
- 3 The SEPR covers three types of communities: Census Metropolitan Areas (CMAs), Census Agglomerations (CAs) with population greater than 50,000, and 'smaller communities' which include CAs with population 50,000 or less and those areas that fall outside of CMAs and CAs. All CMAs and CAs (with population greater than 50,000) were included in the SEPR. A sample of households were selected from smaller communities within each province to represent all households within the province in similar communities. Additional information on the SEPR and its sampling methodology can be found in the 'Survey description' section.
- 4 Throughout this fact sheet, responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.
- 5 This section focuses on personal experiences with emergencies or disasters that happened in Canada, in a community where the person was living at the time, and was significant enough to severely interrupt the individual's regular daily activities.

- 6 Emergency planning activities include: having an emergency exit plan, a household emergency supply kit, extra copies of important documents and an emergency contact list.
- 7 Precautionary measures include: having a wind-up or battery-operated radio, an alternate heat source such as a non-electric stove or heater or a wood-burning fireplace, a back-up generator and an alternative water source such as a well, tank or litres of stored water.
- 8 Unless otherwise specified, differences are statistically significant ( $p < 0.05$ ).
- 9 A 'strong sense of belonging to community' is rating one's own sense of belonging to their community as a 4 or a 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "very weak" and 5 "very strong".
- 10 A proportion (17%) of respondents were not asked questions regarding neighbourhood helpfulness in the event of an emergency and as such these cases are not included in the analysis on neighbourhood helpfulness in general or in the event of an emergency.
- 11 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were equal to 17% when respondents were asked about whether their neighbourhood is a place where neighbours would help each other if there is an emergency.
- 12 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% when respondents were asked about the number of people they could turn to for help if financial support is needed.



## Fact sheet

# Community of Saint John (CMA), New Brunswick

---

In 2014, information on the emergency preparedness of people living in the Census Metropolitan Area<sup>1</sup> of Saint John was collected through the Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience (SEPR).<sup>2</sup> This fact sheet presents information on the risk awareness and the level of emergency preparedness of the residents of Saint John, which could help improve the understanding of community resilience in the event of an emergency.<sup>3,4</sup>

### **Risk awareness and anticipated sources of help in an emergency or disaster**

- Most residents of Saint John anticipated winter storms (including blizzards, ice storms and extreme cold) as the event most likely to occur within their community (96%). Extended power outages lasting 24 hours or longer (87%) and industrial or transportation accidents (72%) were other emergencies or disasters that residents anticipated were likely to occur within their community.
- Residents commonly anticipated turning to news on the radio as an initial source of help and information in the event of an act of terrorism or terrorist threat (39%), an industrial or transportation accident (38%), a weather-related emergency or natural disaster (37%) or a contamination or shortage of water or food (32%) (Table 1.1). Half of residents of Saint John would turn to their utility company (50%) first in the event of an extended power outage, followed by news on the radio (19%). More than half would turn to hospitals, clinics, doctors or other medical professionals (52%) in the event of an outbreak of a serious illness or life-threatening disease, followed by news on the radio (27%). Police (41%<sup>E</sup>) were named as the most common source of initial help and information in the event of rioting or civil unrest.

### **Prior lifetime experience with a major emergency or disaster<sup>5</sup>**

- Close to half of residents of Saint John (47%) have personally experienced a major emergency or disaster in Canada in a community where they were living at the time. For the majority (87%) of these people, the event was significant enough to have resulted in severe disruptions to their daily activities.
- Residents of Saint John who were affected by major emergencies most commonly experienced winter storms which include blizzards and ice storms (52%) as well as extended power outages lasting 24 hours or longer (50%).
- Residents were often unable to use electrical appliances (79%), had to drink bottled water or boil drinking water (65%), or were unable to use water at home for routine tasks (62%). More severe disruptions experienced included home evacuation (27%), an inability to use roads or transportation within the community (21%) or an inability to communicate with others outside the home (17%).
- The majority of residents (81%) were able to resume their daily activities within one week of the event (19%<sup>E</sup> within 24 hours, 20% within one to two days, 27% within three to five days, and 14%<sup>E</sup> within six to seven days).
- More than half of residents received assistance during or immediately following the event (56%). Family members (53%) and neighbours (23%<sup>E</sup>) were most often the source of help.<sup>6</sup>
- Nearly a third (31%) of individuals in Saint John affected by a major emergency or disaster which was significant enough to disrupt their regular daily activities experienced a loss of property or another financial impact. Other long-term impacts, such as emotional or psychological consequences (6%<sup>E</sup>), were not commonly experienced.

### **Emergency planning, precautionary and fire safety behaviours**

- Three-quarters (73%) of residents of Saint John lived in households that were engaged in at least two emergency planning activities,<sup>7</sup> while close to half lived in households with three or four such activities (45%) (Table 1.2). Less than one in ten (8%<sup>E</sup>) lived in a household that had not engaged in any emergency planning activities.
- Seven out of ten (70%) residents lived in a household with at least two precautionary measures<sup>8</sup> taken in the event of an emergency, and more than four in ten (44%) lived in a household with three or four such measures. About one in ten (9%<sup>E</sup>) residents lived in a household with no precautionary measures in place.
- Most residents reported living in a household with a working smoke detector (98%), nearly three-quarters reported living in a household with a working fire extinguisher (73%), and two in five stated that they had a working carbon monoxide detector within their household (39%) (Table 1.3). One-third of the residents stated that they had taken all three fire safety measures within their households (31%).
- There were some significant differences in the number of precautionary and fire safety measures taken by residents of Saint John when compared to residents of New Brunswick and Canada's 10 provinces as a whole. For example, the proportion of those in Saint John who had all four precautionary measures in place (16%) was significantly higher than the proportion of those in New Brunswick (11%) and Canada (7%). However, the proportion of Saint John residents who had all three fire safety measures in place was significantly lower than the proportion of Canadians (31% versus 42%).<sup>9</sup>
- Similarly, some types of activities and measures taken by the residents of Saint John differed from New Brunswick and Canada overall. For example, residents of Saint John were significantly more likely to have a wind-up or battery-operated radio or an alternate water source than provincial and national levels. In addition, they were more likely to have a designated meeting place for household members (41%), an alternate heat source (54%) and a working fire extinguisher (73%) than Canadians (33%, 48% and 66%, respectively). They were, however, significantly less likely to have a working carbon monoxide detector than Canadians (39% versus 60%).

## Social networks and sense of belonging

- Three out of five (59%) residents of Saint John had a strong sense of belonging<sup>10</sup> to their community.
- Most residents described their neighbourhood as a place where neighbours generally help each other (92%).<sup>11</sup> Of those who did not characterize their neighbourhood this way, the majority (85%) still described it as a place where neighbours would help each other in an emergency.<sup>12</sup>
- Two-thirds of residents had a large network of support in the event of an emergency or disaster, with more than five people to turn to for emotional support (66%), for help if physically injured (66%) or in the event of a home evacuation (64%). Fewer people could count on this degree of financial support if faced with a major emergency, with one-third (32%) of residents having more than five people to turn to for financial support.<sup>13</sup> However, only 8% reported that they had no one to turn to for financial help.
- High levels of sense of belonging, self-efficacy and social support as well as civic engagement were often associated with a higher level of emergency preparedness (Table 1.4).

## Data tables

Table 1.1

Most commonly anticipated sources of initial help and information, by type of emergency or disaster, residents of Saint John, New Brunswick, 2014

Most common sources of initial help and information by type of emergency or disaster	percent
<b>Weather-related emergency or natural disaster</b>	
News- Radio	37
News- Television	16
Family	15
<b>Extended power outages</b>	
Utility company	50
News- Radio	19

Family	13
<b>Outbreak of serious or life-threatening disease</b>	
Hospital, clinic, doctor or other medical professional	52
News- Radio	27
News- Television	17 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Industrial or transportation accident</b>	
News- Radio	38
Police/law enforcement	14
News- Internet	14
<b>Contamination or shortage of water or food</b>	
News- Radio	32
Local government	24
News- Internet	15 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Act of terrorism or terrorist threat</b>	
News- Radio	39
Police/law enforcement	30
News- Television	20 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Rioting or civil unrest</b>	
Police/law enforcement	41 <sup>E</sup>
News- Radio	31 <sup>E</sup>
News- Television	17 <sup>E</sup>
<sup>E</sup> use with caution	
<b>Note:</b> Respondents who perceived their community was at risk for any form of emergency or disaster were then asked where they would turn to first for information or assistance in the event of the perceived emergency or disaster. Respondents could provide more than one response. Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.	
<b>Source:</b> Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.	

**Table 1.2**  
**Number of emergency planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents, community of Saint John, New Brunswick, 2014**

Number of planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents	Saint John	New Brunswick	Canada
	percent		
<b>Number of emergency planning activities</b>			
None	8 <sup>E</sup>	10	8
1 activity	16	15	17
2 activities	28	27	25
3 activities	26	28	27
4 activities	19	19	19
<b>Number of precautionary measures</b>			
None	9 <sup>E</sup> **	10	16
1 measure	19 ***	24	27
2 measures	26	28	28
3 measures	28 **	26	20
4 measures	16 ***	11	7
<b>Number of fire safety measures <sup>1 2</sup></b>			
None	F	1 <sup>E</sup>	1
1 measure	17 **	17	14

2 measures	45 ***	50	38
3 measures	31 **	27	42
<p>E use with caution  F too unreliable to be published</p> <p>** significantly different from Canada level estimate (p &lt; 0.05)</p> <p>*** significantly different from both provincial and Canada level estimates (p &lt; 0.05)</p> <p>1 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Canada'.</p> <p>2 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Saint John'.</p> <p><b>Note:</b> Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents. Emergency planning activities include: an emergency exit plan, an emergency supply kit, photocopies/electronic copies of important documents and a list of emergency contact numbers. Precautionary measures include: a battery-operated or wind-up radio, an alternative heat source, a back-up generator and an alternative water source. Fire safety measures include a working smoke detector, a working carbon monoxide detector and a working fire extinguisher.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.</p>			

**Table 1.3**  
**Planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures residents engaged in, community of Saint John, New Brunswick, 2014**

Residents whose households were involved in the following:	Saint John	New Brunswick	Canada
	percent		
<b>Emergency planning activities</b>			
Emergency exit plan	63	65	60
Exit plan has been practised/reviewed in last 12 months <sup>1</sup>	47	46	46
Designated meeting place for household members <sup>2</sup>	41 **	38	33
Contact plan for household members <sup>2</sup>	52	53	55
Household emergency supply kit	52	48	47
Vehicle emergency supply kit <sup>3</sup>	65 **	61	59
Extra copies of important documents	48	51	53
List of emergency contact numbers	68	67	69
Plan for meeting special health needs <sup>4</sup>	62	66	62
<b>Precautionary measures</b>			
Wind-up or battery-operated radio	75 ***	66	58
Alternate heat source	54 **	51	48
Back-up generator	29 **	30	23
Alternate water source	63 ***	56	43
Other <sup>5</sup>	27 **	25	21
<b>Fire safety measures</b>			
Working smoke detector	98	98	98
Working carbon monoxide detector <sup>6</sup>	39 **	35	60
Working fire extinguisher	73 **	72	66

\*\* significantly different from Canada level estimate (p < 0.05)

\*\*\* significantly different from both provincial and Canada level estimates (p < 0.05)

1 Percentage based only on those indicating that they have an emergency exit plan.

2 Excludes Canadians living in single-person households.

3 Excludes those who reported that they lived in a household that did not have a vehicle.

4 Percentage based only on those indicating that they or someone in their household has special medical needs.

5 'Other precautionary measures' include having an escape/rescue plan for pets, extra supply of fuel, checking and replenishing emergency supplies, and keeping exits clear.

6 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Saint John'.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

**Table 1.4**  
**High or moderately high levels of emergency planning, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents, by social and political involvement, community of Saint John, New Brunswick, 2014**

Social and political involvement	Percentage of residents who had high or moderately high levels of...		
	Planning activities	Precautionary measures	Fire safety measures
	percent		
<b>Engagement in political activities <sup>1</sup></b>			
Yes <sup>†</sup>	46	44	34
No <sup>7 8</sup>	39 <sup>E</sup>	41	24 <sup>E</sup>
<b>High level of civic engagement <sup>2</sup></b>			
Yes <sup>†</sup>	47	46	36
No <sup>7 9</sup>	42	38	25 <sup>*</sup>
<b>High level of social support <sup>3</sup></b>			
Yes <sup>†</sup>	58	53	43
No	39 <sup>*</sup>	41 <sup>*</sup>	27 <sup>*</sup>
<b>Strong sense of belonging to community <sup>4</sup></b>			
Yes <sup>†</sup>	49	50	33
No <sup>9</sup>	37 <sup>*</sup>	39 <sup>*</sup>	29
<b>High neighbourhood trust <sup>5</sup></b>			
Yes <sup>9 †</sup>	47	50	35
No	43	42	30
<b>High level of self-efficacy <sup>6</sup></b>			
Yes <sup>9 †</sup>	52	46	36
No	36 <sup>*</sup>	44	27



<sup>E</sup> use with caution

\* significantly different from reference category ( $p < 0.05$ )

† reference category

- 1 Includes individuals over the age of 17 years who are eligible to vote, and who have participated in or volunteered for political parties or events in the past 12 months, including municipal, provincial, or federal elections, or expressed views on political or social issues through signing a petition, contacting news agencies or politicians, or attended a meeting involving social or community issues.
- 2 Civic engagement measures individuals over the age of 17 years who were involved in a recreational group or organization in the past 12 months, and includes engagement in political activities. A 'high level' is defined as having been involved in at least 4 activities in the past 12 months.
- 3 A 'high level of social support' is defined as having five or more people whom that individual could turn to for help in an emergency if they are physically injured, require emotional support, shelter, and/or financial assistance.
- 4 A 'strong sense of belonging to community' is rating one's own sense of belonging to their community as a 4 or a 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "very weak" and 5 "very strong".
- 5 'High neighbourhood trust' is rating one's own trust in the people in one's neighbourhood as 4 or 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "cannot be trusted at all" and 5 represents "can be trusted a lot", as well as having a response of "very likely" when asked about the likelihood of someone in their neighbourhood returning a lost wallet or purse containing two hundred dollars with the money still inside.
- 6 A 'high level of self-efficacy' is derived from having a high self-rating on a scale of 1 (poor) to 5 (excellent) for the following three categories: an ability to think clearly and solve day-to-day problems, to handle unexpected and difficult problems, and to figure out what to do if faced with an emergency situation.
- 7 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Precautionary measures'.
- 8 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were equal to 14% for 'Fire safety measures'.
- 9 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Fire safety measures'.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents. Households with 'moderately high' or 'high' levels of emergency planning engaged in 3 or 4 of the following: having an exit plan, an emergency supply kit, extra copies of important documents and an emergency contact list. 'Moderately high' or 'high' levels of precautionary measures include having 3 or 4 of the following: a wind-up or battery operated radio, a back-up generator, an alternate source of heat and additional water. 'Moderately high' or 'high' levels of fire safety measure include having all 3 of the following: a working smoke detector, a working fire extinguisher, and a working carbon monoxide detector.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

## Notes

<sup>E</sup> use with caution

- 1 A Census Metropolitan Area (CMA) or a Census Agglomeration (CA) is formed by one or more adjacent municipalities centred on a population centre (known as the core). A CMA must have a total population of at least 100,000 of which 50,000 or more must live in the core. A CA must have a core population of at least 10,000. To be included in the CMA or CA, other adjacent municipalities must have a high degree of integration with the core as measured by commuting flows derived from census data.
- 2 The target population for the SEPR included all persons 15 years of age or older, residing in households in Canada's 10 provinces, excluding full-time residents of institutions (e.g., nursing homes, group homes, hospitals).
- 3 The SEPR covers three types of communities: Census Metropolitan Areas (CMAs), Census Agglomerations (CAs) with population greater than 50,000, and 'smaller communities' which include CAs with population 50,000 or less and those areas that fall outside of CMAs and CAs. All CMAs and CAs (with population greater than 50,000) were included in the SEPR. A sample of households were selected from smaller communities within each province to represent all households within the province in similar communities. Additional information on the SEPR and its sampling methodology can be found in the 'Survey description' section.
- 4 Throughout this fact sheet, responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.
- 5 This section focuses on personal experiences with emergencies or disasters that happened in Canada, in a community where the person was living at the time, and was significant enough to severely interrupt the individual's regular daily activities.

- 6 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% when respondents were asked about the source of information or assistance they received during or immediately following the emergency they experienced.
- 7 Emergency planning activities include: having an emergency exit plan, a household emergency supply kit, extra copies of important documents and an emergency contact list.
- 8 Precautionary measures include: having a wind-up or battery-operated radio, an alternate heat source such as a non-electric stove or heater or a wood-burning fireplace, a back-up generator and an alternative water source such as a well, tank or litres of stored water.
- 9 Unless otherwise specified, differences are statistically significant ( $p < 0.05$ ).
- 10 A 'strong sense of belonging to community' is rating one's own sense of belonging to their community as a 4 or a 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "very weak" and 5 "very strong".
- 11 A proportion (17%) of respondents were not asked questions regarding neighbourhood helpfulness in the event of an emergency and as such these cases are not included in the analysis on neighbourhood helpfulness in general or in the event of an emergency.
- 12 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% when respondents were asked about whether their neighbourhood is a place where neighbours would help each other if there is an emergency.
- 13 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% when respondents were asked about the number of people they could turn to for help if financial support is needed.



## Fact sheet

# Community of Fredericton (CA), New Brunswick

---

In 2014, information on the emergency preparedness of people living in the Census Agglomeration<sup>1</sup> of Fredericton was collected through the Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada (SEPR).<sup>2</sup> This fact sheet presents information on the risk awareness and level of emergency preparedness of the residents of Fredericton, which could help improve the understanding of community resilience in the event of an emergency.<sup>3,4</sup>

### Risk awareness and anticipated sources of help in an emergency or disaster

- People living in Fredericton anticipated winter storms (including blizzards, ice storms and extreme cold) as the event most likely to occur within their community (97%). Extended power outages lasting 24 hours or longer (87%), floods (69%) and wildfires or forest fires (64%) were among the other events that residents of Fredericton identified as likely to occur within their community.
- Residents commonly anticipated turning to news on the radio as an initial source for help and information in the event of a weather-related emergency or natural disaster (34%), an industrial or transportation accident (33%) or a contamination or shortage of water or food (20%<sup>E</sup>) (Table 1.1). News from the radio was the second most commonly anticipated source for initial help and information in the event of an extended power outage (14%) following utility companies (62%), as well as in the event of an outbreak of a serious or life-threatening disease (22%) following hospitals, clinics, doctors or other medical professionals (47%). Residents of Fredericton most frequently indicated that news on the television (33%) would be their initial source for help and information in the event of an act of terrorism or terrorist threat, while in the event of rioting or civil unrest, police (45%) were the most commonly anticipated source.

### Prior lifetime experience with a major emergency or disaster<sup>5</sup>

- One in three (32%) residents of Fredericton have personally experienced a major emergency or disaster in Canada in a community where they were living at the time. For the majority (83%) of these people, the event was significant enough to have resulted in severe disruptions to their daily activities.
- Residents affected by major emergencies or disasters most commonly experienced floods (44%), winter storms including blizzards and ice storms (28%<sup>E</sup>), and extended power outages lasting 24 hours or longer (28%<sup>E</sup>).
- The most common disruptions to daily life experienced by residents included missing work or school (64%), missing an appointment or a planned activity (51%) and a need to boil drinking water or drink bottled water (46%). Other more severe disruptions included an inability to use roads or transportation within the community (41%) and home evacuation (25%<sup>E</sup>).
- About three-quarters (76%) of residents who had experienced a major emergency were able to resume their daily activities within one week of the event (16%<sup>E</sup> within 24 hours, 24%<sup>E</sup> within one to two days, 26%<sup>E</sup> within three to five days, and 10%<sup>E</sup> within six to seven days).
- More than half (57%) of emergency victims received help during or immediately following the event. Family members (26%<sup>E</sup>) and friends (17%<sup>E</sup>) were most often the sources of assistance.<sup>6</sup>
- Nearly one-third (32%<sup>E</sup>) of individuals in Fredericton affected by a major emergency or disaster which was significant enough to disrupt their regular daily routines experienced a loss of property or another financial impact.

## Emergency planning, precautionary and fire safety behaviours

- Seven out of ten (71%) residents of Fredericton lived in households that were engaged in at least two emergency planning activities,<sup>7</sup> with close to half (46%) living in households with three or four such activities (Table 1.2). One in ten (10%) lived in a household that had not engaged in any emergency planning activities.
- Three in five (60%) people lived in a household with at least two precautionary measures<sup>8</sup> taken in the event of an emergency, with more than one-quarter (29%) living in a household with three or four such measures. One in eight (13%) residents lived in a household that had not engaged in any precautionary measures.
- Most (98%) residents reported living in a household with a working smoke detector, while nearly three-quarters (73%) reported living in a household with a working fire extinguisher and one in three (35%) stated that they had a working carbon monoxide detector within their household (Table 1.3). About one in four (27%) people stated that they had taken all three fire safety measures within their households.
- Generally, engagement in emergency planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures by residents of Fredericton did not differ significantly from the behaviours reported by residents of New Brunswick overall and of residents of Canada's 10 provinces as a whole, in terms of the number of measures taken.
- Some differences were observed in the types of activities and measures taken by residents of Fredericton when compared to the types taken by residents of New Brunswick in general and by Canadians. For example, residents of Fredericton were less likely to have a household emergency supply kit (41%) compared to all New Brunswick residents (48%) and residents of Canada overall (47%). Although residents of Fredericton were less likely to have a working carbon monoxide detector (35%) within their home compared with the proportion of Canadians (60%), they were more likely to have a wind-up or battery-operated radio (69% versus 58%).<sup>9</sup>

## Social networks and sense of belonging

- Three out of five (60%) residents of Fredericton had a strong sense of belonging<sup>10</sup> to their community.
- Most (88%) residents in Fredericton described their neighbourhood as a place where neighbours generally help each other.<sup>11</sup> Of those who did not describe their neighbourhood this way, most (90%) people still characterized their neighbourhood as a place where neighbours would help each other in an emergency.
- Approximately two-thirds of residents had a large network of support in the event of an emergency or disaster, with more than five people to turn to for help if physically injured (69%), for emotional support (68%), or in the event of a home evacuation (61%). About a quarter (26%) of residents had more than five people to turn to for financial support in the event of an emergency. However, 6%<sup>E</sup> reported that they had no one to turn to for financial help.
- High levels of social support, as well as civic engagement and involvement in political activities were sometimes associated with a higher level of emergency preparedness (Table 1.4).

## Data tables

Table 1.1

Most commonly anticipated sources of initial help and information, by type of emergency or disaster, residents of Fredericton, New Brunswick 2014

Most common sources of initial help and information by type of emergency or disaster	percent
<b>Weather-related emergency or natural disaster</b>	
News- Radio	34
News- Internet	28
News- Television	25
<b>Extended power outages</b>	
Utility company	62
News- Radio	14
News- Internet	10 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Outbreak of serious or life-threatening disease</b>	
Hospital, clinic, doctor or other medical professional	47

News- Radio	22
News- Television	20 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Industrial or transportation accident</b>	
News- Radio	33
News- Internet	20 <sup>E</sup>
News- Television	20 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Contamination or shortage of water or food <sup>1</sup></b>	
News- Radio	20 <sup>E</sup>
Local government	18 <sup>E</sup>
News- Internet	18 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Act of terrorism or terrorist threat</b>	
News- Television	33
Police/law enforcement	32 <sup>E</sup>
News- Radio	27 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Rioting or civil unrest</b>	
Police/law enforcement	45
News- Television	26 <sup>E</sup>
News- Radio	25 <sup>E</sup>
<sup>E</sup> use with caution	
1 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% when respondents were asked about their likely sources of initial help and information.	
<b>Note:</b> Respondents who perceived their community was at risk for any form of emergency or disaster were then asked where they would turn to first for information or assistance in the event of the perceived emergency or disaster. Respondents could provide more than one response. Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.	
<b>Source:</b> Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.	

**Table 1.2**  
**Number of emergency planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents, community of Fredericton, New Brunswick, 2014**

Number of planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents	Fredericton	New Brunswick	Canada
	percent		
<b>Number of emergency planning activities</b>			
None	10	10	8
1 activity	17	15	17
2 activities	25	27	25
3 activities	30	28	27
4 activities	16	19	19
<b>Number of precautionary measures</b>			
None	13	10	16
1 measure	26	24	27
2 measures	31	28	28
3 measures	22	26	20
4 measures	7 <sup>E</sup> *	11	7
<b>Number of fire safety measures <sup>1 2</sup></b>			
None	F	1 <sup>E</sup>	1
1 measure	14	17	14
2 measures	52 **	50	38

3 measures	27 **	27	42
<p><sup>E</sup> use with caution  <sup>F</sup> too unreliable to be published</p> <p>* significantly different from provincial level estimate (p &lt; 0.05)</p> <p>** significantly different from Canada level estimate (p &lt; 0.05)</p> <p>1 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Canada'.</p> <p>2 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Fredericton'.</p> <p><b>Note:</b> Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents. Emergency planning activities include: an emergency exit plan, an emergency supply kit, photocopies/electronic copies of important documents and a list of emergency contact numbers. Precautionary measures include: a battery-operated or wind-up radio, an alternative heat source, a back-up generator and an alternative water source. Fire safety measures include a working smoke detector, a working carbon monoxide detector and a working fire extinguisher.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.</p>			

**Table 1.3**  
**Planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures residents engaged in, community of Fredericton, New Brunswick, 2014**

Residents whose households were involved in the following:	Fredericton	New Brunswick	Canada
	percent		
<b>Emergency planning activities</b>			
Emergency exit plan	66 **	65	60
Exit plan has been practised/reviewed in last 12 months <sup>1</sup>	44	46	46
Designated meeting place for household members <sup>2</sup>	36	38	33
Contact plan for household members <sup>2</sup>	52	53	55
Household emergency supply kit	41 ***	48	47
Vehicle emergency supply kit <sup>3</sup>	66 **	61	59
Extra copies of important documents	52	51	53
List of emergency contact numbers	67	67	69
Plan for meeting special health needs <sup>4</sup>	66	66	62
<b>Precautionary measures</b>			
Wind-up or battery-operated radio	69 **	66	58
Alternate heat source	46	51	48
Back-up generator	20 *	30	23
Alternate water source	47 *	56	43
Other <sup>5</sup>	28 **	25	21
<b>Fire safety measures</b>			
Working smoke detector	98	98	98
Working carbon monoxide detector	35 **	35	60
Working fire extinguisher	73 **	72	66

\* significantly different from provincial level estimate (p < 0.05)

\*\* significantly different from Canada level estimate (p < 0.05)

\*\*\* significantly different from both provincial and Canada level estimates (p < 0.05)

1 Percentage based only on those indicating that they have an emergency exit plan.

2 Excludes Canadians living in single-person households.

3 Excludes those who reported that they lived in a household that did not have a vehicle.

4 Percentage based only on those indicating that they or someone in their household has special medical needs.

5 'Other precautionary measures' include having an escape/rescue plan for pets, extra supply of fuel, checking and replenishing emergency supplies, and keeping exits clear.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

**Table 1.4**  
**High or moderately high levels of emergency planning, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents, by social and political involvement, community of Fredericton, New Brunswick, 2014**

Social and political involvement	Percentage of residents who had high or moderately high levels of...		
	Planning activities	Precautionary measures	Fire safety measures
	percent		
<b>Engagement in political activities <sup>1</sup></b>			
Yes <sup>†</sup>	51	27	28
No <sup>7 8</sup>	31 <sup>E *</sup>	36 <sup>E</sup>	21 <sup>E</sup>
<b>High level of civic engagement <sup>2</sup></b>			
Yes <sup>†</sup>	51	28	32
No <sup>8</sup>	41	28	21 <sup>E *</sup>
<b>High level of social support <sup>3</sup></b>			
Yes <sup>†</sup>	51	41	26 <sup>E</sup>
No <sup>8</sup>	44	25 <sup>*</sup>	27
<b>Strong sense of belonging to community <sup>4</sup></b>			
Yes <sup>8 †</sup>	50	32	23
No	41	24	32
<b>High neighbourhood trust <sup>5</sup></b>			
Yes <sup>†</sup>	49	33	25
No <sup>8</sup>	43	24	27
<b>High level of self-efficacy <sup>6</sup></b>			
Yes <sup>†</sup>	51	30	30
No <sup>8</sup>	41	27	21

<sup>E</sup> use with caution

\* significantly different from reference category ( $p < 0.05$ )

† reference category

- 1 Includes individuals over the age of 17 years who are eligible to vote, and who have participated in or volunteered for political parties or events in the past 12 months, including municipal, provincial, or federal elections, or expressed views on political or social issues through signing a petition, contacting news agencies or politicians, or attended a meeting involving social or community issues.
- 2 Civic engagement measures individuals over the age of 17 years who were involved in a recreational group or organization in the past 12 months, and includes engagement in political activities. A 'high level' is defined as having been involved in at least 4 activities in the past 12 months.
- 3 A 'high level of social support' is defined as having five or more people whom that individual could turn to for help in an emergency if they are physically injured, require emotional support, shelter, and/or financial assistance.
- 4 A 'strong sense of belonging to community' is rating one's own sense of belonging to their community as a 4 or a 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "very weak" and 5 "very strong".
- 5 'High neighbourhood trust' is rating one's own trust in the people in one's neighbourhood as 4 or 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "cannot be trusted at all" and 5 represents "can be trusted a lot", as well as having a response of "very likely" when asked about the likelihood of someone in their neighbourhood returning a lost wallet or purse containing two hundred dollars with the money still inside.
- 6 A 'high level of self-efficacy' is derived from having a high self-rating on a scale of 1 (poor) to 5 (excellent) for the following three categories: an ability to think clearly and solve day-to-day problems, to handle unexpected and difficult problems, and to figure out what to do if faced with an emergency situation.
- 7 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Planning activities'.
- 8 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Fire safety measures'.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents. Households with 'moderately high' or 'high' levels of emergency planning engaged in 3 or 4 of the following: having an exit plan, an emergency supply kit, extra copies of important documents and an emergency contact list. 'Moderately high' or 'high' levels of precautionary measures include having 3 or 4 of the following: a wind-up or battery operated radio, a back-up generator, an alternate source of heat and additional water. 'Moderately high' or 'high' levels of fire safety measure include having all 3 of the following: a working smoke detector, a working fire extinguisher, and a working carbon monoxide detector.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

## Notes

<sup>E</sup> use with caution

- 1 A Census Metropolitan Area (CMA) or a Census Agglomeration (CA) is formed by one or more adjacent municipalities centred on a population centre (known as the core). A CMA must have a total population of at least 100,000 of which 50,000 or more must live in the core. A CA must have a core population of at least 10,000. To be included in the CMA or CA, other adjacent municipalities must have a high degree of integration with the core as measured by commuting flows derived from census data.
- 2 The target population for the SEPR included all persons 15 years of age or older, residing in households in Canada's 10 provinces, excluding full-time residents of institutions (e.g. nursing homes, group homes, hospitals).
- 3 The SEPR covers three types of communities: Census Metropolitan Areas (CMAs), Census Agglomerations (CAs) with population greater than 50,000, and 'smaller communities' which include CAs with population 50,000 or less and those areas that fall outside of CMAs and CAs. All CMAs and CAs (with population greater than 50,000) were included in the SEPR. A sample of households were selected from smaller communities within each province to represent all households within the province in similar communities. Additional information on the SEPR and its sampling methodology can be found in the 'Survey description' section.
- 4 Throughout this fact sheet, responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.
- 5 This section focuses on personal experiences with emergencies or disasters that happened in Canada, in a community where the person was living at the time, and was significant enough to severely interrupt the individual's regular daily activities.



- 6 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% when respondents were asked about the source of information or assistance they received during or immediately following the emergency they experienced.
- 7 Emergency planning activities include: having an emergency exit plan, a household emergency supply kit, extra copies of important documents and an emergency contact list.
- 8 Precautionary measures include: having a wind-up or battery-operated radio, an alternate heat source such as a non-electric stove or heater or a wood-burning fireplace, a back-up generator and an alternative water source such as a well, tank or litres of stored water.
- 9 Unless otherwise specified, differences are statistically significant ( $p < 0.05$ ).
- 10 A 'strong sense of belonging to community' is rating one's own sense of belonging to their community as a 4 or a 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "very weak" and 5 "very strong".
- 11 A proportion (10%) of respondents were not asked questions regarding neighbourhood helpfulness in the event of an emergency and as such these cases are not included in the analysis on neighbourhood helpfulness in general or in the event of an emergency.



## Fact sheet Smaller communities of New Brunswick

---

In 2014, information on the emergency preparedness of people living in the 'smaller communities' of New Brunswick was collected through the Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada (SEPR).<sup>1 2 3</sup> This fact sheet presents information on the risk awareness and level of emergency preparedness of the residents of New Brunswick's smaller communities, which could help improve the understanding of community resilience in the event of an emergency.<sup>4</sup>

### **Risk awareness and anticipated sources of help in an emergency or disaster**

- Residents of smaller communities of New Brunswick anticipated winter storms (including blizzards, ice storms and extreme cold) (94%), extended power outages lasting 24 hours or longer (74%), and wildfires or forest fires (68%) as the events most likely to occur within their communities.
- The source of initial help that residents would turn to in an emergency depended on the type of emergency or disaster. In the event of a weather-related emergency or natural disaster, residents anticipated first turning to news on the radio (21%), while in the event of an extended power outage lasting 24 hours or longer, a utility company (71%) was most commonly reported as the place residents would turn to initially (Table 1.1). People commonly anticipated turning to the police first if rioting or civil unrest (46%), an act of terrorism or terrorist threat (36%<sup>E</sup>), or an industrial or transportation accident (22%) were to occur. In the event of an outbreak of a serious or life-threatening disease, residents of smaller communities of New Brunswick would commonly first turn to hospitals, clinics, doctors and other medical professionals (65%), while local government (32%) was commonly anticipated to be the initial source of help if faced with a contamination or shortage of water or food.

### **Prior lifetime experience with a major emergency or disaster<sup>5</sup>**

- About one in four (24%) residents of smaller communities of New Brunswick has experienced a major emergency or disaster in Canada in a community where they were living at the time. About three-quarters (76%) of those affected by a major emergency experienced severe disruptions to their daily activities as a result.
- Extended power outages lasting 24 hours or longer (35%) were the most common emergencies or disasters experienced, followed by winter storms (including blizzards and ice storms) (28%<sup>E</sup>) and floods (18%<sup>E</sup>).
- The most common types of disruption to daily activities endured by residents affected by emergencies included missing appointments or planned activities (53%), needing to drink bottled water or boil water for drinking (52%) and an inability to use electrical appliances (50%). Other severe impacts experienced were the inability to use roads or transportation within the community (33%<sup>E</sup>) and home evacuations (19%<sup>E</sup>).
- Approximately three out of four (76%) residents who endured major emergencies were able to resume their daily activities within one week of the event; just under half (46%) were able to resume activities within two days.
- Close to half (47%) of residents received help during or immediately following the emergency or disaster. Family members (27%<sup>E</sup>) were the most common source of assistance.
- For one-third (33%) of residents of New Brunswick's smaller communities who experienced a major emergency or disaster which was significant enough to disrupt their regular daily routines, the event resulted in loss of property or another financial impact.

### **Emergency planning, precautionary and fire safety behaviours**

- Three-quarters (75%) of residents of smaller communities of New Brunswick lived in households that were engaged in at least two emergency planning activities,<sup>6</sup> with half (50%) living in households with three or four such activities (Table 1.2). One in ten (10%) residents did not have any emergency planning activities in place in their homes.
- About seven in ten (69%) residents lived in households with at least two precautionary measures<sup>7</sup> taken in case of an emergency. Among them were those who had three or four such measures, representing 42% of residents of smaller communities of New Brunswick. Less than one in ten (7%<sup>E</sup>) people lived in a household with no precautionary measures in place.
- A majority (98%) of residents reported living in households with a working smoke detector and 74% reported living in households with a working fire extinguisher (Table 1.3). About one in three (34%) stated that they had a working carbon monoxide detector in their household. Just over one-quarter (27%) of residents stated that they had implemented all three fire safety measures within their households.
- The number of fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents of smaller communities in New Brunswick often differed from residents of the province overall and Canada's 10 provinces. For example, the proportion of residents of the smaller communities of New Brunswick who had not engaged in any precautionary measures (7%<sup>E</sup>) was significantly lower than both the provincial proportion (10%) and the national proportion (16%). In addition, the proportion of residents who had all three fire safety measures in place (27%) was significantly lower than the overall national proportion (42%).<sup>8</sup>
- The types of activities and measures residents of smaller communities of New Brunswick engaged in also differed from residents of the province in general and from residents of Canada. For example, the proportions of those who had a back-up generator (36%) or an alternate water source (60%) within the smaller communities were significantly higher than those for New Brunswick in general (30% and 56%, respectively) and Canada overall (23% and 43%, respectively). Conversely, the proportion of people within the smaller communities who had a working carbon monoxide detector (34%) was significantly lower than the proportion for Canadians overall (60%).

## Social networks and sense of belonging

- Two out of three (67%) people in New Brunswick's smaller communities had a strong sense of belonging<sup>9</sup> to their community.
- Most (91%) residents believed the neighbourhood they lived in was a place where neighbours generally help each other.<sup>10</sup> Of those who did not describe their neighbourhood this way, the majority (82%) still characterized it as a place where neighbours would help each other in an emergency.<sup>11</sup>
- Approximately two-thirds of residents had a large network of support in the event of an emergency or disaster, with more than five people to turn to for emotional support (68%), for help if physically injured (66%), or in case of a home evacuation (65%). About a quarter had more than five people they could turn to if financial help was needed (26%). However, 9% reported that they had no one to turn to for financial help.
- High levels of social support, as well as neighbourhood trust and self-efficacy were often associated with a higher level of emergency preparedness (Table 1.4).

## Data tables

**Table 1.1**

**Most commonly anticipated sources of initial help and information, by type of emergency or disaster, residents of smaller communities of New Brunswick, 2014**

Most common sources of initial help and information by type of emergency or disaster	percent
<b>Weather-related emergency or natural disaster<sup>1</sup></b>	
News- Radio	21
911	18
News- Internet	16
<b>Extended power outages</b>	
Utility company	71

News- Radio	9 <sup>E</sup>
Local government	8 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Outbreak of serious or life-threatening disease</b>	
Hospital, clinic, doctor or other medical professional	65
News- Radio	10 <sup>E</sup>
News- Television	9 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Industrial or transportation accident</b>	
Police/law enforcement	22
911	21
News- Radio	13 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Contamination or shortage of water or food <sup>2</sup></b>	
Local government	32
Provincial government	11 <sup>E</sup>
Hospital, clinic, doctor or other medical professional	9 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Act of terrorism or terrorist threat</b>	
Police/law enforcement	36 <sup>E</sup>
911	30 <sup>E</sup>
News- Radio	17 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Rioting or civil unrest</b>	
Police/law enforcement	46
911	24 <sup>E</sup>
News- Television	15 <sup>E</sup>
<sup>E</sup> use with caution	
1 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% when respondents were asked about their likely sources of initial help and information.	
2 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were equal to 11% for sources of initial help and information.	
<b>Note:</b> Respondents who perceived their community was at risk for any form of emergency or disaster were then asked where they would turn to first for information or assistance in the event of the perceived emergency or disaster. Respondents could provide more than one response. Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.	
<b>Source:</b> Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.	

**Table 1.2**  
**Number of emergency planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents, smaller communities of New Brunswick, 2014**

Number of planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents	Smaller communities of New Brunswick	New Brunswick	Canada
	percent		
<b>Number of emergency planning activities</b>			
None	10	10	8
1 activity	13 **	15	17
2 activities	25	27	25
3 activities	29	28	27
4 activities	21	19	19
<b>Number of precautionary measures</b>			
None	7 <sup>E</sup> ***	10	16
1 measure	23	24	27
2 measures	27	28	28
3 measures	30 ***	26	20

4 measures	12 **	11	7
<b>Number of fire safety measures <sup>1</sup></b>			
None	F	1 <sup>E</sup>	1
1 measure	16	17	14
2 measures	53 ***	50	38
3 measures	27 **	27	42
<sup>E</sup> use with caution <sup>F</sup> too unreliable to be published ** significantly different from Canada level estimate (p < 0.05) *** significantly different from both provincial and Canada level estimates (p < 0.05) <sup>1</sup> Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Canada'.  <b>Note:</b> Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents. Emergency planning activities include: an emergency exit plan, an emergency supply kit, photocopies/electronic copies of important documents and a list of emergency contact numbers. Precautionary measures include: a battery-operated or wind-up radio, an alternative heat source, a back-up generator and an alternative water source. Fire safety measures include a working smoke detector, a working carbon monoxide detector and a working fire extinguisher. <b>Source:</b> Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.			

**Table 1.3**  
**Planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures residents engaged in, smaller communities of New Brunswick, 2014**

Residents whose households were involved in the following:	Smaller communities of New Brunswick	New Brunswick	Canada
	percent		
<b>Emergency planning activities</b>			
Emergency exit plan	66 **	65	60
Exit plan has been practised/reviewed in last 12 months <sup>1</sup>	46	46	46
Designated meeting place for household members <sup>2</sup>	41 **	38	33
Contact plan for household members <sup>2</sup>	54	53	55
Household emergency supply kit	51	48	47
Vehicle emergency supply kit <sup>3</sup>	56 *	61	59
Extra copies of important documents	51	51	53
List of emergency contact numbers	68	67	69
Plan for meeting special health needs <sup>4</sup>	68	66	62
<b>Precautionary measures</b>			
Wind-up or battery-operated radio	64 **	66	58
Alternate heat source	56 ***	51	48
Back-up generator	36 ***	30	23
Alternate water source	60 ***	56	43
Other <sup>5</sup>	23	25	21
<b>Fire safety measures</b>			
Working smoke detector	98	98	98
Working carbon monoxide detector	34 **	35	60
Working fire extinguisher	74 **	72	66

\* significantly different from provincial level estimate (p < 0.05)

\*\* significantly different from Canada level estimate (p < 0.05)

\*\*\* significantly different from both provincial and Canada level estimates (p < 0.05)

1 Percentage based only on those indicating that they have an emergency exit plan.

2 Excludes Canadians living in single-person households.

3 Excludes those who reported that they lived in a household that did not have a vehicle.

4 Percentage based only on those indicating that they or someone in their household has special medical needs.

5 'Other precautionary measures' include having an escape/rescue plan for pets, extra supply of fuel, checking and replenishing emergency supplies, and keeping exits clear.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

**Table 1.4**

**High or moderately high levels of emergency planning, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents, by social and political involvement, smaller communities of New Brunswick, 2014**

Social and political involvement	Percentage of residents who had high or moderately high levels of...		
	Planning activities	Precautionary measures	Fire safety measures
	percent		
<b>Engagement in political activities <sup>1</sup></b>			
Yes †	48	42	27
No <sup>7</sup>	56	42 <sup>E</sup>	24 <sup>E</sup>
<b>High level of civic engagement <sup>2</sup></b>			
Yes †	50	44	29
No	49	38	23
<b>High level of social support <sup>3</sup></b>			
Yes †	60	55	29 <sup>E</sup>
No	46 *	38 *	26
<b>Strong sense of belonging to community <sup>4</sup></b>			
Yes †	53	44	29
No <sup>7</sup>	42	36	21 <sup>E</sup>
<b>High neighbourhood trust <sup>5</sup></b>			
Yes †	49	51	27
No	50	33 *	26
<b>High level of self-efficacy <sup>6</sup></b>			
Yes †	58	49	33
No	43 *	36 *	22 *

<sup>E</sup> use with caution

\* significantly different from reference category ( $p < 0.05$ )

† reference category

- 1 Includes individuals over the age of 17 years who are eligible to vote, and who have participated in or volunteered for political parties or events in the past 12 months, including municipal, provincial, or federal elections, or expressed views on political or social issues through signing a petition, contacting news agencies or politicians, or attended a meeting involving social or community issues.
- 2 Civic engagement measures individuals over the age of 17 years who were involved in a recreational group or organization in the past 12 months, and includes engagement in political activities. A 'high level' is defined as having been involved in at least 4 activities in the past 12 months.
- 3 A 'high level of social support' is defined as having five or more people whom that individual could turn to for help in an emergency if they are physically injured, require emotional support, shelter, and/or financial assistance.
- 4 A 'strong sense of belonging to community' is rating one's own sense of belonging to their community as a 4 or a 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "very weak" and 5 "very strong".
- 5 'High neighbourhood trust' is rating one's own trust in the people in one's neighbourhood as 4 or 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "cannot be trusted at all" and 5 represents "can be trusted a lot", as well as having a response of "very likely" when asked about the likelihood of someone in their neighbourhood returning a lost wallet or purse containing two hundred dollars with the money still inside.
- 6 A 'high level of self-efficacy' is derived from having a high self-rating on a scale of 1 (poor) to 5 (excellent) for the following three categories: an ability to think clearly and solve day-to-day problems, to handle unexpected and difficult problems, and to figure out what to do if faced with an emergency situation.
- 7 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Fire safety measures'.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents. Households with 'moderately high' or 'high' levels of emergency planning engaged in 3 or 4 of the following: having an exit plan, an emergency supply kit, extra copies of important documents and an emergency contact list. 'Moderately high' or 'high' levels of precautionary measures include having 3 or 4 of the following: a wind-up or battery operated radio, a back-up generator, an alternate source of heat and additional water. 'Moderately high' or 'high' levels of fire safety measure include having all 3 of the following: a working smoke detector, a working fire extinguisher, and a working carbon monoxide detector.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

## Notes

<sup>E</sup> use with caution

- 1 The SEPR covers three types of communities: Census Metropolitan Areas (CMAs), Census Agglomerations (CAs) with population greater than 50,000, and 'smaller communities' which include CAs with population 50,000 or less and those areas that fall outside of CMAs and CAs. All CMAs and CAs (with population greater than 50,000) were included in the SEPR. A sample of households were selected from smaller communities within each province to represent all households within the province in similar communities. Additional information on the SEPR and its sampling methodology can be found in the 'Survey description' section.
- 2 A Census Metropolitan Area (CMA) or a Census Agglomeration (CA) is formed by one or more adjacent municipalities centred on a population centre (known as the core). A CMA must have a total population of at least 100,000 of which 50,000 or more must live in the core. A CA must have a core population of at least 10,000. To be included in the CMA or CA, other adjacent municipalities must have a high degree of integration with the core as measured by commuting flows derived from census data.
- 3 The target population for the SEPR included all persons 15 years of age or older, residing in households in Canada's 10 provinces, excluding full-time residents of institutions (e.g., nursing homes, group homes, hospitals).
- 4 Throughout this fact sheet, responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.
- 5 This section focuses on personal experiences with emergencies or disasters that happened in Canada, in a community where the person was living at the time, and was significant enough to severely interrupt the individual's regular daily activities.

- 6 Emergency planning activities include: having an emergency exit plan, a household emergency supply kit, extra copies of important documents and an emergency contact list.
- 7 Precautionary measures include: having a wind-up or battery-operated radio, an alternate heat source such as a non-electric stove or heater or a wood-burning fireplace, a back-up generator and an alternative water source such as a well, tank or litres of stored water.
- 8 Unless otherwise specified, differences are statistically significant ( $p < 0.05$ ).
- 9 A 'strong sense of belonging to community' is rating one's own sense of belonging to their community as a 4 or a 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "very weak" and 5 "very strong".
- 10 A proportion (9%) of respondents were not asked questions regarding neighbourhood helpfulness in the event of an emergency and as such these cases are not included in the analysis on neighbourhood helpfulness in general or in the event of an emergency.
- 11 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were equal to 9% when respondents were asked about whether their neighbourhood is a place where neighbours would help each other if there is an emergency.





## Fact sheet Community of Rimouski (CA), Quebec

---

In 2014, information on the emergency preparedness of people living in the Census Agglomeration<sup>1</sup> of Rimouski was collected through the Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada (SEPR).<sup>2</sup> This fact sheet presents information on the risk awareness and level of emergency preparedness of the residents of Rimouski, which could help improve the understanding of community resilience in the event of an emergency.<sup>3,4</sup>

### **Risk awareness and anticipated sources of help in an emergency or disaster**

- Winter storms (including blizzards, ice storms and extreme cold) (93%), extended power outages lasting 24 hours or longer (79%) and industrial or transportation accidents (67%) were named by residents of Rimouski as the most likely events to occur within their community.
- Rimouski residents anticipated turning to the police as an initial source for help and information if they were faced with rioting or civil unrest (61%), an act of terrorism or terrorist threat (45%), an industrial or transportation accident (32%) or a weather-related emergency or natural disaster (25%) (Table 1.1).
- Residents also stated (69%) that hospitals, clinics, doctors and other medical professionals were the most common sources of initial help and information in the event of an outbreak of a serious or life-threatening disease. In the event of an extended power outage, residents anticipated first turning to their utility company (54%), and in the event of a contamination or shortage of water or food, they would first turn to their local government (48%).

### **Prior lifetime experience with a major emergency or disaster<sup>5</sup>**

- Approximately one in five (21%) Rimouski residents has faced a major emergency or disaster within Canada in a community they were living in at the time of the event, more than half (58%) of whom reported experiencing severe disruptions to their daily activities as a result of the event.
- Winter storms which include blizzards and ice storms (47%) and extended power outages lasting 24 hours or longer (21%<sup>E</sup>) were the most commonly experienced emergencies or disasters by residents of Rimouski.
- The most common types of disruption to daily activities endured by residents who had experienced a major emergency or disaster included missing work or school (65%) and an inability to use electrical appliances (54%<sup>E</sup>).<sup>6</sup> More severe disruptions were home evacuations experienced by two out of five (41%<sup>E</sup>) people faced with an emergency, as well as an inability to use roads or transportation within the community experienced by one-quarter (25%<sup>E</sup>) of Rimouski residents faced with an emergency.
- Three out of five (60%) residents who experienced an emergency or disaster were able to resume their daily activities within one week of the event.
- More than half (57%) of residents who had experienced an emergency or disaster received help during or immediately following the event, most commonly from a family member (43%<sup>E</sup>).
- Half (50%<sup>E</sup>) of residents of Rimouski who experienced major emergencies or disasters in Canada in a community where they were living at the time of the event and which were significant enough to disrupt their regular daily routine also endured a loss of property or financial impact.<sup>7</sup>

### **Emergency planning, precautionary and fire safety behaviours**

- Three out of five (59%) people residing in Rimouski lived in households that were engaged in at least two emergency planning activities.<sup>8</sup> Among them were those who had three or four such activities, representing 36% of Rimouski's residents (Table 1.2). More than one in ten (13%) people lived in a household that had not participated in any emergency planning activities.
- About half (53%) of residents lived in a household with at least two precautionary measures<sup>9</sup> taken in case of an emergency, and about one-quarter (23%) lived in a household with three or four such measures. Close to one in five (18%) people lived in a household with no precautionary measures in place.
- The majority (98%) of residents reported living in a household with a working smoke detector, and three-quarters (74%) reported living in a household with a working fire extinguisher (Table 1.3). One out of three (34%) residents stated that they had a working carbon monoxide detector in their household. However, less than one-third (30%) of the residents of Rimouski stated that they had implemented all three fire safety measures within their households.
- Generally, the number of emergency planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents of Rimouski did not significantly differ from Quebec residents overall, however, there were some significant differences when compared to residents of Canada's 10 provinces. For example, the proportion of Rimouski residents who had all four emergency planning activities (12%) and those who had all three fire safety measures (30%) set in place in the event of an emergency were significantly lower than for residents of Canada (19% and 42%, respectively).<sup>10</sup>
- There were some differences in the types of activities and measures set in place by residents of Rimouski when compared to Canada. For example, the proportion of Rimouski residents who had an emergency exit plan (44%), a back-up generator (17%) and a working carbon monoxide detector (34%) within their households was significantly lower than for Canada overall (60%, 23% and 60%, respectively). However, the proportion of Rimouski residents who had a working fire extinguisher (74%) was significantly higher than the proportion of Canadians (66%).

## Social networks and sense of belonging

- More than (56%) half of Rimouski's residents had a strong sense of belonging<sup>11</sup> to their community.
- Most (83%) residents described the neighbourhood they lived in as a place where neighbours generally help each other.<sup>12</sup> Of those who did not describe their neighbourhood this way, most (83%) still described it as a place where neighbours would help each other in an emergency.
- Many individuals had a large network of support in the event of an emergency or disaster, with more than five people to turn to for emotional support (60%), for help if physically injured (52%) as well as in case of a home evacuation (50%). However, only about one in seven residents had such a large support network if financial help was needed (15%), and 9%<sup>E</sup> reported that they had no one to turn to for financial help.<sup>13</sup>
- High levels of sense of belonging, self-efficacy and neighbourhood trust, social support as well as civic engagement and involvement in political activities did not have a significant impact on the level of emergency preparedness for residents of Rimouski (Table 1.4).

## Data tables

**Table 1.1**

**Most commonly anticipated sources of initial help and information, by type of emergency or disaster, residents of Rimouski, Quebec, 2014**

Most common sources of initial help and information by type of emergency or disaster	percent
<b>Weather-related emergency or natural disaster</b>	
Police/law enforcement	25
911	25
Local government	24
<b>Extended power outages</b>	
Utility company	54
Family	14 <sup>E</sup>
Local government	10 <sup>E</sup>

<b>Outbreak of serious or life-threatening disease</b>		
Hospital, clinic, doctor or other medical professional		69
911		11 <sup>E</sup>
Family		7 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Industrial or transportation accident</b>		
Police/law enforcement		32
911		30
Local government		18
<b>Contamination or shortage of water or food</b>		
Local government		48
Hospital, clinic, doctor or other medical professional		15 <sup>E</sup>
Police/law enforcement		9 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Act of terrorism or terrorist threat</b>		
Police/law enforcement		45
911		26 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Rioting or civil unrest</b>		
Police/law enforcement		61
911		21 <sup>E</sup>
News- Television		10 <sup>E</sup>
<sup>E</sup> use with caution <b>Note:</b> Respondents who perceived their community was at risk for any form of emergency or disaster were then asked where they would turn to first for information or assistance in the event of the perceived emergency or disaster. Respondents could provide more than one response. Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents. <b>Source:</b> Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.		

**Table 1.2**  
**Number of emergency planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents, community of Rimouski, Quebec, 2014**

Number of planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents	Rimouski	Quebec	Canada
	percent		
<b>Number of emergency planning activities</b>			
None	13 **	10	8
1 activity	24 **	22	17
2 activities	23	26	25
3 activities	24	26	27
4 activities	12 **	14	19
<b>Number of precautionary measures</b>			
None	18	17	16
1 measure	25	29	27
2 measures	30	28	28
3 measures	17	17	20
4 measures	6 <sup>E</sup>	8	7
<b>Number of fire safety measures <sup>1 2 3</sup></b>			
None	F	F	1
1 measure	19 ***	24	14
2 measures	44 **	42	38
3 measures	30 **	28	42

<sup>E</sup> use with caution  
<sup>F</sup> too unreliable to be published

\*\* significantly different from Canada level estimate (p < 0.05)

\*\*\* significantly different from both provincial and Canada level estimates (p < 0.05)

1 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Canada'.

2 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Quebec'.

3 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Rimouski'.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents. Emergency planning activities include: an emergency exit plan, an emergency supply kit, photocopies/electronic copies of important documents and a list of emergency contact numbers. Precautionary measures include: a battery-operated or wind-up radio, an alternative heat source, a back-up generator and an alternative water source. Fire safety measures include a working smoke detector, a working carbon monoxide detector and a working fire extinguisher.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

**Table 1.3**  
**Planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures residents engaged in, community of Rimouski, Quebec, 2014**

Residents whose households were involved in the following:	Rimouski	Quebec	Canada
	percent		
<b>Emergency planning activities</b>			
Emergency exit plan	44 **	46	60
Exit plan has been practised/reviewed in last 12 months <sup>1</sup>	41	40	46
Designated meeting place for household members <sup>2</sup>	35	34	33
Contact plan for household members <sup>2</sup>	48	51	55
Household emergency supply kit	45	47	47
Vehicle emergency supply kit <sup>3</sup>	49 **	46	59
Extra copies of important documents	45 **	47	53
List of emergency contact numbers	62 ***	68	69
Plan for meeting special health needs <sup>4</sup>	69	61	62
<b>Precautionary measures</b>			
Wind-up or battery-operated radio	59	58	58
Alternate heat source	50	48	48
Back-up generator	17 ***	22	23
Alternate water source	38	38	43
Other <sup>5</sup>	18	20	21
<b>Fire safety measures</b>			
Working smoke detector	98	98	98
Working carbon monoxide detector <sup>6</sup>	34 **	34	60
Working fire extinguisher	74 ***	67	66

\*\* significantly different from Canada level estimate (p < 0.05)

\*\*\* significantly different from both provincial and Canada level estimates (p < 0.05)

1 Percentage based only on those indicating that they have an emergency exit plan.

2 Excludes Canadians living in single-person households.

3 Excludes those who reported that they lived in a household that did not have a vehicle.

4 Percentage based only on those indicating that they or someone in their household has special medical needs.

5 'Other precautionary measures' include having an escape/rescue plan for pets, extra supply of fuel, checking and replenishing emergency supplies, and keeping exits clear.

6 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for Rimouski.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

**Table 1.4**  
**High or moderately high levels of emergency planning, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents, by social and political involvement, community of Rimouski, Quebec, 2014**

Social and political involvement	Percentage of residents who had high or moderately high levels of...		
	Planning activities	Precautionary measures	Fire safety measures
	percent		
<b>Engagement in political activities <sup>1</sup></b>			
Yes <sup>7 †</sup>	37	21	30
No	30 <sup>E</sup>	36 <sup>E</sup>	F
<b>High level of civic engagement <sup>2</sup></b>			
Yes <sup>7 †</sup>	40	22	33
No	29	24 <sup>E</sup>	24 <sup>E</sup>
<b>High level of social support <sup>3</sup></b>			
Yes <sup>†</sup>	47 <sup>E</sup>	35 <sup>E</sup>	27 <sup>E</sup>
No <sup>7</sup>	36	22	30
<b>Strong sense of belonging to community <sup>4</sup></b>			
Yes <sup>†</sup>	38	25	29
No <sup>7</sup>	35	21 <sup>E</sup>	31
<b>High neighbourhood trust <sup>5</sup></b>			
Yes <sup>7 †</sup>	37	29	37
No <sup>7</sup>	38	20	26
<b>High level of self-efficacy <sup>6</sup></b>			
Yes <sup>†</sup>	40	24 <sup>E</sup>	34
No <sup>7</sup>	35	23	27

<sup>E</sup> use with caution  
F too unreliable to be published

<sup>t</sup> reference category

- 1 Includes individuals over the age of 17 years who are eligible to vote, and who have participated in or volunteered for political parties or events in the past 12 months, including municipal, provincial, or federal elections, or expressed views on political or social issues through signing a petition, contacting news agencies or politicians, or attended a meeting involving social or community issues.
- 2 Civic engagement measures individuals over the age of 17 years who were involved in a recreational group or organization in the past 12 months, and includes engagement in political activities. A 'high level' is defined as having been involved in at least 4 activities in the past 12 months.
- 3 A 'high level of social support' is defined as having five or more people whom that individual could turn to for help in an emergency if they are physically injured, require emotional support, shelter, and/or financial assistance.
- 4 A 'strong sense of belonging to community' is rating one's own sense of belonging to their community as a 4 or a 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "very weak" and 5 "very strong".
- 5 'High neighbourhood trust' is rating one's own trust in the people in one's neighbourhood as 4 or 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "cannot be trusted at all" and 5 represents "can be trusted a lot", as well as having a response of "very likely" when asked about the likelihood of someone in their neighbourhood returning a lost wallet or purse containing two hundred dollars with the money still inside.
- 6 A 'high level of self-efficacy' is derived from having a high self-rating on a scale of 1 (poor) to 5 (excellent) for the following three categories: an ability to think clearly and solve day-to-day problems, to handle unexpected and difficult problems, and to figure out what to do if faced with an emergency situation.
- 7 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Fire safety measures'.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents. Households with 'moderately high' or 'high' levels of emergency planning engaged in 3 or 4 of the following: having an exit plan, an emergency supply kit, extra copies of important documents and an emergency contact list. 'Moderately high' or 'high' levels of precautionary measures include having 3 or 4 of the following: a wind-up or battery operated radio, a back-up generator, an alternate source of heat and additional water. 'Moderately high' or 'high' levels of fire safety measure include having all 3 of the following: a working smoke detector, a working fire extinguisher, and a working carbon monoxide detector.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

## Notes

<sup>E</sup> use with caution

- 1 A Census Metropolitan Area (CMA) or a Census Agglomeration (CA) is formed by one or more adjacent municipalities centred on a population centre (known as the core). A CMA must have a total population of at least 100,000 of which 50,000 or more must live in the core. A CA must have a core population of at least 10,000. To be included in the CMA or CA, other adjacent municipalities must have a high degree of integration with the core as measured by commuting flows derived from census data.
- 2 The target population for the SEPR included all persons 15 years of age or older, residing in households in Canada's 10 provinces, excluding full-time residents of institutions (e.g., nursing homes, group homes, hospitals).
- 3 The SEPR covers three types of communities: Census Metropolitan Areas (CMAs), Census Agglomerations (CAs) with population greater than 50,000, and 'smaller communities' which include CAs with population 50,000 or less and those areas that fall outside of CMAs and CAs. All CMAs and CAs (with population greater than 50,000) were included in the SEPR. A sample of households were selected from smaller communities within each province to represent all households within the province in similar communities. Additional information on the SEPR and its sampling methodology can be found in the 'Survey description' section.
- 4 Throughout this fact sheet, responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.
- 5 This section focuses on personal experiences with emergencies or disasters that happened in Canada, in a community where the person was living at the time, and was significant enough to severely interrupt the individual's regular daily activities.
- 6 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% when respondents were asked about whether the emergency they experienced had an impact on their ability to use electrical appliances.

- 7 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% when respondents were asked about whether the emergency they experienced caused them to suffer loss of property or financial impacts.
- 8 Emergency planning activities include: having an emergency exit plan, a household emergency supply kit, extra copies of important documents and an emergency contact list.
- 9 Precautionary measures include: having a wind-up or battery-operated radio, an alternate heat source such as a non-electric stove or heater or a wood-burning fireplace, a back-up generator and an alternative water source such as a well, tank or litres of stored water.
- 10 Unless otherwise specified, differences are statistically significant ( $p < 0.05$ ).
- 11 A 'strong sense of belonging to community' is rating one's own sense of belonging to their community as a 4 or a 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "very weak" and 5 "very strong".
- 12 A proportion (16%) of respondents were not asked questions regarding neighbourhood helpfulness in the event of an emergency and as such these cases are not included in the analysis on neighbourhood helpfulness in general or in the event of an emergency.
- 13 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% when respondents were asked about the number of people they could turn to for help if financial support is needed.



## Fact sheet Community of Saguenay (CMA), Quebec

---

In 2014, information on the emergency preparedness of people living in the Census Metropolitan Area<sup>1</sup> of Saguenay was collected through the Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada (SEPR).<sup>2</sup> This fact sheet presents information on the risk awareness and level of emergency preparedness of the residents of Saguenay, which could help improve the understanding of community resilience in the event of an emergency.<sup>3,4</sup>

### Risk awareness and anticipated sources of help in an emergency or disaster

- People living in Saguenay anticipated winter storms (including blizzards, ice storms and extreme cold) (91%), earthquakes (81%) and extended power outages lasting 24 hours or longer (79%) to be the most likely events to occur within their community. Forest fires or wildfires (78%), floods (75%) as well as industrial or transportation accidents (70%) were also among the events residents believed were likely to occur in their community.
- Residents anticipated turning to the police as an initial source for help and information if they were faced with rioting or civil unrest (55%), an act of terrorism or terrorist threat (43%) or an industrial or transportation accident (34%) (Table 1.1). In the event of a contamination or shortage of water or food (59%) or a weather-related emergency or natural disaster (31%) residents of Saguenay anticipated first turning to local government for help and information. Hospitals, clinics, doctors and other medical professionals (69%) were the most common sources of initial help and information in the event of an outbreak of a serious or life-threatening disease, and in the event of an extended power outage, utility companies (59%) were most commonly anticipated to be the first source of help and information for residents of Saguenay.

### Prior lifetime experience with a major emergency or disaster<sup>5</sup>

- Nearly two-thirds (63%) of residents of Saguenay have experienced a major emergency or disaster within Canada in a community where they were living at the time. Close to seven in ten (68%) of those who had experienced an emergency were faced with severe disruptions to their daily activities as a result.
- Floods were the most common type of emergency or disaster experienced (82%), followed by earthquakes (16%) which were not very common.
- Residents affected by a major emergency or disaster often had to boil drinking water or drink bottled water (55%),<sup>6</sup> had to miss school or work (48%), were unable to use roads or transportation within their community (47%) or had to miss an appointment or a planned activity (47%). Two out of five people needed to evacuate their home (42%) and a quarter were unable to communicate with others outside their home (25%).
- About half (46%) of residents of Saguenay who had experienced a major emergency or disaster were able to resume their daily activities within one week of the event: 7%<sup>E</sup> within 24 hours, 10%<sup>E</sup> within one to two days, 16%<sup>E</sup> within three to five days, and 13%<sup>E</sup> within six to seven days.
- About two-thirds (63%) of residents who had experienced an emergency or disaster received help either during or immediately following the event. Family members (43%), local government (22%<sup>E</sup>) and not-for-profit or charitable organizations (21%<sup>E</sup>) were the most common sources of assistance.
- Three out of ten (29%) residents of Saguenay who experienced major emergencies or disasters that were significant enough to disrupt their regular daily routines also endured a loss of property or financial impact. Additionally, one in seven (15%<sup>E</sup>) experienced emotional or psychological impacts as a result of the event they experienced.



## Emergency planning, precautionary and fire safety behaviours

- Three out of five (60%) residents of Saguenay lived in households that were engaged in at least two emergency planning activities,<sup>7</sup> with more than one-third (35%) living in a household with three or four such activities (Table 1.2). More than one in ten (13%) people lived in a household that had not participated in any emergency planning activities.
- About half (52%) of residents lived in a household with at least two precautionary measures<sup>8</sup> taken in case of an emergency, with one-quarter (24%) living in a household with three or four such measures. About one in six (16%) people lived in a household with no precautionary measures in place.
- Almost all (99%) residents reported living in a household with a working smoke detector (Table 1.3). About seven in ten (72%) people reported that they had a working fire extinguisher and less than a third (31%) stated that they had a working carbon monoxide detector in their home. One in four (25%) residents in Saguenay reported that they had all three fire safety measures within their households.
- The number of emergency planning activities and fire safety measures taken by residents of Saguenay were not all that different from the behaviours of the province in general, but often differed from the behaviours of Canadians residing in the 10 provinces. Some of these differences include the proportion of residents of Saguenay who were engaged in all four emergency planning activities (13%) and all three fire safety measures (25%), which were both significantly lower than overall Canadian proportions (19% and 42%, respectively).<sup>9</sup>
- Residents of Saguenay, however, were more likely to have a wind-up or battery-operated radio (64%) when compared to both residents of Quebec as whole as well as to residents of Canada overall (58% each). Contrarily, having an alternate water source was less likely among residents of Saguenay (31%) than among residents of the province as a whole (38%) and Canadians in general (43%).

## Social networks and sense of belonging

- About half (52%) of Saguenay's residents had a strong sense of belonging<sup>10</sup> to their community.
- Most (85%) residents described the neighbourhood they lived in as a place where neighbours generally help each other.<sup>11</sup> Of those who did not describe their neighbourhood this way, most (83%) still described it as a place where neighbours would help each other in an emergency.<sup>12</sup>
- Many residents had a large network of support in the event of an emergency or disaster, with more than five people to turn to for emotional support (58%), for help if physically injured (54%) as well as in case of a home evacuation (53%). However, only 18% of residents had such a large network of support if financial help was needed, and 10% reported they had no one to turn to if they needed financial help.<sup>13</sup>
- High levels of sense of belonging, self-efficacy and neighbourhood trust, social support as well as civic engagement and involvement in political activities were often associated with a higher level of emergency preparedness (Table 1.4).

## Data tables

Table 1.1

Most commonly anticipated sources of initial help and information, by type of emergency or disaster, residents of Saguenay, Quebec, 2014

Most common sources of initial help and information by type of emergency or disaster	percent
<b>Weather-related emergency or natural disaster</b>	
Local government	31
Police/law enforcement	29
911	19
<b>Extended power outages</b>	
Utility company	59
Local government	19
News- Radio	9 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Outbreak of serious or life-threatening disease</b>	

Hospital, clinic, doctor or other medical professional	69
911	7 <sup>E</sup>
News- Television	6 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Industrial or transportation accident</b>	
Police/law enforcement	34
911	26
Local government	20
<b>Contamination or shortage of water or food <sup>1</sup></b>	
Local government	59
Hospital, clinic, doctor or other medical professional	12 <sup>E</sup>
News- Television	6 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Act of terrorism or terrorist threat</b>	
Police/law enforcement	43
911	29
Local government	12 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Rioting or civil unrest</b>	
Police/law enforcement	55
911	19 <sup>E</sup>
News-Television	12 <sup>E</sup>
<sup>E</sup> use with caution	
1 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% when respondents were asked about their likely sources of initial help and information.	
<b>Note:</b> Respondents who perceived their community was at risk for any form of emergency or disaster were then asked where they would turn to first for information or assistance in the event of the perceived emergency or disaster. Respondents could provide more than one response. Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.	
<b>Source:</b> Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.	

**Table 1.2**  
**Number of emergency planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents, community of Saguenay, Quebec, 2014**

Number of planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents	Saguenay	Quebec	Canada
	percent		
<b>Number of emergency planning activities</b>			
None	13 **	10	8
1 activity	23 **	22	17
2 activities	25	26	25
3 activities	22 **	26	27
4 activities	13 **	14	19
<b>Number of precautionary measures</b>			
None	16	17	16
1 measure	31	29	27
2 measures	28	28	28
3 measures	17	17	20
4 measures	7 <sup>E</sup>	8	7
<b>Number of fire safety measures <sup>1 2</sup></b>			
None	F	F	1
1 measure	20 **	24	14

2 measures	50 ***	42	38
3 measures	25 **	28	42

E use with caution  
F too unreliable to be published

\*\* significantly different from Canada level estimate (p < 0.05)

\*\*\* significantly different from both provincial and Canada level estimates (p < 0.05)

1 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Canada'.

2 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Quebec'.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents. Emergency planning activities include: an emergency exit plan, an emergency supply kit, photocopies/electronic copies of important documents and a list of emergency contact numbers. Precautionary measures include: a battery-operated or wind-up radio, an alternate heat source, a back-up generator and an alternative water source. Fire safety measures include a working smoke detector, a working carbon monoxide detector and a working fire extinguisher.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

**Table 1.3**  
**Planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures residents engaged in, community of Saguenay, Quebec, 2014**

Residents whose households were involved in the following:	Saguenay	Quebec	Canada
	percent		
<b>Emergency planning activities</b>			
Emergency exit plan	42 **	46	60
Exit plan has been practised/reviewed in last 12 months <sup>1</sup>	43	40	46
Designated meeting place for household members <sup>2</sup>	35	34	33
Contact plan for household members <sup>2</sup>	49 **	51	55
Household emergency supply kit	49	47	47
Vehicle emergency supply kit <sup>3</sup>	47 **	46	59
Extra copies of important documents	42 **	47	53
List of emergency contact numbers	63 **	68	69
Plan for meeting special health needs <sup>4</sup>	59	61	62
<b>Precautionary measures</b>			
Wind-up or battery-operated radio	64 ***	58	58
Alternate heat source	47	48	48
Back-up generator	24	22	23
Alternate water source	31 ***	38	43
Other <sup>5</sup>	19	20	21
<b>Fire safety measures</b>			
Working smoke detector	99 **	98	98
Working carbon monoxide detector	31 **	34	60
Working fire extinguisher	72 **	67	66

\*\* significantly different from Canada level estimate (p < 0.05)

\*\*\* significantly different from both provincial and Canada level estimates (p < 0.05)

1 Percentage based only on those indicating that they have an emergency exit plan.

2 Excludes Canadians living in single-person households.

3 Excludes those who reported that they lived in a household that did not have a vehicle.

4 Percentage based only on those indicating that they or someone in their household has special medical needs.

5 'Other precautionary measures' include having an escape/rescue plan for pets, extra supply of fuel, checking and replenishing emergency supplies, and keeping exits clear.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

**Table 1.4**

**High or moderately high levels of emergency planning, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents, by social and political involvement, community of Saguenay, Quebec, 2014**

Social and political involvement	Percentage of residents who had high or moderately high levels of...		
	Planning activities	Precautionary measures	Fire safety measures
	percent		
<b>Engagement in political activities <sup>1</sup></b>			
Yes <sup>†</sup>	35	26	27
No <sup>7</sup>	31 <sup>E</sup>	14 <sup>E *</sup>	14 <sup>E *</sup>
<b>High level of civic engagement <sup>2</sup></b>			
Yes <sup>†</sup>	36	28	28
No <sup>8</sup>	34	17 <sup>E *</sup>	19 <sup>E *</sup>
<b>High level of social support <sup>3</sup></b>			
Yes <sup>†</sup>	47	38 <sup>E</sup>	36 <sup>E</sup>
No	32 <sup>*</sup>	20 <sup>*</sup>	23
<b>Strong sense of belonging to community <sup>4</sup></b>			
Yes <sup>†</sup>	42	26	25
No <sup>8</sup>	26 <sup>*</sup>	21	26
<b>High neighbourhood trust <sup>5</sup></b>			
Yes <sup>†</sup>	46	31	29
No <sup>8</sup>	28 <sup>*</sup>	20 <sup>*</sup>	23
<b>High level of self-efficacy <sup>6</sup></b>			
Yes <sup>†</sup>	49	36	29
No	24 <sup>*</sup>	16 <sup>*</sup>	23

<sup>E</sup> use with caution

\* significantly different from reference category ( $p < 0.05$ )

† reference category

- 1 Includes individuals over the age of 17 years who are eligible to vote, and who have participated in or volunteered for political parties or events in the past 12 months, including municipal, provincial, or federal elections, or expressed views on political or social issues through signing a petition, contacting news agencies or politicians, or attended a meeting involving social or community issues.
- 2 Civic engagement measures individuals over the age of 17 years who were involved in a recreational group or organization in the past 12 months, and includes engagement in political activities. A 'high level' is defined as having been involved in at least 4 activities in the past 12 months.
- 3 A 'high level of social support' is defined as having five or more people whom that individual could turn to for help in an emergency if they are physically injured, require emotional support, shelter, and/or financial assistance.
- 4 A 'strong sense of belonging to community' is rating one's own sense of belonging to their community as a 4 or a 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "very weak" and 5 "very strong".
- 5 'High neighbourhood trust' is rating one's own trust in the people in one's neighbourhood as 4 or 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "cannot be trusted at all" and 5 represents "can be trusted a lot", as well as having a response of "very likely" when asked about the likelihood of someone in their neighbourhood returning a lost wallet or purse containing two hundred dollars with the money still inside.
- 6 A 'high level of self-efficacy' is derived from having a high self-rating on a scale of 1 (poor) to 5 (excellent) for the following three categories: an ability to think clearly and solve day-to-day problems, to handle unexpected and difficult problems, and to figure out what to do if faced with an emergency situation.
- 7 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Planning activities'.
- 8 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Fire safety measures'.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents. Households with 'moderately high' or 'high' levels of emergency planning engaged in 3 or 4 of the following: having an exit plan, an emergency supply kit, extra copies of important documents and an emergency contact list. 'Moderately high' or 'high' levels of precautionary measures include having 3 or 4 of the following: a wind-up or battery operated radio, a back-up generator, an alternate source of heat and additional water. 'Moderately high' or 'high' levels of fire safety measure include having all 3 of the following: a working smoke detector, a working fire extinguisher, and a working carbon monoxide detector.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

## Notes

<sup>E</sup> use with caution

- 1 A Census Metropolitan Area (CMA) or a Census Agglomeration (CA) is formed by one or more adjacent municipalities centred on a population centre (known as the core). A CMA must have a total population of at least 100,000 of which 50,000 or more must live in the core. A CA must have a core population of at least 10,000. To be included in the CMA or CA, other adjacent municipalities must have a high degree of integration with the core as measured by commuting flows derived from census data.
- 2 The target population for the SEPR included all persons 15 years of age or older, residing in households in Canada's 10 provinces, excluding full-time residents of institutions (e.g., nursing homes, group homes, hospitals).
- 3 The SEPR covers three types of communities: Census Metropolitan Areas (CMAs), Census Agglomerations (CAs) with population greater than 50,000, and 'smaller communities' which include CAs with population 50,000 or less and those areas that fall outside of CMAs and CAs. All CMAs and CAs (with population greater than 50,000) were included in the SEPR. A sample of households were selected from smaller communities within each province to represent all households within the province in similar communities. Additional information on the SEPR and its sampling methodology can be found in the 'Survey description' section.
- 4 Throughout this fact sheet, responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.
- 5 This section focuses on personal experiences with emergencies or disasters that happened in Canada, in a community where the person was living at the time, and was significant enough to severely interrupt the individual's regular daily activities.

- 6 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% when respondents were asked about whether the emergency they experienced caused them to have to boil drinking water or use bottled water for drinking.
- 7 Emergency planning activities include: having an emergency exit plan, a household emergency supply kit, extra copies of important documents and an emergency contact list.
- 8 Precautionary measures include: having a wind-up or battery-operated radio, an alternate heat source such as a non-electric stove or heater, or a wood-burning fireplace, a back-up generator and an alternative water source such as a well, tank or litres of stored water.
- 9 Unless otherwise specified, differences are statistically significant ( $p < 0.05$ ).
- 10 A 'strong sense of belonging to community' is rating one's own sense of belonging to their community as a 4 or a 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "very weak" and 5 "very strong".
- 11 A proportion (18%) of respondents were not asked questions regarding neighbourhood helpfulness in the event of an emergency and as such these cases are not included in the analysis on neighbourhood helpfulness in general or in the event of an emergency.
- 12 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% when respondents were asked about whether their neighbourhood is a place where neighbours would help each other if there is an emergency.
- 13 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% when respondents were asked about the number of people they could turn to for help if financial support is needed.



## Fact sheet Community of Québec (CMA), Quebec

---

In 2014, information on the emergency preparedness of people living in the Census Metropolitan Area<sup>1</sup> of Québec was collected through the Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada (SEPR).<sup>2</sup> This fact sheet presents information on the risk awareness and level of emergency preparedness of the residents of Québec, which could help improve the understanding of community resilience in the event of an emergency.<sup>3,4</sup>

### **Risk awareness and anticipated sources of help in an emergency or disaster**

- The majority (89%) of residents of the community of Québec believed winter storms (including blizzards, ice storms and extreme cold), extended power outages lasting 24 hours or longer (84%) and earthquakes (73%) were the most likely emergency-type events to occur within their community.
- In the event of an extended power outage, residents most commonly anticipated first turning to their utility company (66%), to hospitals, clinics, doctors or other medical professionals (60%) in the event of an outbreak of a serious or life-threatening disease, and to local government (50%) in the event of a contamination or shortage of water or food (Table 1.1). If faced with an industrial or transportation accident (32%) or a weather-related emergency or natural disaster (27%), residents of the community of Québec most commonly anticipated calling 911 for initial help and information. In the event of an act of terrorism or terrorist threat (49%) or rioting or civil unrest (49%), law enforcement was most commonly anticipated to be the first source of help and information.

### **Prior lifetime experience with a major emergency or disaster<sup>5</sup>**

- One in three (32%) residents of the community of Québec has faced a major emergency or disaster within Canada in a community where they were living at the time, and about half (52%) of these people experienced severe disruptions to their daily activities as a result.
- Winter storms which include blizzards and ice storms were the emergencies or disasters most commonly experienced by residents of Québec (48%), followed by extended power outages lasting 24 hours or longer (17%<sup>E</sup>) and floods (13%<sup>E</sup>).
- The most common types of disruption to daily activities endured by residents who experienced major emergencies or disasters included missing work or school (58%), the inability to use electrical appliances (53%) and missing an appointment or a planned activity (47%). More severe disruptions included the inability to use roads or transportation within the community (38%<sup>E</sup>), experienced by nearly two out of five people faced with an emergency or disaster, as well as home evacuations (21%<sup>E</sup>), experienced by approximately one in five residents.
- Seven in ten (70%) residents who experienced an emergency or disaster were able to resume their daily activities within five days of the event: 22%<sup>E</sup> within 24 hours, 27%<sup>E</sup> in one to two days and 21%<sup>E</sup> in three to five days.
- Less than half (47%) of residents who had experienced an emergency or disaster received help during or immediately following the event, most commonly from family members (51%<sup>E</sup>) and neighbours (20%<sup>E</sup>).
- More than a quarter (27%<sup>E</sup>) of residents of the community of Québec who experienced major emergencies or disasters that were significant enough to disrupt their regular daily routines endured a loss of property or another financial impact as a result.

### **Emergency planning, precautionary and fire safety behaviours**

- Nearly two-thirds (64%) of residents of the community of Québec lived in households that were engaged in at least two emergency planning activities,<sup>6</sup> with one-third (34%) living in households with three or four such activities (Table 1.2). More than one in ten (13%) people lived in a household that had not participated in any emergency planning activities.
- Less than half (45%) of residents lived in a household with at least two precautionary measures<sup>7</sup> taken in case of an emergency. Among them were those who had three or four such measures, representing 19% of residents of the community of Québec. One in five (19%) people lived in a household with no precautionary measures in place.
- The majority (99%) of residents reported living in a household with a working smoke detector, and seven in ten (71%) reported living in a household with a working fire extinguisher (Table 1.3). Just over one in four (27%) people stated that they had a working carbon monoxide detector in their household. Less than one-quarter (22%) of residents reported that they had implemented all three fire safety measures within their households.
- The number of emergency planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents of the community of Québec were often significantly different from both residents of the province of Quebec as a whole and from Canadians residing in the 10 provinces. For example, people living in the community of Québec were less likely to have engaged in all four precautionary measures (4%<sup>E</sup>) and all three fire safety measures (22%) when compared to the province as a whole (8% and 28%, respectively), and when compared to Canadians (7% and 42%, respectively).<sup>8</sup>
- With the exception of being more likely to have a working fire extinguisher (71%) or a working smoke detector (99%) when compared to Canadians across all the provinces (66% and 98%, respectively), residents of the community of Québec were often less likely to have engaged in several other emergency planning activities or precautionary measures when compared to Canadians more broadly.

## Social networks and sense of belonging

- Less than half (44%) of residents of the community of Québec had a strong sense of belonging<sup>9</sup> to their community.
- Three-quarters (76%) of residents described the neighbourhood they lived in as a place where neighbours generally help each other.<sup>10</sup> Of those who did not describe their neighbourhood this way, most (80%)<sup>11</sup> still described it as a place where neighbours would help each other in an emergency.
- About half of residents had a large network of support in the event of an emergency or disaster, with more than five people to turn to for emotional support (57%), for help if physically injured (53%) as well as in case of a home evacuation (46%). However, only about one in six people had such a large network of support if financial help was needed (17%), and about one in ten (11%) reported that they had no one to turn to for financial help.
- The social and political involvement of residents of the community of Québec generally did not have a significant impact on their level of emergency preparedness (Table 1.4).

## Data tables

**Table 1.1**  
Most commonly anticipated sources of initial help and information, by type of emergency or disaster, residents of Québec, Quebec, 2014

Most common sources of initial help and information by type of emergency or disaster	percent
<b>Weather-related emergency or natural disaster</b>	
911	27
Police/law enforcement	23
Local government	21
<b>Extended power outages</b>	
Utility company	66
News- Radio	7 <sup>E</sup>
Family	7 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Outbreak of serious or life-threatening disease</b>	
Hospital, clinic, doctor or other medical professional	60



911	13 <sup>E</sup>
News- Television	10 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Industrial or transportation accident</b>	
911	32
Police/law enforcement	31
First responders	14
<b>Contamination or shortage of water or food</b>	
Local government	50
News- Internet	10 <sup>E</sup>
News- Television	9 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Act of terrorism or terrorist threat</b>	
Police/law enforcement	49
911	28
News- Television	14 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Rioting or civil unrest</b>	
Police/law enforcement	49
911	27
News- Television	14 <sup>E</sup>
<sup>E</sup> use with caution	
<b>Note:</b> Respondents who perceived their community was at risk for any form of emergency or disaster were then asked where they would turn to first for information or assistance in the event of the perceived emergency or disaster. Respondents could provide more than one response. Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.	
<b>Source:</b> Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.	

**Table 1.2**  
**Number of emergency planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents, community of Québec, Quebec, 2014**

Number of planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents	Community of Québec	Province of Quebec	Canada
	percent		
<b>Number of emergency planning activities</b>			
None	13 **	10	8
1 activity	21	22	17
2 activities	30 **	26	25
3 activities	20 ***	26	27
4 activities	14 **	14	19
<b>Number of precautionary measures</b>			
None	19	17	16
1 measure	34 ***	29	27
2 measures	26	28	28
3 measures	15 **	17	20
4 measures	4 <sup>E</sup> ***	8	7
<b>Number of fire safety measures <sup>1 2</sup></b>			
None	F	F	1
1 measure	22 **	24	14
2 measures	51 ***	42	38
3 measures	22 ***	28	42

<sup>E</sup> use with caution  
<sup>F</sup> too unreliable to be published

\*\* significantly different from Canada level estimate (p < 0.05)

\*\*\* significantly different from both provincial and Canada level estimates (p < 0.05)

1 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Canada'.

2 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Province of Quebec'.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents. Emergency planning activities include: an emergency exit plan, an emergency supply kit, photocopies/electronic copies of important documents and a list of emergency contact numbers. Precautionary measures include: a battery-operated or wind-up radio, an alternate heat source, a back-up generator and an alternative water source. Fire safety measures include a working smoke detector, a working carbon monoxide detector and a working fire extinguisher.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

**Table 1.3**  
**Planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures residents engaged in, community of Québec, Quebec, 2014**

Residents whose households were involved in the following:	Community of Québec	Province of Quebec	Canada
	percent		
<b>Emergency planning activities</b>			
Emergency exit plan	40 ***	46	60
Exit plan has been practised/reviewed in last 12 months <sup>1</sup>	39	40	46
Designated meeting place for household members <sup>2</sup>	22 ***	34	33
Contact plan for household members <sup>2</sup>	48 **	51	55
Household emergency supply kit	45	47	47
Vehicle emergency supply kit <sup>3</sup>	49 **	46	59
Extra copies of important documents	44 **	47	53
List of emergency contact numbers	68	68	69
Plan for meeting special health needs <sup>4</sup>	52	61	62
<b>Precautionary measures</b>			
Wind-up or battery-operated radio	58	58	58
Alternate heat source	43	48	48
Back-up generator	14 ***	22	23
Alternate water source	34 **	38	43
Other <sup>5</sup>	19	20	21
<b>Fire safety measures</b>			
Working smoke detector	99 ***	98	98
Working carbon monoxide detector	27 ***	34	60
Working fire extinguisher	71 **	67	66

\*\* significantly different from Canada level estimate (p < 0.05)

\*\*\* significantly different from both provincial and Canada level estimates (p < 0.05)

1 Percentage based only on those indicating that they have an emergency exit plan.

2 Excludes Canadians living in single-person households.

3 Excludes those who reported that they lived in a household that did not have a vehicle.

4 Percentage based only on those indicating that they or someone in their household has special medical needs.

5 'Other precautionary measures' include having an escape/rescue plan for pets, extra supply of fuel, checking and replenishing emergency supplies, and keeping exits clear.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.  
**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

**Table 1.4**

**High or moderately high levels of emergency planning, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents, by social and political involvement, community of Québec, Quebec, 2014**

Social and political involvement	Percentage of residents who had high or moderately high levels of...		
	Planning activities	Precautionary measures	Fire safety measures
	percent		
<b>Engagement in political activities <sup>1</sup></b>			
Yes †	32	20	23
No <sup>7</sup>	40 <sup>E</sup>	F	F
<b>High level of civic engagement <sup>2</sup></b>			
Yes †	36	24	26
No <sup>8</sup>	28	9 <sup>E *</sup>	16 <sup>E *</sup>
<b>High level of social support <sup>3</sup></b>			
Yes †	41	23 <sup>E</sup>	31 <sup>E</sup>
No	32	19	21
<b>Strong sense of belonging to community <sup>4</sup></b>			
Yes †	39	19	20
No	30	20	25
<b>High neighbourhood trust <sup>5</sup></b>			
Yes †	34	18	22
No	34	20	23
<b>High level of self-efficacy <sup>6</sup></b>			
Yes †	38	22	23
No	31	17	23

<sup>E</sup> use with caution

F too unreliable to be published

\* significantly different from reference category ( $p < 0.05$ )

† reference category

- 1 Includes individuals over the age of 17 years who are eligible to vote, and who have participated in or volunteered for political parties or events in the past 12 months, including municipal, provincial, or federal elections, or expressed views on political or social issues through signing a petition, contacting news agencies or politicians, or attended a meeting involving social or community issues.
- 2 Civic engagement measures individuals over the age of 17 years who were involved in a recreational group or organization in the past 12 months, and includes engagement in political activities. A 'high level' is defined as having been involved in at least 4 activities in the past 12 months.
- 3 A 'high level of social support' is defined as having five or more people whom that individual could turn to for help in an emergency if they are physically injured, require emotional support, shelter, and/or financial assistance.
- 4 A 'strong sense of belonging to community' is rating one's own sense of belonging to their community as a 4 or a 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "very weak" and 5 "very strong".
- 5 'High neighbourhood trust' is rating one's own trust in the people in one's neighbourhood as 4 or 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "cannot be trusted at all" and 5 represents "can be trusted a lot", as well as having a response of "very likely" when asked about the likelihood of someone in their neighbourhood returning a lost wallet or purse containing two hundred dollars with the money still inside.
- 6 A 'high level of self-efficacy' is derived from having a high self-rating on a scale of 1 (poor) to 5 (excellent) for the following three categories: an ability to think clearly and solve day-to-day problems, to handle unexpected and difficult problems, and to figure out what to do if faced with an emergency situation.
- 7 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Planning activities'.
- 8 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Fire safety measures'.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents. Households with 'moderately high' or 'high' levels of emergency planning engaged in 3 or 4 of the following: having an exit plan, an emergency supply kit, extra copies of important documents and an emergency contact list. 'Moderately high' or 'high' levels of precautionary measures include having 3 or 4 of the following: a wind-up or battery operated radio, a back-up generator, an alternate source of heat and additional water. 'Moderately high' or 'high' levels of fire safety measure include having all 3 of the following: a working smoke detector, a working fire extinguisher, and a working carbon monoxide detector.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

## Notes

<sup>E</sup> use with caution

- 1 A Census Metropolitan Area (CMA) or a Census Agglomeration (CA) is formed by one or more adjacent municipalities centred on a population centre (known as the core). A CMA must have a total population of at least 100,000 of which 50,000 or more must live in the core. A CA must have a core population of at least 10,000. To be included in the CMA or CA, other adjacent municipalities must have a high degree of integration with the core as measured by commuting flows derived from census data.
- 2 The target population for the SEPR included all persons 15 years of age or older, residing in households in Canada's 10 provinces, excluding full-time residents of institutions (e.g. nursing homes, group homes, hospitals).
- 3 The SEPR covers three types of communities: Census Metropolitan Areas (CMAs), Census Agglomerations (CAs) with population greater than 50,000, and 'smaller communities' which include CAs with population 50,000 or less and those areas that fall outside of CMAs and CAs. All CMAs and CAs (with population greater than 50,000) were included in the SEPR. A sample of households were selected from smaller communities within each province to represent all households within the province in similar communities. Additional information on the SEPR and its sampling methodology can be found in the 'Survey description' section.
- 4 Throughout this fact sheet, responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.
- 5 This section focuses on personal experiences with emergencies or disasters that happened in Canada, in a community where the person was living at the time, and was significant enough to severely interrupt the individual's regular daily activities.

- 6 Emergency planning activities include: having an emergency exit plan, a household emergency supply kit, extra copies of important documents and an emergency contact list.
- 7 Precautionary measures include: having a wind-up or battery-operated radio, an alternate heat source such as a non-electric stove or heater, or a wood-burning fireplace, a back-up generator and an alternative water source such as a well, tank or litres of stored water.
- 8 Unless otherwise specified, differences are statistically significant ( $p < 0.05$ ).
- 9 A 'strong sense of belonging to community' is rating one's own sense of belonging to their community as a 4 or a 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "very weak" and 5 "very strong".
- 10 A proportion (6%) of respondents were not asked questions regarding neighbourhood helpfulness in the event of an emergency and as such these cases are not included in the analysis on neighbourhood helpfulness in general or in the event of an emergency.
- 11 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% when respondents were asked about whether their neighbourhood is a place where neighbours would help each other if there is an emergency.



## Fact sheet Community of Sherbrooke (CMA), Quebec

---

In 2014, information on the emergency preparedness of people living in the Census Metropolitan Area<sup>1</sup> of Sherbrooke was collected through the Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada (SEPR).<sup>2</sup> This fact sheet presents information on the risk awareness and level of emergency preparedness of the residents of Sherbrooke, which could help improve the understanding of community resilience in the event of an emergency.<sup>3,4</sup>

### **Risk awareness and anticipated sources of help in an emergency or disaster**

- Residents of Sherbrooke anticipated winter storms (including blizzards, ice storms and extreme cold) (94%), extended power outages lasting 24 hours or longer (88%) and industrial or transportation accidents (68%) to be the most likely emergency-type events to occur within their community.
- Residents commonly anticipated turning to the police as an initial source for help and information if they were faced with rioting or civil unrest (60%), an act of terrorism or terrorist threat (53%) or an industrial or transportation accident (30%) (Table 1.1). In the event of a contamination or shortage of water or food (56%), or a weather-related emergency or natural disaster (28%), residents anticipated turning to local government first for help and information. Hospitals, clinics, doctors and other medical professionals (65%) were the most common sources of initial help and information in the event of an outbreak of a serious or life-threatening disease, and in the event of an extended power outage, utility companies (56%) were most commonly anticipated to be the first source of help and information for residents of Sherbrooke.

### **Prior lifetime experience with a major emergency or disaster<sup>5</sup>**

- Close to half (46%) of the people living in Sherbrooke had personally experienced a major emergency or disaster in Canada within a community where they were living at the time. For most (70%), the emergencies were severe enough to disrupt their regular daily activities.
- Winter storms including blizzards and ice storms were the most common type of emergency or disaster experienced by residents (66%), followed by extended power outages (27%) and floods (8%<sup>E</sup>).
- Residents who were affected by a major emergency or disaster most often experienced the inability to use electrical appliances (65%), the inability to use water at home for routine tasks (48%) and a need to miss school or work (45%) as a result. More serious implications such as home evacuation (27%) and loss of access to roads or transportation within the community (18%<sup>E</sup>) were less common.
- Three out of four (77%) people in Sherbrooke who had experienced a major emergency or disaster were able to resume their daily activities within one week of the event: 17%<sup>E</sup> in less than 24 hours, 18%<sup>E</sup> within one to two days, 31% within three to five days, and 12%<sup>E</sup> within six to seven days.
- Less than half (45%) of residents received help either during or immediately following the emergency. Family members (43%) and neighbours (21%<sup>E</sup>) were most often the sources of assistance.
- Four in ten people (42%) in Sherbrooke who experienced major emergencies or disasters that were significant enough to disrupt their regular daily routines endured a loss of property or another financial impact as a result, while less than one in ten (7%<sup>E</sup>) experienced long-term emotional or psychological impacts.

### **Emergency planning, precautionary and fire safety behaviours**

- Nearly three out of five (58%) people in Sherbrooke lived in households that were engaged in at least two emergency planning activities,<sup>6</sup> with three out of ten (30%) living in households with three or four such activities (Table 1.2). More than one in ten (12%) lived in a household that had not participated in any emergency planning activities.
- Half (50%) of residents lived in a household with at least two precautionary measures<sup>7</sup> taken in case of an emergency, with two in ten residents (20%) living in a household with three or four such measures. Close to one in five (18%) people lived in a household with no precautionary measures in place.
- Most (98%) residents reported living in a household with a working smoke detector (Table 1.3). Two-thirds (66%) reported living in a household with a working fire extinguisher and less than half (40%) stated that they had a working carbon monoxide detector in their home. Approximately one-third (32%) of residents reported that they had all three fire safety measures within their households.
- Generally, the number of emergency planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures that residents of Sherbrooke were engaged in did not significantly differ from the province as a whole, though there were some differences when compared to residents of Canada's 10 provinces. For example, the proportion of Sherbrooke residents who reported no emergency planning activities (12%) was significantly higher than the overall national proportion (8%), while those with all three fire safety measures within their homes were significantly lower (32% versus 42%).<sup>8</sup>
- Differences in several types of activities and measures taken in case of an emergency were significant when residents of Sherbrooke were compared to all residents of Quebec as well as to Canadians overall. For example, the proportion of Sherbrooke residents who had a list of emergency contact numbers (62%) or an alternate water source (31%) was significantly lower than of those living in Quebec in general (68% and 38%, respectively) as well as of residents of Canada overall (69% and 43%, respectively). Although the proportion of Sherbrooke residents who had a working carbon monoxide detector (40%) was lower than the overall Canadian proportion (60%), it was higher than the proportion reported by Quebec residents in general (34%).

## Social networks and sense of belonging

- Less than half (46%) of residents of Sherbrooke had a strong sense of belonging<sup>9</sup> to their community.
- The majority (79%) of residents described the neighbourhood they lived in as a place where neighbours generally help each other.<sup>10</sup> Of those who did not describe their neighbourhood this way, almost three-quarters (72%) still described it as a place where neighbours would help each other in an emergency.<sup>11</sup>
- Many residents had a large network of support in the event of an emergency or disaster, with more than five people to turn to for emotional support (61%). About half of the residents had such a network of support if physically injured (53%) or in case of a home evacuation (50%). However, only 17% of residents had such a large network of support if financial help was needed, and about one in ten (11%) reported they had no one to turn to for financial help.<sup>12</sup>
- High levels of sense of belonging, self-efficacy and neighbourhood trust were often associated with a higher level of emergency preparedness (Table 1.4).

## Data tables

Table 1.1

Most commonly anticipated sources of initial help and information, by type of emergency or disaster, residents of Sherbrooke, Quebec, 2014

Most common sources of initial help and information by type of emergency or disaster	percent
<b>Weather-related emergency or natural disaster</b>	
Local government	28
Police/law enforcement	25
911	16
<b>Extended power outages</b>	
Utility company	56
Local government	18

Family	9 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Outbreak of serious or life-threatening disease</b>	
Hospital, clinic, doctor or other medical professional	65
911	10 <sup>E</sup>
News- Internet	7 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Industrial or transportation accident</b>	
Police/law enforcement	30
911	28
Local government	21
<b>Contamination or shortage of water or food</b>	
Local government	56
Hospital, clinic, doctor or other medical professional	9 <sup>E</sup>
News- Internet	7 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Act of terrorism or terrorist threat</b>	
Police/law enforcement	53
911	21 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Rioting or civil unrest</b>	
Police/law enforcement	60
911	25
News- Television	11 <sup>E</sup>
<sup>E</sup> use with caution	
<b>Note:</b> Respondents who perceived their community was at risk for any form of emergency or disaster were then asked where they would turn to first for information or assistance in the event of the perceived emergency or disaster. Respondents could provide more than one response. Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.	
<b>Source:</b> Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.	

**Table 1.2**  
**Number of emergency planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents, community of Sherbrooke, Quebec, 2014**

Number of planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents	Sherbrooke	Quebec	Canada
	percent		
<b>Number of emergency planning activities</b>			
None	12 **	10	8
1 activity	27 ***	22	17
2 activities	28	26	25
3 activities	18 ***	26	27
4 activities	12 **	14	19
<b>Number of precautionary measures</b>			
None	18	17	16
1 measure	31	29	27
2 measures	30	28	28
3 measures	15 **	17	20
4 measures	5 <sup>E</sup>	8	7
<b>Number of fire safety measures <sup>1 2</sup></b>			
None	F	F	1
1 measure	22 **	24	14
2 measures	40	42	38



3 measures	32 **	28	42
<p>E use with caution  F too unreliable to be published</p> <p>** significantly different from Canada level estimate (p &lt; 0.05)</p> <p>*** significantly different from both provincial and Canada level estimates (p &lt; 0.05)</p> <p>1 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Canada'.</p> <p>2 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Quebec'.</p> <p><b>Note:</b> Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents. Emergency planning activities include: an emergency exit plan, an emergency supply kit, photocopies/electronic copies of important documents and a list of emergency contact numbers. Precautionary measures include: a battery-operated or wind-up radio, an alternative heat source, a back-up generator and an alternative water source. Fire safety measures include a working smoke detector, a working carbon monoxide detector and a working fire extinguisher.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.</p>			

**Table 1.3**  
**Planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures residents engaged in, community of Sherbrooke, Quebec, 2014**

Residents whose households were involved in the following:	Sherbrooke	Quebec	Canada
	percent		
<b>Emergency planning activities</b>			
Emergency exit plan	39 ***	46	60
Exit plan has been practised/reviewed in last 12 months <sup>1</sup>	44	40	46
Designated meeting place for household members <sup>2</sup>	34	34	33
Contact plan for household members <sup>2</sup>	47 **	51	55
Household emergency supply kit	43	47	47
Vehicle emergency supply kit <sup>3</sup>	45 **	46	59
Extra copies of important documents	43 **	47	53
List of emergency contact numbers	62 ***	68	69
Plan for meeting special health needs <sup>4</sup>	54	61	62
<b>Precautionary measures</b>			
Wind-up or battery-operated radio	58	58	58
Alternate heat source	48	48	48
Back-up generator	18	22	23
Alternate water source	31 ***	38	43
Other <sup>5</sup>	21	20	21
<b>Fire safety measures</b>			
Working smoke detector	98	98	98
Working carbon monoxide detector	40 ***	34	60
Working fire extinguisher	66	67	66

\*\* significantly different from Canada level estimate (p < 0.05)

\*\*\* significantly different from both provincial and Canada level estimates (p < 0.05)

1 Percentage based only on those indicating that they have an emergency exit plan.

2 Excludes Canadians living in single-person households.

3 Excludes those who reported that they lived in a household that did not have a vehicle.

4 Percentage based only on those indicating that they or someone in their household has special medical needs.

5 'Other precautionary measures' include having an escape/rescue plan for pets, extra supply of fuel, checking and replenishing emergency supplies, and keeping exits clear.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

**Table 1.4**

**High or moderately high levels of emergency planning, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents, by social and political involvement, community of Sherbrooke, Quebec, 2014**

Social and political involvement	Percentage of residents who had high or moderately high levels of...		
	Planning activities	Precautionary measures	Fire safety measures
	percent		
<b>Engagement in political activities <sup>1</sup></b>			
Yes †	28	17	33
No	34 <sup>E</sup>	26 <sup>E</sup>	26 <sup>E</sup>
<b>High level of civic engagement <sup>2</sup></b>			
Yes †	29	18	33
No	29	18 <sup>E</sup>	30
<b>High level of social support <sup>3</sup></b>			
Yes †	27 <sup>E</sup>	19 <sup>E</sup>	24 <sup>E</sup>
No	31	20	34
<b>Strong sense of belonging to community <sup>4</sup></b>			
Yes †	35	26	36
No	26	15 <sup>E</sup> *	30
<b>High neighbourhood trust <sup>5</sup></b>			
Yes †	35	25	42
No	27	16 <sup>E</sup> *	26 *
<b>High level of self-efficacy <sup>6</sup></b>			
Yes †	38	27	36
No	25 *	16 *	31

<sup>E</sup> use with caution

\* significantly different from reference category ( $p < 0.05$ )

† reference category

- 1 Includes individuals over the age of 17 years who are eligible to vote, and who have participated in or volunteered for political parties or events in the past 12 months, including municipal, provincial, or federal elections, or expressed views on political or social issues through signing a petition, contacting news agencies or politicians, or attended a meeting involving social or community issues.
- 2 Civic engagement measures individuals over the age of 17 years who were involved in a recreational group or organization in the past 12 months, and includes engagement in political activities. A 'high level' is defined as having been involved in at least 4 activities in the past 12 months.
- 3 A 'high level of social support' is defined as having five or more people whom that individual could turn to for help in an emergency if they are physically injured, require emotional support, shelter, and/or financial assistance.
- 4 A 'strong sense of belonging to community' is rating one's own sense of belonging to their community as a 4 or a 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "very weak" and 5 "very strong".
- 5 'High neighbourhood trust' is rating one's own trust in the people in one's neighbourhood as 4 or 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "cannot be trusted at all" and 5 represents "can be trusted a lot", as well as having a response of "very likely" when asked about the likelihood of someone in their neighbourhood returning a lost wallet or purse containing two hundred dollars with the money still inside.
- 6 A 'high level of self-efficacy' is derived from having a high self-rating on a scale of 1 (poor) to 5 (excellent) for the following three categories: an ability to think clearly and solve day-to-day problems, to handle unexpected and difficult problems, and to figure out what to do if faced with an emergency situation.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents. Households with 'moderately high' or 'high' levels of emergency planning engaged in 3 or 4 of the following: having an exit plan, an emergency supply kit, extra copies of important documents and an emergency contact list. 'Moderately high' or 'high' levels of precautionary measures include having 3 or 4 of the following: a wind-up or battery operated radio, a back-up generator, an alternate source of heat and additional water. 'Moderately high' or 'high' levels of fire safety measure include having all 3 of the following: a working smoke detector, a working fire extinguisher, and a working carbon monoxide detector.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

## Notes

<sup>E</sup> use with caution

- 1 A Census Metropolitan Area (CMA) or a Census Agglomeration (CA) is formed by one or more adjacent municipalities centred on a population centre (known as the core). A CMA must have a total population of at least 100,000 of which 50,000 or more must live in the core. A CA must have a core population of at least 10,000. To be included in the CMA or CA, other adjacent municipalities must have a high degree of integration with the core as measured by commuting flows derived from census data.
- 2 The target population for the SEPR included all persons 15 years of age or older, residing in households in Canada's 10 provinces, excluding full-time residents of institutions (e.g., nursing homes, group homes, hospitals).
- 3 The SEPR covers three types of communities: Census Metropolitan Areas (CMAs), Census Agglomerations (CAs) with population greater than 50,000, and 'smaller communities' which include CAs with population 50,000 or less and those areas that fall outside of CMAs and CAs. All CMAs and CAs (with population greater than 50,000) were included in the SEPR. A sample of households were selected from smaller communities within each province to represent all households within the province in similar communities. Additional information on the SEPR and its sampling methodology can be found in the 'Survey description' section.
- 4 Throughout this fact sheet, responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.
- 5 This section focuses on personal experiences with emergencies or disasters that happened in Canada, in a community where the person was living at the time, and was significant enough to severely interrupt the individual's regular daily activities.
- 6 Emergency planning activities include: having an emergency exit plan, a household emergency supply kit, extra copies of important documents and an emergency contact list.

- 7 Precautionary measures include: having a wind-up or battery-operated radio, an alternate heat source such as a non-electric stove or heater, or a wood-burning fireplace, a back-up generator and an alternative water source such as a well, tank or litres of stored water.
- 8 Unless otherwise specified, differences are statistically significant ( $p < 0.05$ ).
- 9 A 'strong sense of belonging to community' is rating one's own sense of belonging to their community as a 4 or a 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "very weak" and 5 "very strong".
- 10 A proportion (11%) of respondents were not asked questions regarding neighbourhood helpfulness in the event of an emergency and as such these cases are not included in the analysis on neighbourhood helpfulness in general or in the event of an emergency.
- 11 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were equal to 12% when respondents were asked about whether their neighbourhood is a place where neighbours would help each other if there is an emergency.
- 12 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% when respondents were asked about the number of people they could turn to for help if financial support is needed.



## Fact sheet Community of Trois-Rivières (CMA), Quebec

---

In 2014, information on the emergency preparedness of people living in the Census Metropolitan Area <sup>1</sup> of Trois-Rivières was collected through the Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada (SEPR). <sup>2</sup> This fact sheet presents information on the risk awareness and level of emergency preparedness of the residents of Trois-Rivières, which could help improve the understanding of community resilience in the event of an emergency. <sup>3,4</sup>

### **Risk awareness and anticipated sources of help in an emergency or disaster**

- Residents of Trois-Rivières anticipated winter storms (including blizzards, ice storms and extreme cold) (91%), extended power outages lasting 24 hours or longer (78%) and heat waves (70%) as the emergency-type events most likely to occur within their community.
- Residents anticipated turning to the police as an initial source for help and information if they were faced with rioting or civil unrest (64%), an act of terrorism or terrorist threat (59%), an industrial or transportation accident (35%) or a weather-related emergency or natural disaster (31%) (Table 1.1). Hospitals, clinics, doctors and other medical professionals (67%) were the most commonly anticipated sources for initial help and information in the event of an outbreak of a serious or life-threatening disease. In the event of an extended power outage, residents anticipated turning to their utility company first (68%), and in the event of contamination or shortage of water or food, residents would first turn to their local government (60%).

### **Prior lifetime experience with a major emergency or disaster <sup>5</sup>**

- Close to two in five (37%) people in Trois-Rivières have faced a major emergency or disaster in Canada within a community where they were living at the time. Among them, more than half (62%) experienced severe disruptions to their daily activities as a result.
- Residents who had faced a major emergency or disaster most commonly experienced winter storms, which include blizzards and ice storms (70%). Although not experienced as often, extended power outages lasting 24 hours or longer (14%<sup>E</sup>) followed as the next most commonly experienced emergency-type event.
- Seven in ten (70%) residents who have experienced major emergencies or disasters were unable to use electrical appliances as a result. Other common disruptions to daily activities included missing school or work (58%), the inability to use water at home for routine tasks (44%) and missing appointments or planned activities (40%). Other more severe disruptions included home evacuations (33%) and an inability to use roads or transportation within the community (26%<sup>E</sup>).
- Three-quarters (75%) of residents of Trois-Rivières who had experienced an emergency or disaster were able to resume their daily activities within one week of the event; one-third (33%) were able to resume their activities in two days or less.
- Less than half (45%) of the residents received help either during or immediately following the emergency, most commonly from a family member (47%<sup>E</sup>).
- One in three (36%) people in Trois-Rivières who had experienced a major emergency or disaster which was significant enough to disrupt their regular daily activities also endured a loss of property or another financial impact as a result. Long-term emotional or psychological (8%<sup>E</sup>) consequences were not commonly experienced.

## Emergency planning, precautionary and fire safety behaviours

- Two-thirds (65%) of residents of Trois-Rivières lived in households that were engaged in at least two emergency planning activities,<sup>6</sup> with approximately one-third (35%) living in households with three or four such activities (Table 1.2). One in ten (10%) people lived in a household that had not participated in any emergency planning activities.
- Just under half (44%) of residents lived in a household with at least two precautionary measures<sup>7</sup> taken in case of an emergency. Among them were those who had three or four such measures, representing 18% of residents of Trois-Rivières. One out of five (20%) people lived in a household with no precautionary measures in place.
- Most (99%) residents reported living in a household with a working smoke detector, and two-thirds (67%) reported living in a household with a working fire extinguisher (Table 1.3). Less than half (43%) of residents stated that they had a working carbon monoxide detector in their home. One in three (33%) people reported that they had implemented all three fire safety measures within their households.
- There were almost no significant differences in terms of the number of emergency planning activities, fire safety or precautionary measures people were involved in when residents of Trois-Rivières were compared to Quebec residents in general. However, there were differences when they were compared to residents of Canada's 10 provinces overall. Residents of Trois-Rivières were less likely to have undertaken all four emergency planning activities (13%) and precautionary measures (4%<sup>E</sup>), and to have all three fire safety measures (33%) in place, compared to people in Canada overall (19%, 7% and 42%, respectively).<sup>8</sup>
- Additional differences in terms of the types of activities and measures residents were engaged in were observed. For example, people in Trois-Rivières were less likely than Canadians in general to have an emergency exit plan (46% versus 60%). Residents of Trois-Rivières (43%) were less likely than Canadians overall (60%) but more likely than residents of Quebec in general (34%) to have a working carbon monoxide detector within their homes.

## Social networks and sense of belonging

- Less than half (46%) of the people living in Trois-Rivières had a strong sense of belonging<sup>9</sup> to their community.
- Most (82%) residents described the neighbourhood they lived in as a place where neighbours generally help each other.<sup>10</sup> Of those who did not describe their neighbourhood this way, most (79%) still described it as a place where neighbours would help each other in an emergency.<sup>11</sup>
- Many residents had a large network of support in the event of an emergency or disaster, with more than five people to turn to for emotional support (54%), for help if physically injured (49%) as well as in case of a home evacuation (44%). However, only about one in six people had such a large network of support if financial help was needed (17%), and just over one in ten (13%) reported that they had no one to turn to for financial help.<sup>12</sup>
- High levels of sense of belonging, self-efficacy and neighbourhood trust were sometimes associated with a higher level of emergency preparedness (Table 1.4).

## Data tables

Table 1.1

Most commonly anticipated sources of initial help and information, by type of emergency or disaster, residents of Trois-Rivières, Quebec, 2014

Most common sources of initial help and information by type of emergency or disaster	percent
<b>Weather-related emergency or natural disaster</b>	
Police/law enforcement	31
Local government	24
911	19
<b>Extended power outages</b>	
Utility company	68
News- Radio	7 <sup>E</sup>
Local government	6 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Outbreak of serious or life-threatening disease</b>	

Hospital, clinic, doctor or other medical professional	67
911	9 <sup>E</sup>
News- Television	8 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Industrial or transportation accident</b>	
Police/law enforcement	35
911	20
Local government	18
<b>Contamination or shortage of water or food</b>	
Local government	60
Hospital, clinic, doctor or other medical professional	13 <sup>E</sup>
News- Television	9 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Act of terrorism or terrorist threat</b>	
Police/law enforcement	59
911	24
News- Television	11 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Rioting or civil unrest</b>	
Police/law enforcement	64
911	22
News- Television	11 <sup>E</sup>
<sup>E</sup> use with caution	
<b>Note:</b> Respondents who perceived their community was at risk for any form of emergency or disaster were then asked where they would turn to first for information or assistance in the event of the perceived emergency or disaster. Respondents could provide more than one response. Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.	
<b>Source:</b> Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.	

**Table 1.2**  
**Number of emergency planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents, community of Trois-Rivières, Quebec, 2014**

Number of planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents	Trois-Rivières	Quebec	Canada
	percent		
<b>Number of emergency planning activities</b>			
None	10	10	8
1 activity	24 **	22	17
2 activities	30 **	26	25
3 activities	22 **	26	27
4 activities	13 **	14	19
<b>Number of precautionary measures</b>			
None	20	17	16
1 measure	34 **	29	27
2 measures	26	28	28
3 measures	14 **	17	20
4 measures	4 <sup>E</sup> ***	8	7
<b>Number of fire safety measures <sup>1 2 3</sup></b>			
None	F	F	1
1 measure	20 **	24	14
2 measures	41	42	38
3 measures	33 **	28	42

<sup>E</sup> use with caution  
<sup>F</sup> too unreliable to be published

\*\* significantly different from Canada level estimate (p < 0.05)

\*\*\* significantly different from both provincial and Canada level estimates (p < 0.05)

1 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Canada'.

2 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Quebec'.

3 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Trois-Rivières'.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents. Emergency planning activities include: an emergency exit plan, an emergency supply kit, photocopies/electronic copies of important documents and a list of emergency contact numbers. Precautionary measures include: a battery-operated or wind-up radio, an alternative heat source, a back-up generator and an alternative water source. Fire safety measures include a working smoke detector, a working carbon monoxide detector and a working fire extinguisher.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

**Table 1.3**  
**Planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures residents engaged in, community of Trois-Rivières, Quebec, 2014**

Residents whose households were involved in the following:	Trois-Rivières	Quebec	Canada
	percent		
<b>Emergency planning activities</b>			
Emergency exit plan	46 **	46	60
Exit plan has been practised/reviewed in last 12 months <sup>1</sup>	44	40	46
Designated meeting place for household members <sup>2</sup>	38	34	33
Contact plan for household members <sup>2</sup>	51	51	55
Household emergency supply kit	46	47	47
Vehicle emergency supply kit <sup>3</sup>	50 **	46	59
Extra copies of important documents	43 **	47	53
List of emergency contact numbers	68	68	69
Plan for meeting special health needs <sup>4</sup>	46 ***	61	62
<b>Precautionary measures</b>			
Wind-up or battery-operated radio	54	58	58
Alternate heat source	47	48	48
Back-up generator	16 ***	22	23
Alternate water source	29 ***	38	43
Other <sup>5</sup>	17	20	21
<b>Fire safety measures</b>			
Working smoke detector	99	98	98
Working carbon monoxide detector	43 ***	34	60
Working fire extinguisher	67	67	66



\*\* significantly different from Canada level estimate (p < 0.05)

\*\*\* significantly different from both provincial and Canada level estimates (p < 0.05)

1 Percentage based only on those indicating that they have an emergency exit plan.

2 Excludes Canadians living in single-person households.

3 Excludes those who reported that they lived in a household that did not have a vehicle.

4 Percentage based only on those indicating that they or someone in their household has special medical needs.

5 'Other precautionary measures' include having an escape/rescue plan for pets, extra supply of fuel, checking and replenishing emergency supplies, and keeping exits clear.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

**Table 1.4**

**High or moderately high levels of emergency planning, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents, by social and political involvement, community of Trois-Rivières, Quebec, 2014**

Social and political involvement	Percentage of residents who had high or moderately high levels of...		
	Planning activities	Precautionary measures	Fire safety measures
	percent		
<b>Engagement in political activities <sup>1</sup></b>			
Yes †	34	17	35
No	36 <sup>E</sup>	31 <sup>E</sup>	29 <sup>E</sup>
<b>High level of civic engagement <sup>2</sup></b>			
Yes †	35	19	35
No	34	18 <sup>E</sup>	31
<b>High level of social support <sup>3</sup></b>			
Yes †	31 <sup>E</sup>	23 <sup>E</sup>	37 <sup>E</sup>
No	37	17	32
<b>Strong sense of belonging to community <sup>4</sup></b>			
Yes †	41	22	36
No <sup>7</sup>	31 <sup>*</sup>	15 <sup>E</sup>	31
<b>High neighbourhood trust <sup>5</sup></b>			
Yes †	37	24	41
No <sup>7</sup>	36	15 <sup>*</sup>	28 <sup>*</sup>
<b>High level of self-efficacy <sup>6</sup></b>			
Yes †	38	17	40
No <sup>7</sup>	33	19	29 <sup>*</sup>

<sup>E</sup> use with caution

\* significantly different from reference category ( $p < 0.05$ )

† reference category

- 1 Includes individuals over the age of 17 years who are eligible to vote, and who have participated in or volunteered for political parties or events in the past 12 months, including municipal, provincial, or federal elections, or expressed views on political or social issues through signing a petition, contacting news agencies or politicians, or attended a meeting involving social or community issues.
- 2 Civic engagement measures individuals over the age of 17 years who were involved in a recreational group or organization in the past 12 months, and includes engagement in political activities. A 'high level' is defined as having been involved in at least 4 activities in the past 12 months.
- 3 A 'high level of social support' is defined as having five or more people whom that individual could turn to for help in an emergency if they are physically injured, require emotional support, shelter, and/or financial assistance.
- 4 A 'strong sense of belonging to community' is rating one's own sense of belonging to their community as a 4 or a 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "very weak" and 5 "very strong".
- 5 'High neighbourhood trust' is rating one's own trust in the people in one's neighbourhood as 4 or 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "cannot be trusted at all" and 5 represents "can be trusted a lot", as well as having a response of "very likely" when asked about the likelihood of someone in their neighbourhood returning a lost wallet or purse containing two hundred dollars with the money still inside.
- 6 A 'high level of self-efficacy' is derived from having a high self-rating on a scale of 1 (poor) to 5 (excellent) for the following three categories: an ability to think clearly and solve day-to-day problems, to handle unexpected and difficult problems, and to figure out what to do if faced with an emergency situation.
- 7 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Fire safety measures'.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents. Households with 'moderately high' or 'high' levels of emergency planning engaged in 3 or 4 of the following: having an exit plan, an emergency supply kit, extra copies of important documents and an emergency contact list. 'Moderately high' or 'high' levels of precautionary measures include having 3 or 4 of the following: a wind-up or battery operated radio, a back-up generator, an alternate source of heat and additional water. 'Moderately high' or 'high' levels of fire safety measure include having all 3 of the following: a working smoke detector, a working fire extinguisher, and a working carbon monoxide detector.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

## Notes

<sup>E</sup> use with caution

- 1 A Census Metropolitan Area (CMA) or a Census Agglomeration (CA) is formed by one or more adjacent municipalities centred on a population centre (known as the core). A CMA must have a total population of at least 100,000 of which 50,000 or more must live in the core. A CA must have a core population of at least 10,000. To be included in the CMA or CA, other adjacent municipalities must have a high degree of integration with the core as measured by commuting flows derived from census data.
- 2 The target population for the SEPR included all persons 15 years of age or older, residing in households in Canada's 10 provinces, excluding full-time residents of institutions (e.g., nursing homes, group homes, hospitals).
- 3 The SEPR covers three types of communities: Census Metropolitan Areas (CMAs), Census Agglomerations (CAs) with population greater than 50,000, and 'smaller communities' which include CAs with population 50,000 or less and those areas that fall outside of CMAs and CAs. All CMAs and CAs (with population greater than 50,000) were included in the SEPR. A sample of households were selected from smaller communities within each province to represent all households within the province in similar communities. Additional information on the SEPR and its sampling methodology can be found in the 'Survey description' section.
- 4 Throughout this fact sheet, responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.
- 5 This section focuses on personal experiences with emergencies or disasters that happened in Canada, in a community where the person was living at the time, and was significant enough to severely interrupt the individual's regular daily activities.

- 6 Emergency planning activities include: having an emergency exit plan, a household emergency supply kit, extra copies of important documents and an emergency contact list.
- 7 Precautionary measures include: having a wind-up or battery-operated radio, an alternate heat source such as a non-electric stove or heater, or a wood-burning fireplace, a back-up generator and an alternative water source such as a well, tank or litres of stored water.
- 8 Unless otherwise specified, differences are statistically significant ( $p < 0.05$ ).
- 9 A 'strong sense of belonging to community' is rating one's own sense of belonging to their community as a 4 or a 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "very weak" and 5 "very strong".
- 10 A proportion (13%) of respondents were not asked questions regarding neighbourhood helpfulness in the event of an emergency and as such these cases are not included in the analysis on neighbourhood helpfulness in general or in the event of an emergency.
- 11 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were equal to 12% when respondents were asked about whether their neighbourhood is a place where neighbours would help each other if there is an emergency.
- 12 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% when respondents were asked about the number of people they could turn to for help if financial support is needed.



## Fact sheet Community of Shawinigan (CA), Quebec

---

In 2014, information on the emergency preparedness of people living in the Census Agglomeration<sup>1</sup> of Shawinigan was collected through the Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada (SEPR).<sup>2</sup> This fact sheet presents information on the risk awareness and level of emergency preparedness of the residents of Shawinigan, which could help improve the understanding of community resilience in the event of an emergency.<sup>3,4</sup>

### **Risk awareness and anticipated sources of help in an emergency or disaster**

- Residents of Shawinigan anticipated winter storms (including blizzards, ice storms and extreme cold) (84%), extended power outages lasting 24 hours or longer (72%) and heat waves (66%) to be the most likely emergency-type events to occur within their community.
- Residents anticipated turning to the police as an initial source for help and information if they were faced with rioting or civil unrest (60%), an act of terrorism or terrorist threat (48%) or a weather-related emergency or natural disaster (28%). Calling 911 (35%) was the most commonly anticipated source of initial help if an industrial or transportation accident were to occur (Table 1.1). In the event of an extended power outage, utility companies (72%) were most commonly anticipated to be the first source of help and information, whereas hospitals, clinics, doctors or other medical professionals (81%) were the most commonly anticipated sources of initial help and information in the event of an outbreak of a serious or life-threatening disease. Residents of Shawinigan anticipated turning to their local government (57%) as an initial source of help and information in the event of a contamination or shortage of water or food.

### **Prior lifetime experience with a major emergency or disaster<sup>5</sup>**

- One in four (25%) residents of Shawinigan had personally experienced a major emergency or disaster in Canada within a community where they were living at the time. Close to two-thirds (63%) of these people had experienced emergencies that were severe enough to disrupt their regular daily activities.
- Winter storms including blizzards and ice storms were the most common type of emergency or disaster experienced by residents (46%), followed by extended power outages (21%<sup>E</sup>).
- Residents who were affected by a major emergency or disaster most often experienced an inability to use electrical appliances (64%), an inability to use water at home for routine tasks (49%) and a need to miss school or work (41%) as a result. More serious implications such as home evacuation (25%<sup>E</sup>) and the inability to use roads or transportation within the community (20%<sup>E</sup>) were less commonly experienced.
- Two-thirds (68%) of victims of major emergencies or disasters were able to resume their daily activities within one week of the event; half of residents (50%) were able to resume activities within two days.
- About half (48%) of residents who were affected by major emergencies received help either during or immediately following the event, most commonly from family members (45%<sup>E</sup>).<sup>6</sup>
- Just over one-third (35%<sup>E</sup>) of the residents of Shawinigan who had experienced major emergencies or disasters endured a loss of property or another financial impact as a result. About one in seven (15%<sup>E</sup>) experienced long-term emotional or psychological impacts.

### **Emergency planning, precautionary and fire safety behaviours**

- Two-thirds (67%) of people in Shawinigan lived in households that were engaged in at least two emergency planning activities <sup>7</sup> (Table 1.2). About four in ten (39%) lived in a household with three or four such activities. Less than one in ten (8%<sup>E</sup>) people lived in a household that had not participated in any emergency planning activities.
- More than half (54%) of residents lived in a household with at least two precautionary measures <sup>8</sup> taken in case of an emergency, with one-quarter (25%) living in a household with three or four such measures. More than one in ten (13%) people lived in a household with no precautionary measures in place.
- Most (98%) residents reported living in a household with a working smoke detector (Table 1.3). Three-quarters (74%) of the residents reported living in a household with a working fire extinguisher and one in three (34%) stated that they had a working carbon monoxide detector in their home. About three in ten (29%) people reported that they had all three fire safety measures within their households.
- Generally, the number of emergency planning activities or precautionary measures taken by residents of Shawinigan did not differ significantly from the behaviours of residents of Quebec or residents of Canada's 10 provinces in general. In terms of fire safety, residents of Shawinigan were significantly less likely to have all three measures within their homes (29%) compared to Canadians overall (42%).<sup>9</sup>
- Residents of Shawinigan were more likely to have a working fire extinguisher within their homes (74%) than both residents of Quebec (67%) and Canada overall (66%). In terms of other types of activities and measures, where there were differences between residents of Shawinigan and Canadians, rates of participation were lower among residents of Shawinigan.

## Social networks and sense of belonging

- Almost half (46%) of residents of Shawinigan had a strong sense of belonging <sup>10</sup> to their community.
- The majority (89%) of residents described the neighbourhood they lived in as a place where neighbours generally help each other. <sup>11</sup> Of those who did not describe their neighbourhood this way, almost three-quarters (72%) still described it as a place where neighbours would help each other in an emergency. <sup>12</sup>
- Many residents had a large network of support in the event of an emergency or disaster, with more than five people to turn to for emotional support (55%), if physically injured (49%) or in case of a home evacuation (48%). About one in five people had a large network of support if financial help was needed (18%), and about one in ten (11%) reported they had no one to turn to for financial help. <sup>13</sup>
- The involvement of residents of Shawinigan in social and political activities did not have any significant impact on their level of emergency preparedness (Table 1.4).

## Data tables

**Table 1.1**

**Most commonly anticipated sources of initial help and information, by type of emergency or disaster, residents of Shawinigan, Quebec, 2014**

Most common sources of initial help and information by type of emergency or disaster	percent
<b>Weather-related emergency or natural disaster</b>	
Police/law enforcement	28
Local government	28
911	24
<b>Extended power outages</b>	
Utility company	72
Local government	7 <sup>E</sup>
Family	6 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Outbreak of serious or life-threatening disease</b>	
Hospital, clinic, doctor or other medical professional	81
911	8 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Industrial or transportation accident</b>	

911	35
Police/law enforcement	30
Local government	17 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Contamination or shortage of water or food</b>	
Local government	57
Hospital, clinic, doctor or other medical professional	9 <sup>E</sup>
News- Internet	8 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Act of terrorism or terrorist threat</b>	
Police/law enforcement	48
911	41
<b>Rioting or civil unrest</b>	
Police/law enforcement	60
911	37 <sup>E</sup>
<sup>E</sup> use with caution	
<b>Note:</b> Respondents who perceived their community was at risk for any form of emergency or disaster were then asked where they would turn to first for information or assistance in the event of the perceived emergency or disaster. Respondents could provide more than one response. Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.	
<b>Source:</b> Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.	

**Table 1.2**  
**Number of emergency planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents, community of Shawinigan, Quebec, 2014**

Number of planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents	Shawinigan	Quebec	Canada
	percent		
<b>Number of emergency planning activities</b>			
None	8 <sup>E</sup>	10	8
1 activity	22	22	17
2 activities	28	26	25
3 activities	22 **	26	27
4 activities	17	14	19
<b>Number of precautionary measures</b>			
None	13	17	16
1 measure	31	29	27
2 measures	29	28	28
3 measures	19	17	20
4 measures	6 <sup>E</sup>	8	7
<b>Number of fire safety measures <sup>1 2</sup></b>			
None	F	F	1
1 measure	18 ***	24	14
2 measures	47 **	42	38
3 measures	29 **	28	42

E use with caution  
 F too unreliable to be published

\*\* significantly different from Canada level estimate (p < 0.05)

\*\*\* significantly different from both provincial and Canada level estimates (p < 0.05)

1 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Canada'.

2 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Quebec'.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents. Emergency planning activities include: an emergency exit plan, an emergency supply kit, photocopies/electronic copies of important documents and a list of emergency contact numbers. Precautionary measures include: a battery-operated or wind-up radio, an alternative heat source, a back-up generator and an alternative water source. Fire safety measures include a working smoke detector, a working carbon monoxide detector and a working fire extinguisher.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

**Table 1.3**  
**Planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures residents engaged in, community of Shawinigan, Quebec, 2014**

Residents whose households were involved in the following:	Shawinigan	Quebec	Canada
	percent		
<b>Emergency planning activities</b>			
Emergency exit plan	47 **	46	60
Exit plan has been practised/reviewed in last 12 months <sup>1</sup>	50 <sup>1</sup>	40	46
Designated meeting place for household members <sup>2</sup>	36	34	33
Contact plan for household members <sup>2</sup>	49	51	55
Household emergency supply kit	53	47	47
Vehicle emergency supply kit <sup>3</sup>	45 **	46	59
Extra copies of important documents	46 **	47	53
List of emergency contact numbers	70	68	69
Plan for meeting special health needs <sup>4</sup>	70	61	62
<b>Precautionary measures</b>			
Wind-up or battery-operated radio	60	58	58
Alternate heat source	54	48	48
Back-up generator	18	22	23
Alternate water source	36 **	38	43
Other <sup>5</sup>	21	20	21
<b>Fire safety measures</b>			
Working smoke detector	98	98	98
Working carbon monoxide detector	34 **	34	60
Working fire extinguisher	74 ***	67	66

\* significantly different from provincial level estimate (p < 0.05)

\*\* significantly different from Canada level estimate (p < 0.05)

\*\*\* significantly different from both provincial and Canada level estimates (p < 0.05)

1 Percentage based only on those indicating that they have an emergency exit plan.

2 Excludes Canadians living in single-person households.

3 Excludes those who reported that they lived in a household that did not have a vehicle.

4 Percentage based only on those indicating that they or someone in their household has special medical needs.

5 'Other precautionary measures' include having an escape/rescue plan for pets, extra supply of fuel, checking and replenishing emergency supplies, and keeping exits clear.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

**Table 1.4**

**High or moderately high levels of emergency planning, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents, by social and political involvement, community of Shawinigan, Quebec, 2014**

Social and political involvement	Percentage of residents who had high or moderately high levels of...		
	Planning activities	Precautionary measures	Fire safety measures
	percent		
<b>Engagement in political activities <sup>1</sup></b>			
Yes †	41	26	29
No	36 <sup>E</sup>	26 <sup>E</sup>	F
<b>High level of civic engagement <sup>2</sup></b>			
Yes †	43	26	28
No	38	26	30
<b>High level of social support <sup>3</sup></b>			
Yes †	48	34 <sup>E</sup>	29 <sup>E</sup>
No	37	24	30
<b>Strong sense of belonging to community <sup>4</sup></b>			
Yes †	42	27	33
No	36	24	26
<b>High neighbourhood trust <sup>5</sup></b>			
Yes †	36	31	32
No	40	24	28
<b>High level of self-efficacy <sup>6</sup></b>			
Yes †	42	30	31
No	36	22 <sup>E</sup>	27



<sup>E</sup> use with caution

F too unreliable to be published

t reference category

- 1 Includes individuals over the age of 17 years who are eligible to vote, and who have participated in or volunteered for political parties or events in the past 12 months, including municipal, provincial, or federal elections, or expressed views on political or social issues through signing a petition, contacting news agencies or politicians, or attended a meeting involving social or community issues.
- 2 Civic engagement measures individuals over the age of 17 years who were involved in a recreational group or organization in the past 12 months, and includes engagement in political activities. A 'high level' is defined as having been involved in at least 4 activities in the past 12 months.
- 3 A 'high level of social support' is defined as having five or more people whom that individual could turn to for help in an emergency if they are physically injured, require emotional support, shelter, and/or financial assistance.
- 4 A 'strong sense of belonging to community' is rating one's own sense of belonging to their community as a 4 or a 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "very weak" and 5 "very strong".
- 5 'High neighbourhood trust' is rating one's own trust in the people in one's neighbourhood as 4 or 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "cannot be trusted at all" and 5 represents "can be trusted a lot", as well as having a response of "very likely" when asked about the likelihood of someone in their neighbourhood returning a lost wallet or purse containing two hundred dollars with the money still inside.
- 6 A 'high level of self-efficacy' is derived from having a high self-rating on a scale of 1 (poor) to 5 (excellent) for the following three categories: an ability to think clearly and solve day-to-day problems, to handle unexpected and difficult problems, and to figure out what to do if faced with an emergency situation.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents. Households with 'moderately high' or 'high' levels of emergency planning engaged in 3 or 4 of the following: having an exit plan, an emergency supply kit, extra copies of important documents and an emergency contact list. 'Moderately high' or 'high' levels of precautionary measures include having 3 or 4 of the following: a wind-up or battery operated radio, a back-up generator, an alternate source of heat and additional water. 'Moderately high' or 'high' levels of fire safety measure include having all 3 of the following: a working smoke detector, a working fire extinguisher, and a working carbon monoxide detector.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

## Notes

<sup>E</sup> use with caution

- 1 A Census Metropolitan Area (CMA) or a Census Agglomeration (CA) is formed by one or more adjacent municipalities centred on a population centre (known as the core). A CMA must have a total population of at least 100,000 of which 50,000 or more must live in the core. A CA must have a core population of at least 10,000. To be included in the CMA or CA, other adjacent municipalities must have a high degree of integration with the core as measured by commuting flows derived from census data.
- 2 The target population for the SEPR included all persons 15 years of age or older, residing in households in Canada's 10 provinces, excluding full-time residents of institutions (e.g. nursing homes, group homes, hospitals).
- 3 The SEPR covers three types of communities: Census Metropolitan Areas (CMAs), Census Agglomerations (CAs) with population greater than 50,000, and 'smaller communities' which include CAs with population 50,000 or less and those areas that fall outside of CMAs and CAs. All CMAs and CAs (with population greater than 50,000) were included in the SEPR. A sample of households were selected from smaller communities within each province to represent all households within the province in similar communities. Additional information on the SEPR and its sampling methodology can be found in the 'Survey description' section.
- 4 Throughout this fact sheet, responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.
- 5 This section focuses on personal experiences with emergencies or disasters that happened in Canada, in a community where the person was living at the time, and was significant enough to severely interrupt the individual's regular daily activities.
- 6 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% when respondents were asked about the source of information or assistance they received during or immediately following the emergency they experienced.

- 7 Emergency planning activities include: having an emergency exit plan, a household emergency supply kit, extra copies of important documents and an emergency contact list.
- 8 Precautionary measures include: having a wind-up or battery-operated radio, an alternate heat source such as a non-electric stove or heater, or a wood-burning fireplace, a back-up generator and an alternative water source such as a well, tank or litres of stored water.
- 9 Unless otherwise specified, differences are statistically significant ( $p < 0.05$ ).
- 10 A 'strong sense of belonging to community' is rating one's own sense of belonging to their community as a 4 or a 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "very weak" and 5 "very strong".
- 11 A proportion (20%) of respondents were not asked questions regarding neighbourhood helpfulness in the event of an emergency and as such these cases are not included in the analysis on neighbourhood helpfulness in general or in the event of an emergency.
- 12 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were equal to 16% when respondents were asked about whether their neighbourhood is a place where neighbours would help each other if there is an emergency.
- 13 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% when respondents were asked about the number of people they could turn to for help if financial support is needed.



## Fact sheet Community of Drummondville (CA), Quebec

---

In 2014, information on the emergency preparedness of people living in the Census Agglomeration<sup>1</sup> of Drummondville was collected through the Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada (SEPR).<sup>2</sup> This fact sheet presents information on the risk awareness and level of emergency preparedness of the residents of Drummondville, which could help improve the understanding of community resilience in the event of an emergency.<sup>3,4</sup>

### **Risk awareness and anticipated sources of help in an emergency or disaster**

- Most (92%) residents of Drummondville anticipated winter storms (including blizzards, ice storms and extreme cold) to be the most likely events to occur within their community, followed by extended power outages lasting 24 hours or longer (85%) and industrial or transportation accidents (61%).
- The police were the most commonly anticipated source of initial help and information by residents in the event of rioting or civil unrest (58%), an act of terrorism or terrorist threat (47%) or an industrial or transportation accident (28%) (Table 1.1). Residents anticipated first turning to their local government in the event of a contamination or shortage of water or food (47%) or a weather-related emergency or natural disaster (27%). If faced with an extended power outage, residents of Drummondville would turn to their utility company first (62%) and to a hospital, clinic, doctor or other medical professional (66%) in the event of an outbreak of a serious or life-threatening disease.

### **Prior lifetime experience with a major emergency or disaster<sup>5</sup>**

- Close to six in ten (62%) people in Drummondville have faced a major emergency or disaster within Canada in a community where they were living at the time. Most (77%) of these people experienced severe disruptions to their daily activities as a result.
- Winter storms, which include blizzards and ice storms were the most commonly experienced emergency or disaster (92%).
- The most common types of disruption to daily activities endured by residents who experienced major emergencies or disasters included the inability to use electrical appliances (78%), missing work or school (72%) and having to boil water for drinking or drink bottled water (53%).<sup>6</sup> More severe disruptions included home evacuations (43%), experienced by more than four in ten residents, and the inability to use roads or transportation within the community (22%), experienced by nearly a quarter of people faced with an emergency.
- Three in ten (30%) victims of major emergencies or disasters were able to resume their daily activities within a week of the event. More than half (52%) needed between one and four weeks to recover.
- Two-thirds (67%) of residents received help during or immediately following the emergency or disaster they experienced. Family members (52%) were the most common source of assistance, followed by friends (16%<sup>E</sup>) and local government (15%<sup>E</sup>).
- Half (50%) of the residents of Drummondville who had experienced major emergencies or disasters that were significant enough to disrupt their regular daily activities endured a loss of property or another financial impact as a result. Other long-term impacts, such as emotional or psychological consequences (5%<sup>E</sup>) were not as commonly experienced.

### **Emergency planning, precautionary and fire safety behaviours**

- Just over six in ten (63%) people in Drummondville lived in households that were engaged in at least two emergency planning activities,<sup>7</sup> with three in ten residents (31%) reporting three or four such activities (Table 1.2). One in seven (14%) people lived in a household that had not participated in any emergency planning activities.
- More than half (55%) of residents lived in a household with at least two precautionary measures<sup>8</sup> taken in case of an emergency, with one-quarter (25%) living in a household with three or four such measures. About one in seven (15%) people lived in a household with no precautionary measures in place.
- The majority (98%) of residents reported living in a household with a working smoke detector, and two-thirds (66%) reported that they had a working fire extinguisher (Table 1.3). About four in ten (38%) residents stated that they had a working carbon monoxide detector in their household. One in three (33%) people reported that they had implemented all three fire safety measures within their households.
- When compared to residents of Quebec overall, there were almost no significant differences in the number of activities or measures engaged in by residents of Drummondville. However, when compared to Canadians living in the 10 provinces, the proportion of people in Drummondville who had not participated in any emergency planning activities was significantly higher (14% versus 8%), while the proportion of people with all four emergency planning activities (11%) and all three fire safety measures (33%) was significantly lower than the Canadian proportions overall (19% and 42%, respectively).<sup>9</sup>
- In terms of the types of activities and measures people were involved in, some differences were found between residents of Drummondville and residents of Quebec and Canada overall. For example, having an emergency exit plan was less common among residents of Drummondville (38%) than among Quebec residents (46%) and Canadians overall (60%). Similarly, the proportion of those in Drummondville with a working carbon monoxide detector within their homes (38%) was significantly lower than the national proportion (60%).

## Social networks and sense of belonging

- Half (49%) of residents of Drummondville had a strong sense of belonging<sup>10</sup> to their community.
- Three-quarters (77%) of residents described the neighbourhood they lived in as a place where neighbours generally help each other.<sup>11</sup> Of those who did not describe their neighbourhood this way, most (76%) still described it as a place where neighbours would help each other in an emergency.<sup>12</sup>
- More than half of residents had a large network of support in the event of an emergency or disaster, with more than five people to turn to for emotional support (60%), for help if physically injured (55%) and in case of a home evacuation (52%). About one in five people had a large network of support if financial help was needed (19%), and about one in ten (11%) reported that they had no one to turn to for financial help.<sup>13</sup>
- Generally, there were no significant differences found between those residents of Drummondville who were involved in social or political activities and those who were not, in terms of levels of emergency planning activities, precautionary or fire safety measures (Table 1.4).

## Data tables

**Table 1.1**

**Most commonly anticipated sources of initial help and information, by type of emergency or disaster, residents of Drummondville, Quebec, 2014**

Most common sources of initial help and information by type of emergency or disaster	percent
<b>Weather-related emergency or natural disaster</b>	
Local government	27
Police/law enforcement	25
911	18
<b>Extended power outages</b>	
Utility company	62
Local government	10 <sup>E</sup>
Family	9 <sup>E</sup>

<b>Outbreak of serious or life-threatening disease</b>	
Hospital, clinic, doctor or other medical professional	66
News- Internet	9 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Industrial or transportation accident</b>	
Police/law enforcement	28
911	26
Local government	18
<b>Contamination or shortage of water or food <sup>1</sup></b>	
Local government	47
Police/law enforcement	8 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Act of terrorism or terrorist threat</b>	
Police/law enforcement	47
911	26 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Rioting or civil unrest <sup>1</sup></b>	
Police/law enforcement	58
911	22 <sup>E</sup>
News- Television	7 <sup>E</sup>
<sup>E</sup> use with caution	
1 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% when respondents were asked about their likely sources of initial help and information.	
<b>Note:</b> Respondents who perceived their community was at risk for any form of emergency or disaster were then asked where they would turn to first for information or assistance in the event of the perceived emergency or disaster. Respondents could provide more than one response. Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.	
<b>Source:</b> Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.	

**Table 1.2**

**Number of emergency planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents, community of Drummondville, Quebec, 2014**

Number of planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents	Drummondville	Quebec	Canada
	percent		
<b>Number of emergency planning activities</b>			
None	14 **	10	8
1 activity	23 **	22	17
2 activities	32 **	26	25
3 activities	20 ***	26	27
4 activities	11 **	14	19
<b>Number of precautionary measures</b>			
None	15	17	16
1 measure	27	29	27
2 measures	30	28	28
3 measures	17	17	20
4 measures	8 <sup>E</sup>	8	7
<b>Number of fire safety measures <sup>1 2</sup></b>			
None	F	F	1
1 measure	27 **	24	14
2 measures	37	42	38
3 measures	33 **	28	42

E use with caution  
 F too unreliable to be published

\*\* significantly different from Canada level estimate (p < 0.05)

\*\*\* significantly different from both provincial and Canada level estimates (p < 0.05)

1 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Canada'.

2 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Quebec'.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents. Emergency planning activities include: an emergency exit plan, an emergency supply kit, photocopies/electronic copies of important documents and a list of emergency contact numbers. Precautionary measures include: a battery-operated or wind-up radio, an alternative heat source, a back-up generator and an alternative water source. Fire safety measures include a working smoke detector, a working carbon monoxide detector and a working fire extinguisher.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

**Table 1.3**  
**Planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures residents engaged in, community of Drummondville, Quebec, 2014**

Residents whose households were involved in the following:	Drummondville	Quebec	Canada
	percent		
<b>Emergency planning activities</b>			
Emergency exit plan	38 ***	46	60
Exit plan has been practised/reviewed in last 12 months <sup>1</sup>	45	40	46
Designated meeting place for household members <sup>2</sup>	41 ***	34	33
Contact plan for household members <sup>2</sup>	47 **	51	55
Household emergency supply kit	48	47	47
Vehicle emergency supply kit <sup>3</sup>	46 **	46	59
Extra copies of important documents	37 ***	47	53
List of emergency contact numbers	68	68	69
Plan for meeting special health needs <sup>4 6</sup>	56	61	62
<b>Precautionary measures</b>			
Wind-up or battery-operated radio	56	58	58
Alternate heat source	49	48	48
Back-up generator	22	22	23
Alternate water source	46 *	38	43
Other <sup>5</sup>	17	20	21
<b>Fire safety measures</b>			
Working smoke detector	98	98	98
Working carbon monoxide detector	38 **	34	60
Working fire extinguisher	66	67	66

\* significantly different from provincial level estimate (p < 0.05)

\*\* significantly different from Canada level estimate (p < 0.05)

\*\*\* significantly different from both provincial and Canada level estimates (p < 0.05)

1 Percentage based only on those indicating that they have an emergency exit plan.

2 Excludes Canadians living in single-person households.

3 Excludes those who reported that they lived in a household that did not have a vehicle.

4 Percentage based only on those indicating that they or someone in their household has special medical needs.

5 'Other precautionary measures' include having an escape/rescue plan for pets, extra supply of fuel, checking and replenishing emergency supplies, and keeping exits clear.

6 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Drummondville'.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

**Table 1.4**

**High or moderately high levels of emergency planning, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents, by social and political involvement, community of Drummondville, Quebec, 2014**

Social and political involvement	Percentage of residents who had high or moderately high levels of...		
	Planning activities	Precautionary measures	Fire safety measures
	percent		
<b>Engagement in political activities <sup>1</sup></b>			
Yes †	32	27	33
No	35 <sup>E</sup>	25 <sup>E</sup>	35 <sup>E</sup>
<b>High level of civic engagement <sup>2</sup></b>			
Yes †	34	31	35
No	30	21 <sup>E</sup>	30
<b>High level of social support <sup>3</sup></b>			
Yes †	30 <sup>E</sup>	26 <sup>E</sup>	41 <sup>E</sup>
No	31	26	30
<b>Strong sense of belonging to community <sup>4</sup></b>			
Yes †	36	25	34
No	27	26	32
<b>High neighbourhood trust <sup>5</sup></b>			
Yes †	40	32 <sup>E</sup>	41
No	28 †	23	29
<b>High level of self-efficacy <sup>6</sup></b>			
Yes †	37	33	37
No	28	20 †	30

<sup>E</sup> use with caution

\* significantly different from reference category ( $p < 0.05$ )

† reference category

- 1 Includes individuals over the age of 17 years who are eligible to vote, and who have participated in or volunteered for political parties or events in the past 12 months, including municipal, provincial, or federal elections, or expressed views on political or social issues through signing a petition, contacting news agencies or politicians, or attended a meeting involving social or community issues.
- 2 Civic engagement measures individuals over the age of 17 years who were involved in a recreational group or organization in the past 12 months, and includes engagement in political activities. A 'high level' is defined as having been involved in at least 4 activities in the past 12 months.
- 3 A 'high level of social support' is defined as having five or more people whom that individual could turn to for help in an emergency if they are physically injured, require emotional support, shelter, and/or financial assistance.
- 4 A 'strong sense of belonging to community' is rating one's own sense of belonging to their community as a 4 or a 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "very weak" and 5 "very strong".
- 5 'High neighbourhood trust' is rating one's own trust in the people in one's neighbourhood as 4 or 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "cannot be trusted at all" and 5 represents "can be trusted a lot", as well as having a response of "very likely" when asked about the likelihood of someone in their neighbourhood returning a lost wallet or purse containing two hundred dollars with the money still inside.
- 6 A 'high level of self-efficacy' is derived from having a high self-rating on a scale of 1 (poor) to 5 (excellent) for the following three categories: an ability to think clearly and solve day-to-day problems, to handle unexpected and difficult problems, and to figure out what to do if faced with an emergency situation.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents. Households with 'moderately high' or 'high' levels of emergency planning engaged in 3 or 4 of the following: having an exit plan, an emergency supply kit, extra copies of important documents and an emergency contact list. 'Moderately high' or 'high' levels of precautionary measures include having 3 or 4 of the following: a wind-up or battery operated radio, a back-up generator, an alternate source of heat and additional water. 'Moderately high' or 'high' levels of fire safety measure include having all 3 of the following: a working smoke detector, a working fire extinguisher, and a working carbon monoxide detector.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

## Notes

<sup>E</sup> use with caution

- 1 A Census Metropolitan Area (CMA) or a Census Agglomeration (CA) is formed by one or more adjacent municipalities centred on a population centre (known as the core). A CMA must have a total population of at least 100,000 of which 50,000 or more must live in the core. A CA must have a core population of at least 10,000. To be included in the CMA or CA, other adjacent municipalities must have a high degree of integration with the core as measured by commuting flows derived from census data.
- 2 The target population for the SEPR included all persons 15 years of age or older, residing in households in Canada's 10 provinces, excluding full-time residents of institutions (e.g., nursing homes, group homes, hospitals).
- 3 The SEPR covers three types of communities: Census Metropolitan Areas (CMAs), Census Agglomerations (CAs) with population greater than 50,000, and 'smaller communities' which include CAs with population 50,000 or less and those areas that fall outside of CMAs and CAs. All CMAs and CAs (with population greater than 50,000) were included in the SEPR. A sample of households were selected from smaller communities within each province to represent all households within the province in similar communities. Additional information on the SEPR and its sampling methodology can be found in the 'Survey description' section.
- 4 Throughout this fact sheet, responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.
- 5 This section focuses on personal experiences with emergencies or disasters that happened in Canada, in a community where the person was living at the time, and was significant enough to severely interrupt the individual's regular daily activities.
- 6 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% when respondents were asked about whether the emergency they experienced caused them to have to boil drinking water or use bottled water for drinking.



- 7 Emergency planning activities include: having an emergency exit plan, a household emergency supply kit, extra copies of important documents and an emergency contact list.
- 8 Precautionary measures include: having a wind-up or battery-operated radio, an alternate heat source such as a non-electric stove or heater, or a wood-burning fireplace, a back-up generator and an alternative water source such as a well, tank or litres of stored water.
- 9 Unless otherwise specified, differences are statistically significant ( $p < 0.05$ ).
- 10 A 'strong sense of belonging to community' is rating one's own sense of belonging to their community as a 4 or a 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "very weak" and 5 "very strong".
- 11 A proportion (16%) of respondents were not asked questions regarding neighbourhood helpfulness in the event of an emergency and as such these cases are not included in the analysis on neighbourhood helpfulness in general or in the event of an emergency.
- 12 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% when respondents were asked about whether their neighbourhood is a place where neighbours would help each other if there is an emergency.
- 13 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% when respondents were asked about the number of people they could turn to for help if financial support is needed.



## Fact sheet Community of Granby (CA), Quebec

---

In 2014, information on the emergency preparedness of people living in the Census Agglomeration<sup>1</sup> of Granby was collected through the Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada (SEPR).<sup>2</sup> This fact sheet presents information on the risk awareness and level of emergency preparedness of the residents of Granby, which could help improve the understanding of community resilience in the event of an emergency.<sup>3,4</sup>

### **Risk awareness and anticipated sources of help in an emergency or disaster**

- Most (93%) people in Granby anticipated winter storms (including blizzards, ice storms and extreme cold) as the event most likely to occur within their community. Extended power outages lasting 24 hours or longer (86%) and heat waves (62%) were also among the types of events residents believed are most likely to occur.
- Residents anticipated turning to the police as an initial source for help and information if they were faced with an act of terrorism or terrorist threat (59%), rioting or civil unrest (54%) or an industrial or transportation accident (33%) (Table 1.1). Residents anticipated first turning to their local government in the event of a contamination or shortage of water or food (61%) or if faced with a weather-related emergency or natural disaster (35%). Hospitals, clinics, doctors and other medical professionals (69%) were the most commonly anticipated sources for initial help and information in the event of an outbreak of a serious or life-threatening disease. In the event of an extended power outage, residents would first turn to their utility company (66%).

### **Prior lifetime experience with a major emergency or disaster<sup>5</sup>**

- The majority (73%) of residents of Granby have faced a major emergency or disaster within Canada in a community where they were living at the time, and for most (82%) people this emergency led to severe disruptions to daily activities.
- Most (95%) residents who faced a major emergency or disaster experienced winter storms which include blizzards and ice storms. Although experienced less often, extended power outages lasting 24 hours or longer (7%<sup>E</sup>) followed as the next most commonly experienced type of event.
- An inability to use electrical appliances was the most common disruption to daily life (84%), followed by missing work or school (78%). Half of those affected by an emergency had to evacuate their home as a result (50%). Though less commonly experienced, the inability to communicate with others outside the household (23%) and the inability to use roads or transportation within the community (17%) were among the more serious disruptions experienced as a result of a major emergency.
- Although three in ten (29%) residents of Granby who experienced an emergency or disaster were able to resume their daily activities within one week of the event, many (54%) needed between one week and a month.
- Three-quarters (76%) of residents who experienced an emergency or disaster received help either during or immediately following the event, most often from a family member (44%). One in four (25%) received the help from their local government.
- More than half (55%) of the residents of Granby who experienced a major emergency or disaster severe enough to disrupt their regular daily activities endured a loss of property or another financial impact as a result. Long-term emotional or psychological consequences were less common (7%<sup>E</sup>).

## Emergency planning, precautionary and fire safety behaviours

- Three in five (59%) people in Granby lived in households that were engaged in at least two emergency planning activities,<sup>6</sup> with more than one-third (37%) living in households with three or four such activities (Table 1.2). One in ten (11%) people lived in a household that had not participated in any emergency planning activities.
- More than half (54%) of residents lived in a household with at least two precautionary measures<sup>7</sup> taken in case of an emergency, with more than one-quarter (29%) living in a household with three or four such measures. One out of seven (14%) people lived in a household with no precautionary measures in place.
- Most (98%) residents reported living in a household with a working smoke detector, and nearly three-quarters reported that they had a working fire extinguisher (73%) (Table 1.3). More than one-third (39%) of residents stated that they had a working carbon monoxide detector in their household. One in three people (33%) stated that they had implemented all three fire safety measures within their households.<sup>8</sup>
- The precautionary behaviours of residents of Granby did not significantly differ from residents of Quebec in general or from Canadians in the 10 provinces overall. Granby residents, however, were less likely to have all four emergency planning activities (11%) and all three fire safety measures (33%) in place compared to Canadians (19% and 42%, respectively), but were still more likely than Quebec residents overall to have all three fire safety measures (28%).<sup>9 10</sup>
- Some differences in terms of the types of activities and measures taken were observed between residents of Granby and residents of Quebec in general and Canadians overall. For example, residents of Granby who had an emergency exit plan were more likely than all Quebec residents to have recently practiced or reviewed the plan (53% versus 40%). They were also more likely to have a working fire extinguisher in their homes (73%) than were all Quebec residents (67%) and all Canadians (66%).

## Social networks and sense of belonging

- Less than half (43%) of residents of Granby had a strong sense of belonging<sup>11</sup> to their community.
- Almost three-quarters (73%) of residents described the neighbourhood they lived in as a place where neighbours generally help each other.<sup>12</sup> Of those who did not describe their neighbourhood this way, most (80%) still described it as a place where neighbours would help each other in an emergency.<sup>13</sup>
- More than half of residents had a large network of support in the event of an emergency or disaster, with more than five people to turn to for emotional support (56%) and for help if physically injured (53%). Nearly as many had such a network of support in case of a home evacuation (45%). About one in five people had such a large network of support if financial help was needed (19%), and about one in ten (11%) reported that they had no one to turn to for financial help.<sup>14</sup>
- High levels of civic engagement and involvement in political activities were often associated with a higher level of emergency preparedness (Table 1.4).

## Data tables

Table 1.1

Most commonly anticipated sources of initial help and information, by type of emergency or disaster, residents of Granby, Quebec, 2014

Most common sources of initial help and information by type of emergency or disaster	percent
<b>Weather-related emergency or natural disaster</b>	
Local government	35
Police/law enforcement	33
911	16
<b>Extended power outages</b>	
Utility company	66
Family	10 <sup>E</sup>
Local government	7 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Outbreak of serious or life-threatening disease</b>	

Hospital, clinic, doctor or other medical professional	69
News- Television	10 <sup>E</sup>
News- Internet	9 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Industrial or transportation accident</b>	
Police/law enforcement	33
Local government	23
911	21
<b>Contamination or shortage of water or food</b>	
Local government	61
News- Internet	7 <sup>E</sup>
Police/law enforcement	7 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Act of terrorism or terrorist threat</b>	
Police/law enforcement	59
911	21 <sup>E</sup>
News- Television	13 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Rioting or civil unrest</b>	
Police/law enforcement	54
911	19 <sup>E</sup>
News- Television	11 <sup>E</sup>
<sup>E</sup> use with caution <b>Note:</b> Respondents who perceived their community was at risk for any form of emergency or disaster were then asked where they would turn to first for information or assistance in the event of the perceived emergency or disaster. Respondents could provide more than one response. Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents. <b>Source:</b> Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.	

**Table 1.2**  
**Number of emergency planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents, community of Granby, Quebec, 2014**

Number of planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents	Granby	Quebec	Canada
	percent		
<b>Number of emergency planning activities</b>			
None	11	10	8
1 activity	27 **	22	17
2 activities	22	26	25
3 activities	26	26	27
4 activities	11 **	14	19
<b>Number of precautionary measures</b>			
None	14	17	16
1 measure	29	29	27
2 measures	25	28	28
3 measures	22	17	20
4 measures	7 <sup>E</sup>	8	7
<b>Number of fire safety measures <sup>1 2 3</sup></b>			
None	F	F	1
1 measure	19 **	24	14
2 measures	42	42	38
3 measures	33 ***	28	42

<sup>E</sup> use with caution  
<sup>F</sup> too unreliable to be published

\*\* significantly different from Canada level estimate (p < 0.05)

\*\*\* significantly different from both provincial and Canada level estimates (p < 0.05)

1 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Canada'.

2 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Quebec'.

3 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Granby'.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents. Emergency planning activities include: an emergency exit plan, an emergency supply kit, photocopies/electronic copies of important documents and a list of emergency contact numbers. Precautionary measures include: a battery-operated or wind-up radio, an alternative heat source, a back-up generator and an alternative water source. Fire safety measures include a working smoke detector, a working carbon monoxide detector and a working fire extinguisher.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

**Table 1.3**  
**Planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures residents engaged in, community of Granby, Quebec, 2014**

Residents whose households were involved in the following:	Granby	Quebec	Canada
	percent		
<b>Emergency planning activities</b>			
Emergency exit plan	43 **	46	60
Exit plan has been practised/reviewed in last 12 months <sup>1</sup>	53 *	40	46
Designated meeting place for household members <sup>2</sup>	33	34	33
Contact plan for household members <sup>2</sup>	42 ***	51	55
Household emergency supply kit	49	47	47
Vehicle emergency supply kit <sup>3</sup>	47 **	46	59
Extra copies of important documents	38 ***	47	53
List of emergency contact numbers	67	68	69
Plan for meeting special health needs <sup>4</sup>	47 **	61	62
<b>Precautionary measures</b>			
Wind-up or battery-operated radio	59	58	58
Alternate heat source	53	48	48
Back-up generator	21	22	23
Alternate water source	43	38	43
Other <sup>5</sup>	18	20	21
<b>Fire safety measures</b>			
Working smoke detector	98	98	98
Working carbon monoxide detector	39 **	34	60
Working fire extinguisher	73 ***	67	66

\* significantly different from provincial level estimate (p < 0.05)

\*\* significantly different from Canada level estimate (p < 0.05)

\*\*\* significantly different from both provincial and Canada level estimates (p < 0.05)

1 Percentage based only on those indicating that they have an emergency exit plan.

2 Excludes Canadians living in single-person households.

3 Excludes those who reported that they lived in a household that did not have a vehicle.

4 Percentage based only on those indicating that they or someone in their household has special medical needs.

5 'Other precautionary measures' include having an escape/rescue plan for pets, extra supply of fuel, checking and replenishing emergency supplies, and keeping exits clear.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

**Table 1.4**

**High or moderately high levels of emergency planning, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents, by social and political involvement, community of Granby, Quebec, 2014**

Social and political involvement	Percentage of residents who had high or moderately high levels of...		
	Planning activities	Precautionary measures	Fire safety measures
	percent		
<b>Engagement in political activities <sup>1</sup></b>			
Yes †	42	31	37
No	24 <sup>E *</sup>	22 <sup>E</sup>	22 <sup>E *</sup>
<b>High level of civic engagement <sup>2</sup></b>			
Yes †	43	35	38
No	32 <sup>*</sup>	21 <sup>E *</sup>	29
<b>High level of social support <sup>3</sup></b>			
Yes †	37 <sup>E</sup>	42 <sup>E</sup>	40 <sup>E</sup>
No	39	27	32
<b>Strong sense of belonging to community <sup>4</sup></b>			
Yes <sup>7</sup> †	41	31	30
No	36	29	36
<b>High neighbourhood trust <sup>5</sup></b>			
Yes †	45	32	39
No	36	28	31
<b>High level of self-efficacy <sup>6</sup></b>			
Yes <sup>7</sup> †	43	36	37
No	37	25	32

<sup>E</sup> use with caution

\* significantly different from reference category ( $p < 0.05$ )

† reference category

- 1 Includes individuals over the age of 17 years who are eligible to vote, and who have participated in or volunteered for political parties or events in the past 12 months, including municipal, provincial, or federal elections, or expressed views on political or social issues through signing a petition, contacting news agencies or politicians, or attended a meeting involving social or community issues.
- 2 Civic engagement measures individuals over the age of 17 years who were involved in a recreational group or organization in the past 12 months, and includes engagement in political activities. A 'high level' is defined as having been involved in at least 4 activities in the past 12 months.
- 3 A 'high level of social support' is defined as having five or more people whom that individual could turn to for help in an emergency if they are physically injured, require emotional support, shelter, and/or financial assistance.
- 4 A 'strong sense of belonging to community' is rating one's own sense of belonging to their community as a 4 or a 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "very weak" and 5 "very strong".
- 5 'High neighbourhood trust' is rating one's own trust in the people in one's neighbourhood as 4 or 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "cannot be trusted at all" and 5 represents "can be trusted a lot", as well as having a response of "very likely" when asked about the likelihood of someone in their neighbourhood returning a lost wallet or purse containing two hundred dollars with the money still inside.
- 6 A 'high level of self-efficacy' is derived from having a high self-rating on a scale of 1 (poor) to 5 (excellent) for the following three categories: an ability to think clearly and solve day-to-day problems, to handle unexpected and difficult problems, and to figure out what to do if faced with an emergency situation.
- 7 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Fire safety measures'.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents. Households with 'moderately high' or 'high' levels of emergency planning engaged in 3 or 4 of the following: having an exit plan, an emergency supply kit, extra copies of important documents and an emergency contact list. 'Moderately high' or 'high' levels of precautionary measures include having 3 or 4 of the following: a wind-up or battery operated radio, a back-up generator, an alternate source of heat and additional water. 'Moderately high' or 'high' levels of fire safety measure include having all 3 of the following: a working smoke detector, a working fire extinguisher, and a working carbon monoxide detector.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

## Notes

<sup>E</sup> use with caution

- 1 A Census Metropolitan Area (CMA) or a Census Agglomeration (CA) is formed by one or more adjacent municipalities centred on a population centre (known as the core). A CMA must have a total population of at least 100,000 of which 50,000 or more must live in the core. A CA must have a core population of at least 10,000. To be included in the CMA or CA, other adjacent municipalities must have a high degree of integration with the core as measured by commuting flows derived from census data.
- 2 The target population for the SEPR included all persons 15 years of age or older, residing in households in Canada's 10 provinces, excluding full-time residents of institutions (e.g., nursing homes, group homes, hospitals).
- 3 The SEPR covers three types of communities: Census Metropolitan Areas (CMAs), Census Agglomerations (CAs) with population greater than 50,000, and 'smaller communities' which include CAs with population 50,000 or less and those areas that fall outside of CMAs and CAs. All CMAs and CAs (with population greater than 50,000) were included in the SEPR. A sample of households were selected from smaller communities within each province to represent all households within the province in similar communities. Additional information on the SEPR and its sampling methodology can be found in the 'Survey description' section.
- 4 Throughout this fact sheet, responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.
- 5 This section focuses on personal experiences with emergencies or disasters that happened in Canada, in a community where the person was living at the time, and was significant enough to severely interrupt the individual's regular daily activities.

- 6 Emergency planning activities include: having an emergency exit plan, a household emergency supply kit, extra copies of important documents and an emergency contact list.
- 7 Precautionary measures include: having a wind-up or battery-operated radio, an alternate heat source such as a non-electric stove or heater, or a wood-burning fireplace, a back-up generator and an alternative water source such as a well, tank or litres of stored water.
- 8 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Fire safety measures'.
- 9 Unless otherwise specified, differences are statistically significant ( $p < 0.05$ ).
- 10 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Fire safety measures'.
- 11 A 'strong sense of belonging to community' is rating one's own sense of belonging to their community as a 4 or a 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "very weak" and 5 "very strong".
- 12 A proportion (9%) of respondents were not asked questions regarding neighbourhood helpfulness in the event of an emergency and as such these cases are not included in the analysis on neighbourhood helpfulness in general or in the event of an emergency.
- 13 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were equal to 12% when respondents were asked about whether their neighbourhood is a place where neighbours would help each other if there is an emergency.
- 14 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% when respondents were asked about the number of people they could turn to for help if financial support is needed.





## Fact sheet Community of Saint-Hyacinthe (CA), Quebec

---

In 2014, information on the emergency preparedness of people living in the Census Agglomeration<sup>1</sup> of Saint-Hyacinthe was collected through the Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada (SEPR).<sup>2</sup> This fact sheet presents information on the risk awareness and level of emergency preparedness of the residents of Saint-Hyacinthe, which could help improve the understanding of community resilience in the event of an emergency.<sup>3,4</sup>

### **Risk awareness and anticipated sources of help in an emergency or disaster**

- Residents of Saint-Hyacinthe anticipated winter storms (including blizzards, ice storms and extreme cold) (94%), extended power outages lasting 24 hours or longer (88%), heat waves (65%) and a contamination or shortage of water or food (63%) to be the most likely emergency-type events to occur within their community.
- Residents anticipated turning to the police as an initial source for help and information if they were faced with rioting or civil unrest (63%), an act of terrorism or terrorist threat (63%) or an industrial or transportation accident (31%) (Table 1.1). In the event of a contamination or shortage of water or food (55%) or a weather-related emergency or natural disaster (31%) residents anticipated turning to their local government first for help and information. Hospitals, clinics, doctors and other medical professionals (68%) were the most commonly anticipated sources of initial help and information in the event of an outbreak of a serious or life-threatening disease. In the event of an extended power outage, utility companies (60%) were most commonly anticipated to be the first source of help and information for people in Saint-Hyacinthe.

### **Prior lifetime experience with a major emergency or disaster<sup>5</sup>**

- Three-quarters (75%) of residents of the community of Saint-Hyacinthe had personally experienced a major emergency or disaster within Canada in a community where they were living at the time. For most (83%), the emergencies were severe enough to disrupt their regular daily activities.
- Winter storms including blizzards and ice storms were the most common type of emergency or disaster experienced by residents in Saint-Hyacinthe (96%). Extended power outages were the second most common emergency, but they were only experienced by 5%<sup>E</sup> of those faced with a major emergency.
- Missing work or school (73%), the inability to use electrical appliances (69%) and missing appointments or planned activities (58%) were among some of the disruptions experienced by residents who were affected by a major emergency or disaster. More than half of those affected by major emergencies had to evacuate their homes (56%) and about a quarter were unable to use roads or transportation within their community (24%).
- Nearly a quarter (22%) of residents were able to resume their daily activities within one week or less of the event. The majority (75%) of people affected needed a week to two months to recover; 8%<sup>E</sup> needed one to less than two weeks, 31% needed two to less than four weeks and 36% needed one to two months.
- Many (82%) residents received help either during or immediately following the emergency. Family members (48%) and provincial (19%) and local (18%<sup>E</sup>) governments were among the most common sources of assistance.
- Nearly two-thirds (64%) of the residents of Saint-Hyacinthe who experienced major emergencies or disasters that were significant enough to have resulted in severe disruptions to their regular daily routines also endured a loss of property or another financial impact. One in ten (10%<sup>E</sup>) reported long-term emotional or psychological consequences as a result of the major emergency that they experienced.

## Emergency planning, precautionary and fire safety behaviours

- About two-thirds (64%) of the people in Saint-Hyacinthe lived in households that were engaged in at least two emergency planning activities,<sup>6</sup> with more than one-third (36%) living in a household with three or four such activities (Table 1.2). One in ten (10%) people lived in a household that had not participated in any emergency planning activities.
- More than half (58%) of residents lived in a household with at least two precautionary measures<sup>7</sup> taken in case of an emergency, with about one-quarter (27%) living in a household with three or four such measures. About one in seven (14%) people lived in a household with no precautionary measures in place.
- Most (98%) residents reported living in a household with a working smoke detector (Table 1.3). Seven in ten (71%) residents reported living in a household with a working fire extinguisher and more than one-third (37%) stated that they had a working carbon monoxide detector in their home. About three in ten (29%) people reported that they had all three fire safety measures within their households.<sup>8</sup>
- The number of emergency planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents of Saint-Hyacinthe did not differ significantly from behaviours of Quebec residents overall. However, some differences were observed when they were compared to the behaviours of Canadians in the 10 provinces. For example, residents of Saint-Hyacinthe were less likely to have implemented all four emergency planning activities (12%) and all three fire safety measures (29%) than the general Canadian population (19% and 42%, respectively).<sup>9 10</sup>
- In terms of the types of activities and measures taken in the event of an emergency, residents of Saint-Hyacinthe were less likely to have an emergency exit plan (40%), for example, than the general Canadian population (60%), but they were more likely to have a back-up generator (28% versus 23%).

## Social networks and sense of belonging

- Less than half (45%) of the residents of Saint-Hyacinthe had a strong sense of belonging<sup>11</sup> to their community.
- Three-quarters (75%) of residents described the neighbourhood they lived in as a place where neighbours generally help each other.<sup>12</sup> Of those who did not describe their neighbourhood this way, most (84%) still described it as a place where neighbours would help each other in an emergency.<sup>13</sup>
- About half of residents had a large network of support in the event of an emergency or disaster, with more than five people to turn to for emotional support (54%), if physically injured (52%) or in case of a home evacuation (46%). However, only 17% of residents had such a large network of support if financial help was needed, and one in ten (10%) reported that they had no one to turn to for financial help.<sup>14</sup>
- Generally, engagement in social and political activities by residents of Saint-Hyacinthe did not have an impact on their level of emergency preparedness (Table 1.4).

## Data tables

Table 1.1

Most commonly anticipated sources of initial help and information, by type of emergency or disaster, residents of Saint-Hyacinthe, Quebec, 2014

Most common sources of initial help and information by type of emergency or disaster	percent
<b>Weather-related emergency or natural disaster</b>	
Local government	31
Police/law enforcement	28
Family	14
<b>Extended power outages</b>	
Utility company	60
Local government	15 <sup>E</sup>
Family	9 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Outbreak of serious or life-threatening disease</b>	

Hospital, clinic, doctor or other medical professional	68
911	9 <sup>E</sup>
News- Internet	6 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Industrial or transportation accident</b>	
Police/law enforcement	31
Local government	24
911	22
<b>Contamination or shortage of water or food</b>	
Local government	55
Hospital, clinic, doctor or other medical professional	9 <sup>E</sup>
Provincial government	7 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Act of terrorism or terrorist threat</b>	
Police/law enforcement	63
911	18 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Rioting or civil unrest</b>	
Police/law enforcement	63
911	19 <sup>E</sup>
News- Television	8 <sup>E</sup>
<sup>E</sup> use with caution	
<b>Note:</b> Respondents who perceived their community was at risk for any form of emergency or disaster were then asked where they would turn to first for information or assistance in the event of the perceived emergency or disaster. Respondents could provide more than one response. Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.	
<b>Source:</b> Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.	

**Table 1.2**

**Number of emergency planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents, community of Saint-Hyacinthe, Quebec, 2014**

Number of planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents	Saint-Hyacinthe	Quebec	Canada
	percent		
<b>Number of emergency planning activities</b>			
None	10	10	8
1 activity	22 **	22	17
2 activities	28	26	25
3 activities	24	26	27
4 activities	12 **	14	19
<b>Number of precautionary measures</b>			
None	14	17	16
1 measure	25	29	27
2 measures	31	28	28
3 measures	18	17	20
4 measures	9 <sup>E</sup>	8	7
<b>Number of fire safety measures <sup>1 2 3</sup></b>			
None	F	F	1
1 measure	19 **	24	14
2 measures	44 **	42	38
3 measures	29 **	28	42

<sup>E</sup> use with caution  
 F too unreliable to be published

\*\* significantly different from Canada level estimate (p < 0.05)

1 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Canada'.

2 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Quebec'.

3 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Saint-Hyacinthe'.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents. Emergency planning activities include: an emergency exit plan, an emergency supply kit, photocopies/electronic copies of important documents and a list of emergency contact numbers. Precautionary measures include: a battery-operated or wind-up radio, an alternative heat source, a back-up generator and an alternative water source. Fire safety measures include a working smoke detector, a working carbon monoxide detector and a working fire extinguisher.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

**Table 1.3**  
**Planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures residents engaged in, community of Saint-Hyacinthe, Quebec, 2014**

Residents whose households were involved in the following:	Saint-Hyacinthe	Quebec	Canada
	percent		
<b>Emergency planning activities</b>			
Emergency exit plan	40 **	46	60
Exit plan has been practised/reviewed in last 12 months <sup>1</sup>	39	40	46
Designated meeting place for household members <sup>2</sup>	33	34	33
Contact plan for household members <sup>2</sup>	48 **	51	55
Household emergency supply kit	47	47	47
Vehicle emergency supply kit <sup>3</sup>	44 **	46	59
Extra copies of important documents	46 **	47	53
List of emergency contact numbers	70	68	69
Plan for meeting special health needs <sup>4</sup>	48 **	61	62
<b>Precautionary measures</b>			
Wind-up or battery-operated radio	60	58	58
Alternate heat source	51	48	48
Back-up generator	28 **	22	23
Alternate water source	41	38	43
Other <sup>5</sup>	17	20	21
<b>Fire safety measures</b>			
Working smoke detector	98	98	98
Working carbon monoxide detector <sup>6</sup>	37 **	34	60
Working fire extinguisher	71	67	66

\*\* significantly different from Canada level estimate (p < 0.05)

1 Percentage based only on those indicating that they have an emergency exit plan.

2 Excludes Canadians living in single-person households.

3 Excludes those who reported that they lived in a household that did not have a vehicle.

4 Percentage based only on those indicating that they or someone in their household has special medical needs.

5 'Other precautionary measures' include having an escape/rescue plan for pets, extra supply of fuel, checking and replenishing emergency supplies, and keeping exits clear.

6 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Saint-Hyacinthe'.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.  
**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

**Table 1.4**

**High or moderately high levels of emergency planning, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents, by social and political involvement, community of Saint-Hyacinthe, Quebec, 2014**

Social and political involvement	Percentage of residents who had high or moderately high levels of...		
	Planning activities	Precautionary measures	Fire safety measures
	percent		
<b>Engagement in political activities <sup>1</sup></b>			
Yes †	37	29	31
No	37 <sup>E</sup>	26 <sup>E</sup>	35 <sup>E</sup>
<b>High level of civic engagement <sup>2</sup></b>			
Yes †	40	29	32
No	34	28	31
<b>High level of social support <sup>3</sup></b>			
Yes †	42 <sup>E</sup>	40 <sup>E</sup>	35 <sup>E</sup>
No <sup>7</sup>	36	26	30
<b>Strong sense of belonging to community <sup>4</sup></b>			
Yes †	42	35	34
No <sup>7</sup>	33	21 *	27
<b>High neighbourhood trust <sup>5</sup></b>			
Yes †	41	35	36
No <sup>7</sup>	35	23 *	27
<b>High level of self-efficacy <sup>6</sup></b>			
Yes †	42	32	33
No <sup>7</sup>	34	24	29

<sup>E</sup> use with caution

\* significantly different from reference category ( $p < 0.05$ )

† reference category

1 Includes individuals over the age of 17 years who are eligible to vote, and who have participated in or volunteered for political parties or events in the past 12 months, including municipal, provincial, or federal elections, or expressed views on political or social issues through signing a petition, contacting news agencies or politicians, or attended a meeting involving social or community issues.

2 Civic engagement measures individuals over the age of 17 years who were involved in a recreational group or organization in the past 12 months, and includes engagement in political activities. A 'high level' is defined as having been involved in at least 4 activities in the past 12 months.

3 A 'high level of social support' is defined as having five or more people whom that individual could turn to for help in an emergency if they are physically injured, require emotional support, shelter, and/or financial assistance.

4 A 'strong sense of belonging to community' is rating one's own sense of belonging to their community as a 4 or a 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "very weak" and 5 "very strong".

5 'High neighbourhood trust' is rating one's own trust in the people in one's neighbourhood as 4 or 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "cannot be trusted at all" and 5 represents "can be trusted a lot", as well as having a response of "very likely" when asked about the likelihood of someone in their neighbourhood returning a lost wallet or purse containing two hundred dollars with the money still inside.

6 A 'high level of self-efficacy' is derived from having a high self-rating on a scale of 1 (poor) to 5 (excellent) for the following three categories: an ability to think clearly and solve day-to-day problems, to handle unexpected and difficult problems, and to figure out what to do if faced with an emergency situation.

7 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Fire safety measures'.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents. Households with 'moderately high' or 'high' levels of emergency planning engaged in 3 or 4 of the following: having an exit plan, an emergency supply kit, extra copies of important documents and an emergency contact list. 'Moderately high' or 'high' levels of precautionary measures include having 3 or 4 of the following: a wind-up or battery operated radio, a back-up generator, an alternate source of heat and additional water. 'Moderately high' or 'high' levels of fire safety measure include having all 3 of the following: a working smoke detector, a working fire extinguisher, and a working carbon monoxide detector.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

## Notes

<sup>E</sup> use with caution

- 1 A Census Metropolitan Area (CMA) or a Census Agglomeration (CA) is formed by one or more adjacent municipalities centred on a population centre (known as the core). A CMA must have a total population of at least 100,000 of which 50,000 or more must live in the core. A CA must have a core population of at least 10,000. To be included in the CMA or CA, other adjacent municipalities must have a high degree of integration with the core as measured by commuting flows derived from census data.
- 2 The target population for the SEPR included all persons 15 years of age or older, residing in households in Canada's 10 provinces, excluding full-time residents of institutions (e.g. nursing homes, group homes, hospitals).
- 3 The SEPR covers three types of communities: Census Metropolitan Areas (CMAs), Census Agglomerations (CAs) with population greater than 50,000, and 'smaller communities' which include CAs with population 50,000 or less and those areas that fall outside of CMAs and CAs. All CMAs and CAs (with population greater than 50,000) were included in the SEPR. A sample of households were selected from smaller communities within each province to represent all households within the province in similar communities. Additional information on the SEPR and its sampling methodology can be found in the 'Survey description' section.
- 4 Throughout this fact sheet, responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.
- 5 This section focuses on personal experiences with emergencies or disasters that happened in Canada, in a community where the person was living at the time, and was significant enough to severely interrupt the individual's regular daily activities.
- 6 Emergency planning activities include: having an emergency exit plan, a household emergency supply kit, extra copies of important documents and an emergency contact list.
- 7 Precautionary measures include: having a wind-up or battery-operated radio, an alternate heat source such as a non-electric stove or heater, or a wood-burning fireplace, a back-up generator and an alternative water source such as a well, tank or litres of stored water.
- 8 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Fire safety measures'.
- 9 Unless otherwise specified, differences are statistically significant ( $p < 0.05$ ).
- 10 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Fire safety measures'.
- 11 A 'strong sense of belonging to community' is rating one's own sense of belonging to their community as a 4 or a 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "very weak" and 5 "very strong".
- 12 A proportion (9%) of respondents were not asked questions regarding neighbourhood helpfulness in the event of an emergency and as such these cases are not included in the analysis on neighbourhood helpfulness in general or in the event of an emergency.
- 13 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% when respondents were asked about whether their neighbourhood is a place where neighbours would help each other if there is an emergency.
- 14 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% when respondents were asked about the number of people they could turn to for help if financial support is needed.



## Fact sheet

# Community of Saint-Jean-sur-Richelieu (CA), Quebec

---

In 2014, information on the emergency preparedness of people living in the Census Agglomeration<sup>1</sup> of Saint-Jean-sur-Richelieu was collected through the Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada (SEPR).<sup>2</sup> This fact sheet presents information on the risk awareness and level of emergency preparedness of the residents of Saint-Jean-sur-Richelieu, which could help improve the understanding of community resilience in the event of an emergency.<sup>3,4</sup>

### Risk awareness and anticipated sources of help in an emergency or disaster

- Residents of Saint-Jean-sur-Richelieu anticipated winter storms (including blizzards, ice storms and extreme cold) (95%), extended power outages lasting 24 hours or longer (87%) and floods (78%) to be the most likely emergency-type events to occur within their community.
- Residents anticipated turning to the police as an initial source for help and information if they were faced with rioting or civil unrest (66%), an act of terrorism or terrorist threat (53%), or an industrial or transportation accident (31%) (Table 1.1). Local government was the most commonly anticipated source for initial help and information if faced with a contamination or shortage of water or food (53%) or in the event of a weather-related emergency or natural disaster (30%). If faced with an extended power outage, utility companies (63%) were commonly reported as the first source of help and information for residents of Saint-Jean-sur-Richelieu, while hospitals, clinics, doctors and other medical professionals (70%) were the most commonly anticipated sources in the event of an outbreak of a serious or life-threatening disease.

### Prior lifetime experience with a major emergency or disaster<sup>5</sup>

- Close to four in five (77%) people in Saint-Jean-sur-Richelieu have personally experienced a major emergency or disaster within Canada in a community where they were living at the time. For most (90%) of these individuals, the events they experienced were severe enough to disrupt their regular daily activities.
- Winter storms including blizzards and ice storms were the most common type of emergency or disaster experienced by residents (90%), followed by floods (12%<sup>E</sup>) and extended power outages (6%<sup>E</sup>).
- Residents who were affected by a major emergency or disaster most often had to miss work or school (78%), miss an appointment or a planned activity (57%) or were unable to use electrical appliances (54%) as a result. More than half had to evacuate their homes due to the emergency (54%), and a quarter were unable to use roads or transportation within the community (25%).
- Less than a quarter (22%<sup>E</sup>) of residents were able to resume their daily activities within one week of the event. Most (78%) needed more than a week to resume their daily activities—for instance, 9%<sup>E</sup> needed more than a week but less than two weeks, 29% needed two to less than four weeks and 38% needed one to two months.
- About four out of five (78%) residents received help either during or immediately following the emergency, most often from family members (52%) and local government (21%).
- More than half (57%) of the residents of Saint-Jean-sur-Richelieu who experienced major emergencies or disasters endured a loss of property or another financial impact. One in seven (14%<sup>E</sup>) experienced long-term emotional or psychological consequences as a result of the emergency.

### Emergency planning, precautionary and fire safety behaviours

- Nearly two-thirds (63%) of residents of Saint-Jean-sur-Richelieu lived in households that were engaged in at least two emergency planning activities<sup>6 7</sup> (Table 1.2). More than a third (37%) lived in households with three or four such activities. About one in ten (11%) people lived in a household that had not participated in any emergency planning activities.
- Three in five (61%) residents lived in a household with at least two precautionary measures<sup>8</sup> taken in case of an emergency, with one-quarter (25%) living in a household with three or four such measures. One in ten (11%) people lived in a household with no precautionary measures in place.
- Most (97%) residents reported living in a household with a working smoke detector (Table 1.3). Two-thirds (66%) reported living in a household with a working fire extinguisher and close to half (45%) stated that they had a working carbon monoxide detector in their home. One in three (34%) residents reported that they had all three fire safety measures within their households.<sup>9</sup>
- Some differences existed in the number of emergency planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents of Saint-Jean-sur-Richelieu and residents of Quebec and Canada's 10 provinces. For example, the proportion of residents of Saint-Jean-sur-Richelieu who had implemented all four planning activities (13%)<sup>10</sup> was significantly lower than the national proportion (19%), while the proportion of residents who had not participated in any precautionary measures (11%) was significantly lower than the overall proportion of Quebec residents (17%) and Canadians in general (16%).<sup>11</sup>
- The types of activities and measures that residents of Saint-Jean-sur-Richelieu were involved in sometimes differed from Quebec as a whole and from Canadians in general. For example, residents of Saint-Jean-sur-Richelieu were less likely to have an emergency exit plan (42%) or extra copies of important documents (46%) than Canadians in general (60% and 53%, respectively), but they were more likely to have a wind-up or battery-operated radio (67%) than both Quebec residents and Canadians overall (58% each).

## Social networks and sense of belonging

- Close to four in ten (37%) people in Saint-Jean-sur-Richelieu had a strong sense of belonging<sup>12</sup> to their community.
- The majority (83%) of residents described the neighbourhood they lived in as a place where neighbours generally help each other.<sup>13</sup> Of those who did not describe their neighbourhood this way, seven in ten (71%) still described it as a place where neighbours would help each other in an emergency.<sup>14</sup>
- Approximately half of residents had a large network of support in the event of an emergency or disaster, with more than five people to turn to for emotional support (54%), if physically injured (54%) or in case of a home evacuation (50%). One in five people had such a large network of support if financial help was needed (20%), and one in ten reported that they had no one to turn to for financial help (10%<sup>E</sup>).<sup>15</sup>
- Generally, the level of social and political involvement of residents of Saint-Jean-sur-Richelieu did not significantly impact their level of emergency preparedness (Table 1.4).

## Data tables

Table 1.1

Most commonly anticipated sources of initial help and information, by type of emergency or disaster, residents of Saint-Jean-sur-Richelieu, Quebec, 2014

Most common sources of initial help and information by type of emergency or disaster	percent
<b>Weather-related emergency or natural disaster</b>	
Local government	30
Police/law enforcement	26
News- Internet	13
<b>Extended power outages</b>	
Utility company	63
Provincial government	12 <sup>E</sup>
Local government	9 <sup>E</sup>



<b>Outbreak of serious or life-threatening disease</b>		
Hospital, clinic, doctor or other medical professional		70
News- Internet		10 <sup>E</sup>
News- Television		9 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Industrial or transportation accident</b>		
Police/law enforcement		31
First responders		21 <sup>E</sup>
Local government		21
<b>Contamination or shortage of water or food <sup>1</sup></b>		
Local government		53
Hospital, clinic, doctor or other medical professional		10 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Act of terrorism or terrorist threat</b>		
Police/law enforcement		53
911		19 <sup>E</sup>
News- Radio		13 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Rioting or civil unrest</b>		
Police/law enforcement		66
911		14 <sup>E</sup>
Local government		10 <sup>E</sup>
<sup>E</sup> use with caution		
1 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% when respondents were asked about their likely sources of initial help and information.		
<b>Note:</b> Respondents who perceived their community was at risk for any form of emergency or disaster were then asked where they would turn to first for information or assistance in the event of the perceived emergency or disaster. Respondents could provide more than one response. Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.		
<b>Source:</b> Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.		

**Table 1.2**  
**Number of emergency planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents, community of Saint-Jean-sur-Richelieu, Quebec, 2014**

Number of planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents	Saint-Jean-sur-Richelieu	Quebec	Canada
	percent		
<b>Number of emergency planning activities <sup>1</sup></b>			
None	11	10	8
1 activity	21	22	17
2 activities	26	26	25
3 activities	24	26	27
4 activities	13 **	14	19
<b>Number of precautionary measures</b>			
None	11 ***	17	16
1 measure	25	29	27
2 measures	36 ***	28	28
3 measures	18	17	20
4 measures	7 <sup>E</sup>	8	7
<b>Number of fire safety measures <sup>1 2 3</sup></b>			
None	F	F	1
1 measure	20 **	24	14

2 measures	39	42	38
3 measures	34 **	28	42

E use with caution  
F too unreliable to be published

\*\* significantly different from Canada level estimate (p < 0.05)

\*\*\* significantly different from both provincial and Canada level estimates (p < 0.05)

1 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Saint-Jean-sur-Richelieu'.

2 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Canada'.

3 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Quebec'.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents. Emergency planning activities include: an emergency exit plan, an emergency supply kit, photocopies/electronic copies of important documents and a list of emergency contact numbers. Precautionary measures include: a battery-operated or wind-up radio, an alternative heat source, a back-up generator and an alternative water source. Fire safety measures include a working smoke detector, a working carbon monoxide detector and a working fire extinguisher.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

**Table 1.3**  
**Planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures residents engaged in, community of Saint-Jean-sur-Richelieu, Quebec, 2014**

Residents whose households were involved in the following:	Saint-Jean-sur-Richelieu	Quebec	Canada
	percent		
<b>Emergency planning activities</b>			
Emergency exit plan	42 **	46	60
Exit plan has been practised/reviewed in last 12 months <sup>1</sup>	38	40	46
Designated meeting place for household members <sup>2</sup>	36	34	33
Contact plan for household members <sup>2</sup>	45 **	51	55
Household emergency supply kit	46	47	47
Vehicle emergency supply kit <sup>3</sup>	47 **	46	59
Extra copies of important documents	46 **	47	53
List of emergency contact numbers	67	68	69
Plan for meeting special health needs <sup>4</sup>	69	61	62
<b>Precautionary measures</b>			
Wind-up or battery-operated radio	67 ***	58	58
Alternate heat source	51	48	48
Back-up generator	24	22	23
Alternate water source	39	38	43
Other <sup>5</sup>	22	20	21
<b>Fire safety measures</b>			
Working smoke detector	97	98	98
Working carbon monoxide detector	45 ***	34	60
Working fire extinguisher	66	67	66

\*\* significantly different from Canada level estimate (p < 0.05)

\*\*\* significantly different from both provincial and Canada level estimates (p < 0.05)

1 Percentage based only on those indicating that they have an emergency exit plan.

2 Excludes Canadians living in single-person households.

3 Excludes those who reported that they lived in a household that did not have a vehicle.

4 Percentage based only on those indicating that they or someone in their household has special medical needs.

5 'Other precautionary measures' include having an escape/rescue plan for pets, extra supply of fuel, checking and replenishing emergency supplies, and keeping exits clear.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

**Table 1.4**

**High or moderately high levels of emergency planning, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents, by social and political involvement, community of Saint-Jean-sur-Richelieu, Quebec, 2014**

Social and political involvement	Percentage of residents who had high or moderately high levels of...		
	Planning activities	Precautionary measures	Fire safety measures
	percent		
<b>Engagement in political activities <sup>1</sup></b>			
Yes †	37	25	37
No	41 <sup>E</sup>	F	F
<b>High level of civic engagement <sup>2</sup></b>			
Yes <sup>7</sup> †	41	26	41
No <sup>8</sup>	33	21 <sup>E</sup>	28 <sup>*</sup>
<b>High level of social support <sup>3</sup></b>			
Yes †	42	23 <sup>E</sup>	43
No	36	26	33
<b>Strong sense of belonging to community <sup>4</sup></b>			
Yes †	40	27	37
No <sup>7</sup>	36	25	34
<b>High neighbourhood trust <sup>5</sup></b>			
Yes †	41	27	34
No <sup>7</sup> <sup>8</sup>	35	25	36
<b>High level of self-efficacy <sup>6</sup></b>			
Yes †	42	30	33
No <sup>7</sup> <sup>8</sup>	33	23	37

<sup>E</sup> use with caution

F too unreliable to be published

\* significantly different from reference category ( $p < 0.05$ )

† reference category

- 1 Includes individuals over the age of 17 years who are eligible to vote, and who have participated in or volunteered for political parties or events in the past 12 months, including municipal, provincial, or federal elections, or expressed views on political or social issues through signing a petition, contacting news agencies or politicians, or attended a meeting involving social or community issues.
- 2 Civic engagement measures individuals over the age of 17 years who were involved in a recreational group or organization in the past 12 months, and includes engagement in political activities. A 'high level' is defined as having been involved in at least 4 activities in the past 12 months.
- 3 A 'high level of social support' is defined as having five or more people whom that individual could turn to for help in an emergency if they are physically injured, require emotional support, shelter, and/or financial assistance.
- 4 A 'strong sense of belonging to community' is rating one's own sense of belonging to their community as a 4 or a 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "very weak" and 5 "very strong".
- 5 'High neighbourhood trust' is rating one's own trust in the people in one's neighbourhood as 4 or 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "cannot be trusted at all" and 5 represents "can be trusted a lot", as well as having a response of "very likely" when asked about the likelihood of someone in their neighbourhood returning a lost wallet or purse containing two hundred dollars with the money still inside.
- 6 A 'high level of self-efficacy' is derived from having a high self-rating on a scale of 1 (poor) to 5 (excellent) for the following three categories: an ability to think clearly and solve day-to-day problems, to handle unexpected and difficult problems, and to figure out what to do if faced with an emergency situation.
- 7 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Planning activities'.
- 8 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Fire safety measures'.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents. Households with 'moderately high' or 'high' levels of emergency planning engaged in 3 or 4 of the following: having an exit plan, an emergency supply kit, extra copies of important documents and an emergency contact list. 'Moderately high' or 'high' levels of precautionary measures include having 3 or 4 of the following: a wind-up or battery operated radio, a back-up generator, an alternate source of heat and additional water. 'Moderately high' or 'high' levels of fire safety measure include having all 3 of the following: a working smoke detector, a working fire extinguisher, and a working carbon monoxide detector.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

## Notes

<sup>E</sup> use with caution

- 1 A Census Metropolitan Area (CMA) or a Census Agglomeration (CA) is formed by one or more adjacent municipalities centred on a population centre (known as the core). A CMA must have a total population of at least 100,000 of which 50,000 or more must live in the core. A CA must have a core population of at least 10,000. To be included in the CMA or CA, other adjacent municipalities must have a high degree of integration with the core as measured by commuting flows derived from census data.
- 2 The target population for the SEPR included all persons 15 years of age or older, residing in households in Canada's 10 provinces, excluding full-time residents of institutions (e.g. nursing homes, group homes, hospitals).
- 3 The SEPR covers three types of communities: Census Metropolitan Areas (CMAs), Census Agglomerations (CAs) with population greater than 50,000, and 'smaller communities' which include CAs with population 50,000 or less and those areas that fall outside of CMAs and CAs. All CMAs and CAs (with population greater than 50,000) were included in the SEPR. A sample of households were selected from smaller communities within each province to represent all households within the province in similar communities. Additional information on the SEPR and its sampling methodology can be found in the 'Survey description' section.
- 4 Throughout this fact sheet, responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.
- 5 This section focuses on personal experiences with emergencies or disasters that happened in Canada, in a community where the person was living at the time, and was significant enough to severely interrupt the individual's regular daily activities.

- 6 Emergency planning activities include: having an emergency exit plan, a household emergency supply kit, extra copies of important documents and an emergency contact list.
- 7 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Planning activities'.
- 8 Precautionary measures include: having a wind-up or battery-operated radio, an alternate heat source such as a non-electric stove or heater, or a wood-burning fireplace, a back-up generator and an alternative water source such as a well, tank or litres of stored water.
- 9 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Fire safety measures'.
- 10 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Planning activities'.
- 11 Unless otherwise specified, differences are statistically significant ( $p < 0.05$ ).
- 12 A 'strong sense of belonging to community' is rating one's own sense of belonging to their community as a 4 or a 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "very weak" and 5 "very strong".
- 13 A proportion (17%) of respondents were not asked questions regarding neighbourhood helpfulness in the event of an emergency and as such these cases are not included in the analysis on neighbourhood helpfulness in general or in the event of an emergency.
- 14 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were equal to 20% when respondents were asked about whether their neighbourhood is a place where neighbours would help each other if there is an emergency.
- 15 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% when respondents were asked about the number of people they could turn to for help if financial support is needed.



## Fact sheet Community of Montréal (CMA), Quebec

---

In 2014, information on the emergency preparedness of people living in the Census Metropolitan Area<sup>1</sup> of Montréal was collected through the Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada (SEPR).<sup>2</sup> This fact sheet presents information on the risk awareness and level of emergency preparedness of the residents of Montréal, which could help improve the understanding of community resilience in the event of an emergency.<sup>3,4</sup>

### **Risk awareness and anticipated sources of help in an emergency or disaster**

- Winter storms (including blizzards, ice storms and extreme cold) (90%), extended power outages lasting 24 hours or longer (81%) and heat waves (64%) were named by residents of Montréal as the most likely emergency-type events to occur within their community.
- Residents anticipated turning to their local government (24%) or to the police (24%) in the event of a weather-related emergency or natural disaster (Table 1.1). Similarly, in the event of a contamination or shortage of water or food, local government (55%) was the most anticipated source of initial help and information.
- In the event of rioting or civil unrest (52%) or an act of terrorism or terrorist threat (45%), the police were commonly reported as the source of initial help and information for residents. If faced with an industrial or transportation accident, people in Montréal anticipated calling 911 first for help or information (27%), while hospitals, clinics, doctors and other medical professionals (57%) were the most commonly anticipated sources of initial help and information in the event of an outbreak of a serious or life-threatening disease. In the event of an extended power outage, residents anticipated first turning to their utility company (64%).

### **Prior lifetime experience with a major emergency or disaster<sup>5</sup>**

- More than half (55%) of the residents of Montréal had faced a major emergency or disaster within Canada in a community where they were living at the time. For most (79%), it led to severe disruptions to their daily activities.
- Most (83%) residents were faced with winter storms which include blizzards and ice storms, followed by extended power outages lasting 24 hours or longer (11%<sup>E</sup>) and floods (5%<sup>E</sup>).
- Some of the most commonly experienced disruptions to daily activities endured by victims of major emergencies or disasters included missing work or school (66%), the inability to use electrical appliances (65%) and missing appointments or planned activities (54%). More severe disruptions included home evacuations, experienced by about half (52%) of those faced with an emergency, as well as an inability to use roads or transportation within the community, experienced by one in five victims (20%).
- Half (51%) of residents who experienced an emergency or disaster were able to resume their daily activities within one week of the event. Most of the remaining half (46%) recovered in less than two months after the event.
- Nearly two-thirds (64%) of victims received help during or immediately following the emergency, most often from a family member (50%).
- Close to half (45%) of residents of Montréal who had experienced major emergencies or disasters that were severe enough to disrupt their regular daily routines endured a loss of property or another financial impact, while one in ten (10%<sup>E</sup>) reported long-term emotional or psychological consequences.

### **Emergency planning, precautionary and fire safety behaviours**

- Nearly two-thirds (64%) of residents of Montréal lived in households that were engaged in at least two emergency planning activities,<sup>6</sup> with four in ten residents (41%) living in households with three or four such activities (Table 1.2). One in ten (10%) people lived in a household that had not participated in any emergency planning activities.
- Just over two in five (44%) residents lived in a household with at least two precautionary measures<sup>7</sup> taken in case of an emergency, and less than one in five (16%) lived in a household with three or four such measures. One in five (20%) lived in a household with no precautionary measures in place.
- Most (97%) residents reported living in a household with a working smoke detector, and six in ten (59%) reported living in a home with a working fire extinguisher (Table 1.3). Three in ten (31%) stated that they had a working carbon monoxide detector within their household.<sup>8</sup> Nearly a quarter (23%) of residents reported that they had implemented all three fire safety measures in their homes.<sup>9</sup>
- The number of emergency planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures implemented by residents of Montréal often differed significantly from the behaviours of residents of Quebec in general, as well as from residents of Canada's 10 provinces overall. For example, the proportion of Montréal residents who had engaged in all four planning activities (14%) was significantly lower than the national proportion (19%).<sup>10</sup> Significantly fewer residents of Montréal had all three fire safety measures within their homes (23%) compared to residents of Quebec (28%) in general and Canada overall (42%).<sup>11</sup> Montréal residents were more likely (20%) than people in the province as a whole (17%) and all Canadians in general (16%) to have no precautionary measures set in place for an emergency.
- In terms of the types of activities and measures residents were involved in, some differences included having a household emergency supply kit, having an alternate water source and having a working carbon monoxide detector, which were all less common among Montréal residents (42%, 32% and 31%, respectively)<sup>12</sup> compared to Quebec residents overall (47%, 38% and 34%, respectively) and Canadians in general (47%, 43% and 60%, respectively).

## Social networks and sense of belonging

- About four in ten (43%) residents in Montréal had a strong sense of belonging<sup>13</sup> to their community.
- The majority (78%) of residents believed the neighbourhood they lived in was a place where neighbours generally help each other.<sup>14</sup> Of those who did not describe their neighbourhood as a generally helpful place, three-quarters (74%) still described it as a place where neighbours would help each other in an emergency.<sup>15</sup>
- About half of residents had a large network of support in the event of an emergency or disaster, with more than five people to turn to for emotional support (53%) and if physically injured (48%). Two in five residents had such a network of support in case of a home evacuation (40%)<sup>16</sup> and 15% had a large support network if financial help was needed. However, 12% of respondents reported that they had no one to turn to for financial help.<sup>17</sup>
- High levels of sense of belonging, self-efficacy and neighbourhood trust, social support as well as involvement in political activities were sometimes associated with a higher level of emergency preparedness (Table 1.4).

## Data tables

**Table 1.1**

**Most commonly anticipated sources of initial help and information, by type of emergency or disaster, residents of Montréal, Quebec, 2014**

Most common sources of initial help and information by type of emergency or disaster	percent
<b>Weather-related emergency or natural disaster</b>	
Local government	24
Police/law enforcement	24
911	22
<b>Extended power outages</b>	
Utility company	64
Local government	8 <sup>E</sup>
News- Radio	6 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Outbreak of serious or life-threatening disease</b>	

Hospital, clinic, doctor or other medical professional	57
News- Internet	11 <sup>E</sup>
911	11 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Industrial or transportation accident</b>	
911	27
Police/law enforcement	25
Local government	19
<b>Contamination or shortage of water or food</b>	
Local government	55
911	7 <sup>E</sup>
News- Internet	7 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Act of terrorism or terrorist threat</b>	
Police/law enforcement	45
911	30
News- Television	10 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Rioting or civil unrest</b>	
Police/law enforcement	52
911	23
News- Internet	9 <sup>E</sup>
<sup>E</sup> use with caution <b>Note:</b> Respondents who perceived their community was at risk for any form of emergency or disaster were then asked where they would turn to first for information or assistance in the event of the perceived emergency or disaster. Respondents could provide more than one response. Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents. <b>Source:</b> Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.	

**Table 1.2**  
**Number of emergency planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents, community of Montréal, Quebec, 2014**

Number of planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents	Montréal	Quebec	Canada
	percent		
<b>Number of emergency planning activities</b>			
None	10	10	8
1 activity	23 **	22	17
2 activities	23 *	26	25
3 activities	27	26	27
4 activities	14 **	14	19
<b>Number of precautionary measures</b>			
None	20 ***	17	16
1 measure	33 ***	29	27
2 measures	28	28	28
3 measures	11 ***	17	20
4 measures	5 <sup>E</sup> ***	8	7
<b>Number of fire safety measures <sup>1, 2, 3</sup></b>			
None	F	F	1
1 measure	29 ***	24	14
2 measures	40	42	38
3 measures	23 ***	28	42



<sup>E</sup> use with caution  
<sup>F</sup> too unreliable to be published

\* significantly different from provincial level estimate (p < 0.05)

\*\* significantly different from Canada level estimate (p < 0.05)

\*\*\* significantly different from both provincial and Canada level estimates (p < 0.05)

1 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Canada'.

2 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Quebec'.

3 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Montréal'.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents. Emergency planning activities include: an emergency exit plan, an emergency supply kit, photocopies/electronic copies of important documents and a list of emergency contact numbers. Precautionary measures include: a battery-operated or wind-up radio, an alternative heat source, a back-up generator and an alternative water source. Fire safety measures include a working smoke detector, a working carbon monoxide detector and a working fire extinguisher.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

**Table 1.3**  
**Planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures residents engaged in, community of Montréal, Quebec, 2014**

Residents whose households were involved in the following:	Montréal	Quebec	Canada
	percent		
<b>Emergency planning activities</b>			
Emergency exit plan	46 **	46	60
Exit plan has been practised/reviewed in last 12 months <sup>1</sup>	37 **	40	46
Designated meeting place for household members <sup>2</sup>	29 *	34	33
Contact plan for household members <sup>2</sup>	53	51	55
Household emergency supply kit	42 ***	47	47
Vehicle emergency supply kit <sup>3</sup>	43 ***	46	59
Extra copies of important documents	50	47	53
List of emergency contact numbers	68	68	69
Plan for meeting special health needs <sup>4</sup>	64	61	62
<b>Precautionary measures</b>			
Wind-up or battery-operated radio	57	58	58
Alternate heat source	40 ***	48	48
Back-up generator	16 ***	22	23
Alternate water source	32 ***	38	43
Other <sup>5</sup>	19	20	21
<b>Fire safety measures</b>			
Working smoke detector	97	98	98
Working carbon monoxide detector <sup>6</sup>	31 ***	34	60
Working fire extinguisher	59 ***	67	66

\* significantly different from provincial level estimate (p < 0.05)

\*\* significantly different from Canada level estimate (p < 0.05)

\*\*\* significantly different from both provincial and Canada level estimates (p < 0.05)

1 Percentage based only on those indicating that they have an emergency exit plan.

2 Excludes Canadians living in single-person households.

3 Excludes those who reported that they lived in a household that did not have a vehicle.

4 Percentage based only on those indicating that they or someone in their household has special medical needs.

5 'Other precautionary measures' include having an escape/rescue plan for pets, extra supply of fuel, checking and replenishing emergency supplies, and keeping exits clear.

6 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Montréal'.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

**Table 1.4**

**High or moderately high levels of emergency planning, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents, by social and political involvement, community of Montréal, Quebec, 2014**

Social and political involvement	Percentage of residents who had high or moderately high levels of...		
	Planning activities	Precautionary measures	Fire safety measures
	percent		
<b>Engagement in political activities <sup>1</sup></b>			
Yes <sup>†</sup>	41	20	25
No <sup>7</sup>	40 <sup>E</sup>	F	15 <sup>E *</sup>
<b>High level of civic engagement <sup>2</sup></b>			
Yes <sup>†</sup>	44	20	27
No	36	15	20
<b>High level of social support <sup>3</sup></b>			
Yes <sup>7, †</sup>	53	17 <sup>E</sup>	43
No <sup>7</sup>	39	17	19 <sup>*</sup>
<b>Strong sense of belonging to community <sup>4</sup></b>			
Yes <sup>†</sup>	45	17	28
No <sup>7</sup>	36	16	18 <sup>*</sup>
<b>High neighbourhood trust <sup>5</sup></b>			
Yes <sup>†</sup>	45	21	32
No <sup>7</sup>	38	15	19 <sup>*</sup>
<b>High level of self-efficacy <sup>6</sup></b>			
Yes <sup>†</sup>	45	20	28
No <sup>7</sup>	37	14	19 <sup>*</sup>

<sup>E</sup> use with caution  
F too unreliable to be published

† reference category

\* significantly different from reference category ( $p < 0.05$ )

- 1 Includes individuals over the age of 17 years who are eligible to vote, and who have participated in or volunteered for political parties or events in the past 12 months, including municipal, provincial, or federal elections, or expressed views on political or social issues through signing a petition, contacting news agencies or politicians, or attended a meeting involving social or community issues.
- 2 Civic engagement measures individuals over the age of 17 years who were involved in a recreational group or organization in the past 12 months, and includes engagement in political activities. A 'high level' is defined as having been involved in at least 4 activities in the past 12 months.
- 3 A 'high level of social support' is defined as having five or more people whom that individual could turn to for help in an emergency if they are physically injured, require emotional support, shelter, and/or financial assistance.
- 4 A 'strong sense of belonging to community' is rating one's own sense of belonging to their community as a 4 or a 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "very weak" and 5 "very strong".
- 5 'High neighbourhood trust' is rating one's own trust in the people in one's neighbourhood as 4 or 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "cannot be trusted at all" and 5 represents "can be trusted a lot", as well as having a response of "very likely" when asked about the likelihood of someone in their neighbourhood returning a lost wallet or purse containing two hundred dollars with the money still inside.
- 6 A 'high level of self-efficacy' is derived from having a high self-rating on a scale of 1 (poor) to 5 (excellent) for the following three categories: an ability to think clearly and solve day-to-day problems, to handle unexpected and difficult problems, and to figure out what to do if faced with an emergency situation.
- 7 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Fire safety measures'.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents. Households with 'moderately high' or 'high' levels of emergency planning engaged in 3 or 4 of the following: having an exit plan, an emergency supply kit, extra copies of important documents and an emergency contact list. 'Moderately high' or 'high' levels of precautionary measures include having 3 or 4 of the following: a wind-up or battery operated radio, a back-up generator, an alternate source of heat and additional water. 'Moderately high' or 'high' levels of fire safety measure include having all 3 of the following: a working smoke detector, a working fire extinguisher, and a working carbon monoxide detector.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

## Notes

<sup>E</sup> use with caution

- 1 A Census Metropolitan Area (CMA) or a Census Agglomeration (CA) is formed by one or more adjacent municipalities centred on a population centre (known as the core). A CMA must have a total population of at least 100,000 of which 50,000 or more must live in the core. A CA must have a core population of at least 10,000. To be included in the CMA or CA, other adjacent municipalities must have a high degree of integration with the core as measured by commuting flows derived from census data.
- 2 The target population for the SEPR included all persons 15 years of age or older, residing in households in Canada's 10 provinces, excluding full-time residents of institutions (e.g. nursing homes, group homes, hospitals).
- 3 The SEPR covers three types of communities: Census Metropolitan Areas (CMAs), Census Agglomerations (CAs) with population greater than 50,000, and 'smaller communities' which include CAs with population 50,000 or less and those areas that fall outside of CMAs and CAs. All CMAs and CAs (with population greater than 50,000) were included in the SEPR. A sample of households were selected from smaller communities within each province to represent all households within the province in similar communities. Additional information on the SEPR and its sampling methodology can be found in the 'Survey description' section.
- 4 Throughout this fact sheet, responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.
- 5 This section focuses on personal experiences with emergencies or disasters that happened in Canada, in a community where the person was living at the time, and was significant enough to severely interrupt the individual's regular daily activities.

- 6 Emergency planning activities include: having an emergency exit plan, a household emergency supply kit, extra copies of important documents and an emergency contact list.
- 7 Precautionary measures include: having a wind-up or battery-operated radio, an alternate heat source such as a non-electric stove or heater, or a wood-burning fireplace, a back-up generator and an alternative water source such as a well, tank or litres of stored water.
- 8 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% when respondents were asked about a working carbon monoxide detector.
- 9 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Fire safety measures'.
- 10 Unless otherwise specified, differences are statistically significant ( $p < 0.05$ ).
- 11 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Fire safety measures'.
- 12 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% when respondents were asked about a working carbon monoxide detector.
- 13 A 'strong sense of belonging to community' is rating one's own sense of belonging to their community as a 4 or a 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "very weak" and 5 "very strong".
- 14 A proportion (15%) of respondents were not asked questions regarding neighbourhood helpfulness in the event of an emergency and as such these cases are not included in the analysis on neighbourhood helpfulness in general or in the event of an emergency.
- 15 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% when respondents were asked about whether their neighbourhood is a place where neighbours would help each other if there is an emergency.
- 16 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% when respondents were asked about the number of people they could turn to for help in case of home evacuation.
- 17 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% when respondents were asked about the number of people they could turn to for help if financial support is needed.



## Fact sheet

# Community of Ottawa–Gatineau (CMA), Quebec

---

In 2014, information on the emergency preparedness of people living in the Quebec Census Metropolitan Area<sup>1</sup> of Ottawa–Gatineau was collected through the Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada (SEPR).<sup>2</sup> This fact sheet presents information on the risk awareness and level of emergency preparedness of the residents of Ottawa–Gatineau (Quebec part), which could help improve the understanding of community resilience in the event of an emergency.<sup>3 4 5</sup>

### Risk awareness and anticipated sources of help in an emergency or disaster

- Most (93%) people in Ottawa–Gatineau (Quebec part) anticipated winter storms (including blizzards, ice storms and extreme cold) to be the most likely events to occur within their community. Extended power outages lasting 24 hours or longer (81%), earthquakes (77%) and heatwaves (71%) followed as the emergency-type events likely to occur within the community.
- Residents of Ottawa–Gatineau (Quebec part) anticipated turning to their local government as an initial source of help and information in the event of a contamination or shortage of water or food (59%) or a weather-related emergency or natural disaster (32%) (Table 1.1). Calling 911 for help and information was the most commonly anticipated initial reaction in the event of an industrial or transportation accident (33%) or if faced with an act of terrorism or terrorist threat (27%). In the event of rioting or civil unrest, residents anticipated first turning to the police (44%). If faced with an extended power outage, residents of Ottawa–Gatineau (Quebec part) would turn to their utility company first (66%) and to hospitals, clinics, doctors and other medical professionals (58%) in the event of an outbreak of a serious or life-threatening disease.

### Prior lifetime experience with a major emergency or disaster<sup>6</sup>

- More than half (54%) of the residents of Ottawa–Gatineau (Quebec part) had experienced a major emergency or disaster within Canada in a community where they were living at the time. Of those who were faced with a major emergency or disaster, about two-thirds (68%) experienced severe disruptions to their daily activities as a result.
- Winter storms which include blizzards and ice storms were the most commonly experienced emergency or disaster (74%), followed by power outages (12%<sup>E</sup>).
- Victims of major emergencies or disasters most commonly experienced an inability to use electrical appliances (70%) or missing work or school (65%). More severe disruptions included home evacuations, experienced by about four in ten victims (39%), and the inability to use roads or transportation within the community, experienced by about one-quarter of people faced with an emergency (24%).
- Half (51%) of the residents of Ottawa–Gatineau (Quebec part) who had experienced a major emergency or disaster were able to resume their daily activities within a week of the event, and about four in ten (43%) recovered within one to less than four weeks.
- Two-thirds (66%) of residents who experienced an emergency or disaster received help during or immediately following the event. Family members (48%) were the most common source of assistance, followed by friends (22%<sup>E</sup>), neighbours (18%<sup>E</sup>) and local government (13%<sup>E</sup>).
- Two in five (40%) people in Ottawa–Gatineau (Quebec part) who had experienced major emergencies or disasters severe enough to disrupt their regular daily routines endured a loss of property or another financial impact as a result.

Other forms of long-term impacts, such as emotional or psychological consequences (7%<sup>E</sup>), were not as commonly experienced.

## Emergency planning, precautionary and fire safety behaviours

- Seven in ten (71%) people in Ottawa–Gatineau (Quebec part) lived in households that were engaged in at least two emergency planning activities,<sup>7</sup> with four in ten (42%) living in households with three or four such activities (Table 1.2). About one in ten (9%) people lived in a household that had not participated in any emergency planning activities.
- More than half (54%) of residents lived in a household with at least two precautionary measures<sup>8</sup> taken in case of an emergency. Just over one-quarter of residents (28%) lived in a household with three or four such measures. One in ten (11%) residents lived in a household with no precautionary measures in place.
- Most (98%) residents reported living in a household with a working smoke detector, and nearly two-thirds (64%) reported living in a household with a working fire extinguisher (Table 1.3). Less than half (43%) of residents stated that they had a working carbon monoxide detector in their home. Three in ten (31%) reported that they had implemented all three fire safety measures within their households.<sup>9</sup>
- Generally, the number of activities or measures that residents of Ottawa–Gatineau (Quebec part) were engaged in did not significantly differ from the province as a whole, though there were some differences when compared to residents of Canada’s 10 provinces overall. For example, the proportion of Ottawa–Gatineau residents (Quebec part) who reported having all three fire safety measures within their homes were significantly lower than the proportion of Canadians (31% versus 42%).<sup>10 11</sup>
- A few differences in the types of activities and measures implemented in case of an emergency were significant when residents of Ottawa–Gatineau (Quebec part) were compared to all residents of Quebec as well as to Canadians overall. For example, the proportion of Ottawa–Gatineau residents (Quebec part) who had an alternate water source (51%) was significantly higher than of those living in Quebec in general (38%) as well as of residents of Canada overall (43%). Although the proportion of Ottawa–Gatineau residents (Quebec part) who had a working carbon monoxide detector (43%) was lower than the overall Canadian proportion (60%), it was higher than the proportion reported by Quebec residents in general (34%).

## Social networks and sense of belonging

- Less than half (43%) of residents of Ottawa–Gatineau (Quebec part) had a strong sense of belonging<sup>12</sup> to their community.
- Most (79%) residents described the neighbourhood they lived in as a place where neighbours generally help each other.<sup>13 14</sup> Of those who did not describe their neighbourhood this way, more than two-thirds (68%) still described it as a place where neighbours would help each other in an emergency.<sup>15</sup>
- More than half of residents had a large network of support in the event of an emergency or disaster, with more than five people to turn to for emotional support (63%), for help if physically injured (60%) as well as in case of a home evacuation (53%). One in four (24%) people had such a large network of support if financial help was needed, and about one in ten (9%) reported that they had no one to turn to for financial help.<sup>16</sup>
- High levels of self-efficacy and neighbourhood trust were often associated with a higher level of emergency preparedness (Table 1.4).

## Data tables

Table 1.1

Most commonly anticipated sources of initial help and information, by type of emergency or disaster, residents of Ottawa–Gatineau, Quebec, 2014

Most common sources of initial help and information by type of emergency or disaster	percent
<b>Weather-related emergency or natural disaster</b>	
Local government	32
911	22
Police/law enforcement	16

<b>Extended power outages</b>		
Utility company		66
Local government		12
News- Radio		7 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Outbreak of serious or life-threatening disease</b>		
Hospital, clinic, doctor or other medical professional		58
News- Internet		11 <sup>E</sup>
News- Television		11 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Industrial or transportation accident</b>		
911		33
Police/law enforcement		23
Local government		19
<b>Contamination or shortage of water or food</b>		
Local government		59
News- Internet		9 <sup>E</sup>
Hospital, clinic, doctor or other medical professional		8 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Act of terrorism or terrorist threat</b>		
911		27
News- Internet		14 <sup>E</sup>
News- Television		12 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Rioting or civil unrest</b>		
Police/law enforcement		44
911		24
News- Television		14 <sup>E</sup>
<sup>E</sup> use with caution <b>Note:</b> Respondents who perceived their community was at risk for any form of emergency or disaster were then asked where they would turn to first for information or assistance in the event of the perceived emergency or disaster. Respondents could provide more than one response. Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents. <b>Source:</b> Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.		

**Table 1.2**  
**Number of emergency planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents, community of Ottawa–Gatineau, Quebec, 2014**

Number of planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents	Ottawa–Gatineau	Quebec	Canada
	percent		
<b>Number of emergency planning activities</b>			
None	9	10	8
1 activity	18	22	17
2 activities	29	26	25
3 activities	27	26	27
4 activities	15 **	14	19
<b>Number of precautionary measures</b>			
None	11 ***	17	16
1 measure	33 **	29	27
2 measures	26	28	28
3 measures	18	17	20
4 measures	10 <sup>E</sup>	8	7

Number of fire safety measures <sup>1 2 3</sup>			
None	F	F	1
1 measure	20 **	24	14
2 measures	41	42	38
3 measures	31 **	28	42

<sup>E</sup> use with caution  
<sup>F</sup> too unreliable to be published

\*\* significantly different from Canada level estimate (p < 0.05)

\*\*\* significantly different from both provincial and Canada level estimates (p < 0.05)

1 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Canada'.

2 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Quebec'.

3 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Ottawa-Gatineau'.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents. Emergency planning activities include: an emergency exit plan, an emergency supply kit, photocopies/electronic copies of important documents and a list of emergency contact numbers. Precautionary measures include: a battery-operated or wind-up radio, an alternative heat source, a back-up generator and an alternative water source. Fire safety measures include a working smoke detector, a working carbon monoxide detector and a working fire extinguisher.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

**Table 1.3**  
**Planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures residents engaged in, community of Ottawa-Gatineau, Quebec, 2014**

Residents whose households were involved in the following:	Ottawa-Gatineau	Quebec	Canada
	percent		
<b>Emergency planning activities</b>			
Emergency exit plan	50 **	46	60
Exit plan has been practised/reviewed in last 12 months <sup>1</sup>	45	40	46
Designated meeting place for household members <sup>2</sup>	34	34	33
Contact plan for household members <sup>2</sup>	50	51	55
Household emergency supply kit	51	47	47
Vehicle emergency supply kit <sup>3</sup>	49 **	46	59
Extra copies of important documents	47 **	47	53
List of emergency contact numbers	69	68	69
Plan for meeting special health needs <sup>4</sup>	55	61	62
<b>Precautionary measures</b>			
Wind-up or battery-operated radio	61	58	58
Alternate heat source	46	48	48
Back-up generator	21	22	23
Alternate water source	51 ***	38	43
Other <sup>5</sup>	22	20	21
<b>Fire safety measures</b>			
Working smoke detector	98	98	98
Working carbon monoxide detector	43 ***	34	60
Working fire extinguisher	64	67	66



\*\* significantly different from Canada level estimate (p < 0.05)

\*\*\* significantly different from both provincial and Canada level estimates (p < 0.05)

1 Percentage based only on those indicating that they have an emergency exit plan.

2 Excludes Canadians living in single-person households.

3 Excludes those who reported that they lived in a household that did not have a vehicle.

4 Percentage based only on those indicating that they or someone in their household has special medical needs.

5 'Other precautionary measures' include having an escape/rescue plan for pets, extra supply of fuel, checking and replenishing emergency supplies, and keeping exits clear.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

**Table 1.4**

**High or moderately high levels of emergency planning, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents, by social and political involvement, community of Ottawa–Gatineau, Quebec, 2014**

Social and political involvement	Percentage of residents who had high or moderately high levels of...		
	Planning activities	Precautionary measures	Fire safety measures
	percent		
<b>Engagement in political activities <sup>1</sup></b>			
Yes †	40	27	30
No	44	32 <sup>E</sup>	29 <sup>E</sup>
<b>High level of civic engagement <sup>2</sup></b>			
Yes †	39	25	33
No	44	32	26
<b>High level of social support <sup>3</sup></b>			
Yes †	50	27 <sup>E</sup>	41
No <sup>7</sup>	39	29	28
<b>Strong sense of belonging to community <sup>4</sup></b>			
Yes †	45	29	33
No <sup>7</sup>	39	28	30
<b>High neighbourhood trust <sup>5</sup></b>			
Yes †	42	36	35
No <sup>7</sup>	41	24 <sup>*</sup>	29
<b>High level of self-efficacy <sup>6</sup></b>			
Yes †	49	31	40
No <sup>7</sup>	35 <sup>*</sup>	26	25 <sup>*</sup>

<sup>E</sup> use with caution

\* significantly different from reference category ( $p < 0.05$ )

† reference category

- 1 Includes individuals over the age of 17 years who are eligible to vote, and who have participated in or volunteered for political parties or events in the past 12 months, including municipal, provincial, or federal elections, or expressed views on political or social issues through signing a petition, contacting news agencies or politicians, or attended a meeting involving social or community issues.
- 2 Civic engagement measures individuals over the age of 17 years who were involved in a recreational group or organization in the past 12 months, and includes engagement in political activities. A 'high level' is defined as having been involved in at least 4 activities in the past 12 months.
- 3 A 'high level of social support' is defined as having five or more people whom that individual could turn to for help in an emergency if they are physically injured, require emotional support, shelter, and/or financial assistance.
- 4 A 'strong sense of belonging to community' is rating one's own sense of belonging to their community as a 4 or a 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "very weak" and 5 "very strong".
- 5 'High neighbourhood trust' is rating one's own trust in the people in one's neighbourhood as 4 or 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "cannot be trusted at all" and 5 represents "can be trusted a lot", as well as having a response of "very likely" when asked about the likelihood of someone in their neighbourhood returning a lost wallet or purse containing two hundred dollars with the money still inside.
- 6 A 'high level of self-efficacy' is derived from having a high self-rating on a scale of 1 (poor) to 5 (excellent) for the following three categories: an ability to think clearly and solve day-to-day problems, to handle unexpected and difficult problems, and to figure out what to do if faced with an emergency situation.
- 7 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Fire safety measures'.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents. Households with 'moderately high' or 'high' levels of emergency planning engaged in 3 or 4 of the following: having an exit plan, an emergency supply kit, extra copies of important documents and an emergency contact list. 'Moderately high' or 'high' levels of precautionary measures include having 3 or 4 of the following: a wind-up or battery operated radio, a back-up generator, an alternate source of heat and additional water. 'Moderately high' or 'high' levels of fire safety measure include having all 3 of the following: a working smoke detector, a working fire extinguisher, and a working carbon monoxide detector.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

## Notes

<sup>E</sup> use with caution

- 1 A Census Metropolitan Area (CMA) or a Census Agglomeration (CA) is formed by one or more adjacent municipalities centred on a population centre (known as the core). A CMA must have a total population of at least 100,000 of which 50,000 or more must live in the core. A CA must have a core population of at least 10,000. To be included in the CMA or CA, other adjacent municipalities must have a high degree of integration with the core as measured by commuting flows derived from census data.
- 2 The target population for the SEPR included all persons 15 years of age or older, residing in households in Canada's 10 provinces, excluding full-time residents of institutions (e.g. nursing homes, group homes, hospitals).
- 3 The SEPR covers three types of communities: Census Metropolitan Areas (CMAs), Census Agglomerations (CAs) with population greater than 50,000, and 'smaller communities' which include CAs with population 50,000 or less and those areas that fall outside of CMAs and CAs. All CMAs and CAs (with population greater than 50,000) were included in the SEPR. A sample of households were selected from smaller communities within each province to represent all households within the province in similar communities. Additional information on the SEPR and its sampling methodology can be found in the 'Survey description' section.
- 4 The Census Metropolitan Area (CMA) of Ottawa–Gatineau crosses the provincial boundaries of Ontario and Quebec. This fact sheet only covers the Quebec part of this CMA. Information on the Ontario part of this CMA can be found in the fact sheet "Community of Ottawa–Gatineau (CMA), Ontario".
- 5 Throughout this fact sheet, responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.

- 6 This section focuses on personal experiences with emergencies or disasters that happened in Canada, in a community where the person was living at the time, and was significant enough to severely interrupt the individual's regular daily activities.
- 7 Emergency planning activities include: having an emergency exit plan, a household emergency supply kit, extra copies of important documents and an emergency contact list.
- 8 Precautionary measures include: having a wind-up or battery-operated radio, an alternate heat source such as a non-electric stove or heater, or a wood-burning fireplace, a back-up generator and an alternative water source such as a well, tank or litres of stored water.
- 9 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Fire safety measures'.
- 10 Unless otherwise specified, differences are statistically significant ( $p < 0.05$ ).
- 11 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Fire safety measures'.
- 12 A 'strong sense of belonging to community' is rating one's own sense of belonging to their community as a 4 or a 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "very weak" and 5 "very strong".
- 13 A proportion (17%) of respondents were not asked questions regarding neighbourhood helpfulness in the event of an emergency and as such these cases are not included in the analysis on neighbourhood helpfulness in general or in the event of an emergency.
- 14 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% when respondents were asked about whether their neighbourhood is generally a place where neighbours help each other.
- 15 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were equal to 25% when respondents were asked about whether their neighbourhood is a place where neighbours would help each other if there is an emergency.
- 16 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% when respondents were asked about the number of people they could turn to for help if financial support is needed.



## Fact sheet Smaller communities of Quebec

---

In 2014, information on the emergency preparedness of people living in 'smaller communities' of Quebec was collected through the Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada (SEPR).<sup>1 2 3</sup> This fact sheet presents information on the risk awareness and level of emergency preparedness of the residents of Quebec's smaller communities, which could help improve the understanding of community resilience in the event of an emergency.<sup>4</sup>

### **Risk awareness and anticipated sources of help in an emergency or disaster**

- People living in the smaller communities of Quebec anticipated winter storms (including blizzards, ice storms and extreme cold) (91%), extended power outages lasting 24 hours or longer (77%), earthquakes (64%), forest fires or wildfires (63%) and heat waves (61%) as the events most likely to occur within their communities.
- Residents of these smaller communities anticipated first turning to the police as an initial source of help and information in the event of rioting or civil unrest (56%), an act of terrorism or terrorist threat (43%) or an industrial or transportation accident (33%) (Table 1.1). In the event of a contamination or shortage of water or food (62%) or a weather-related emergency or natural disaster (31%), local government was the most commonly anticipated source of help and information for residents.
- In the event of an extended power outage lasting 24 hours or longer, people in Quebec's smaller communities anticipated first turning to their utility company (68%). If faced with an outbreak of a serious or life-threatening disease, they anticipated first turning to hospitals, clinics, doctors and other medical professionals (79%).

### **Prior lifetime experience with a major emergency or disaster<sup>5</sup>**

- Just over one in three (36%) residents of the smaller communities of Quebec had personally experienced a major emergency or disaster within Canada in a community where they were living at the time. Close to two-thirds (63%) of these people had experienced an emergency or a disaster that was significant enough to have resulted in severe disruptions to their daily activities.
- Winter storms including blizzards and ice storms (68%) were the most commonly experienced emergency or disaster. Extended power outages lasting 24 hours or longer (15%<sup>E</sup>) were the next most commonly experienced emergencies.
- Missing work or school (61%) was the most common type of disruption to daily activities endured by victims of emergencies, followed by an inability to use electrical appliances (51%), an inability to use water at home for tasks (48%) and missing appointments or planned activities (44%). More than one-third of victims had to evacuate their homes (37%) and about a quarter were unable to use roads or transportation within their community (23%<sup>E</sup>).
- Half (51%) of the residents of Quebec's smaller communities who had experienced major emergencies or disasters were able to resume their daily activities within one week of the event. The other half needed more than a week, but most (43%) were able to recover within one week to two months.
- Close to two-thirds (63%) of residents who had experienced an emergency or disaster received help during or immediately following the event. Family (37%) and local government (26%<sup>E</sup>) were the most common sources of the assistance received.
- Nearly half (47%) of the residents of Quebec's smaller communities who were affected by major emergencies or disasters significant enough to disrupt their regular daily routines endured a loss of property or another financial

impact, and one in ten (11%<sup>E</sup>) experienced long-term emotional or psychological consequences. Other types of serious or long term implications, such as physical or health consequences, were rare.

## Emergency planning, precautionary and fire safety behaviours

- Seven in ten (71%) residents of the smaller communities of Quebec lived in households that were engaged in at least two emergency planning activities,<sup>6</sup> with just over four in ten (43%) living in households with three or four such activities (Table 1.2). About one in ten (9%<sup>E</sup>) people lived in a household that had not engaged in any emergency planning activities.
- About two-thirds (68%) of residents lived in a household with at least two precautionary measures<sup>7</sup> taken in the event of an emergency. Four in ten (41%) lived in a household with three or four such measures. Just over one in ten (12%) people lived in a household with no precautionary measures set in place.
- Most (98%) residents reported that they had a working smoke detector in their home, a majority reported that they had a working fire extinguisher (79%) and less than half (40%) reported that they had a working carbon monoxide detector (Table 1.3). More than a third (37%) of residents stated that they had all three fire safety measures within their household.
- Some differences were observed in the number of fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents of smaller communities of Quebec compared to the province as a whole and to residents of Canada's 10 provinces in general. For example, residents of the smaller communities of Quebec were more likely to have engaged in all four precautionary measures (14%) than were residents of Quebec overall (8%) and Canadians in general (7%). Though the proportion of residents of the smaller communities of Quebec (37%) that had all three fire safety measures within their homes was lower than the national proportion (42%), significantly more residents of the smaller communities had all three measures compared to Quebec residents overall (28%).<sup>8,9</sup>
- Residents of smaller communities of Quebec differed from the province in general and Canadians overall in the types of the activities and measures they were involved in. For example, they were less likely to have an emergency exit plan (49%) or a working carbon monoxide detector (40%) when compared to all Canadians in general (60% each), but were more likely to have a designated meeting place (44%) than Quebec residents overall (34%) and Canadians in general (33%). Residents of the smaller communities of Quebec were also more likely to have a working fire extinguisher (79%) than both Quebec residents overall (67%) and Canadian residents in general (66%).

## Social networks and sense of belonging

- Three in five (61%) people living in the smaller communities of Quebec had a strong sense of belonging<sup>10</sup> to their community.
- The majority (88%) of residents believed the neighbourhood they lived in is a place where neighbours generally help each other.<sup>11</sup> Of those who did not describe their neighbourhood this way, three-quarters (78%) still described it as a place where neighbours would help each other in an emergency.<sup>12</sup>
- More than half of residents had a large network of support in the event of an emergency or disaster, with more than five people to turn to for help for emotional support (62%), if physically injured (58%) or if they had to evacuate their home (54%). In the event of an emergency, less than a quarter of people had such a network for financial support (18%), and one in ten (10%) reported that they had no one to turn to for financial help.<sup>13</sup>
- Generally, involvement in social or political activities did not have a significant impact on the level of emergency preparedness of the residents of smaller communities of Quebec (Table 1.4).

## Data tables

Table 1.1

Most commonly anticipated sources of initial help and information, by type of emergency or disaster, residents of smaller communities of Quebec, 2014

Most common sources of initial help and information by type of emergency or disaster	percent
<b>Weather-related emergency or natural disaster</b>	
Local government	31

Police/law enforcement	27
911	19
<b>Extended power outages</b>	
Utility company	68
Local government	12 <sup>E</sup>
Family	6 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Outbreak of serious or life-threatening disease</b>	
Hospital, clinic, doctor or other medical professional	79
911	7 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Industrial or transportation accident</b>	
Police/law enforcement	33
911	25
Local government	20
<b>Contamination or shortage of water or food</b>	
Local government	62
Hospital, clinic, doctor or other medical professional	13 <sup>E</sup>
Provincial government	7 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Act of terrorism or terrorist threat</b>	
Police/law enforcement	43
911	24 <sup>E</sup>
Local government	9 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Rioting or civil unrest</b>	
Police/law enforcement	56
911	21 <sup>E</sup>
<sup>E</sup> use with caution	
<b>Note:</b> Respondents who perceived their community was at risk for any form of emergency or disaster were then asked where they would turn to first for information or assistance in the event of the perceived emergency or disaster. Respondents could provide more than one response. Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.	
<b>Source:</b> Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.	

**Table 1.2**  
**Number of emergency planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents, smaller communities of Quebec, 2014**

Number of planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents	Smaller communities of Quebec	Quebec	Canada
	percent		
<b>Number of emergency planning activities</b>			
None	9 <sup>E</sup>	10	8
1 activity	19	22	17
2 activities	28	26	25
3 activities	29	26	27
4 activities	14 **	14	19
<b>Number of precautionary measures</b>			
None	12 ***	17	16
1 measure	18 ***	29	27
2 measures	27	28	28
3 measures	27 ***	17	20
4 measures	14 ***	8	7

Number of fire safety measures <sup>1 2</sup>			
None	F	F	1
1 measure	17 ***	24	14
2 measures	42	42	38
3 measures	37 ***	28	42

<sup>E</sup> use with caution  
<sup>F</sup> too unreliable to be published

\*\* significantly different from Canada level estimate (p < 0.05)

\*\*\* significantly different from both provincial and Canada level estimates (p < 0.05)

1 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Canada'.

2 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Quebec'.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents. Emergency planning activities include: an emergency exit plan, an emergency supply kit, photocopies/electronic copies of important documents and a list of emergency contact numbers. Precautionary measures include: a battery-operated or wind-up radio, an alternative heat source, a back-up generator and an alternative water source. Fire safety measures include a working smoke detector, a working carbon monoxide detector and a working fire extinguisher.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

**Table 1.3**  
**Planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures residents engaged in, smaller communities of Quebec, 2014**

Residents whose households were involved in the following:	Smaller communities of Quebec	Quebec	Canada
	percent		
<b>Emergency planning activities</b>			
Emergency exit plan	49 **	46	60
Exit plan has been practised/reviewed in last 12 months <sup>1</sup>	44	40	46
Designated meeting place for household members <sup>2</sup>	44 ***	34	33
Contact plan for household members <sup>2</sup>	52	51	55
Household emergency supply kit	58 ***	47	47
Vehicle emergency supply kit <sup>3</sup>	50 **	46	59
Extra copies of important documents	46 **	47	53
List of emergency contact numbers	68	68	69
Plan for meeting special health needs <sup>4</sup>	60	61	62
<b>Precautionary measures</b>			
Wind-up or battery-operated radio	59	58	58
Alternate heat source	65 ***	48	48
Back-up generator	39 ***	22	23
Alternate water source	50 ***	38	43
Other <sup>5</sup>	22	20	21
<b>Fire safety measures</b>			
Working smoke detector	98	98	98
Working carbon monoxide detector	40 ***	34	60
Working fire extinguisher	79 ***	67	66

\*\* significantly different from Canada level estimate (p < 0.05)

\*\*\* significantly different from both provincial and Canada level estimates (p < 0.05)

1 Percentage based only on those indicating that they have an emergency exit plan.

2 Excludes Canadians living in single-person households.

3 Excludes those who reported that they lived in a household that did not have a vehicle.

4 Percentage based only on those indicating that they or someone in their household has special medical needs.

5 'Other precautionary measures' include having an escape/rescue plan for pets, extra supply of fuel, checking and replenishing emergency supplies, and keeping exits clear.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

**Table 1.4**

**High or moderately high levels of emergency planning, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents, by social and political involvement, smaller communities of Quebec, 2014**

Social and political involvement	Percentage of residents who had high or moderately high levels of...		
	Planning activities	Precautionary measures	Fire safety measures
	percent		
<b>Engagement in political activities <sup>1</sup></b>			
Yes †	42	41	38
No	40 <sup>E</sup>	35 <sup>E</sup>	33 <sup>E</sup>
<b>High level of civic engagement <sup>2</sup></b>			
Yes †	42	42	39
No	41	38	36
<b>High level of social support <sup>3</sup></b>			
Yes †	44	45	42 <sup>E</sup>
No	43	40	35
<b>Strong sense of belonging to community <sup>4</sup></b>			
Yes †	46	43	40
No	40	38	29 <sup>†</sup>
<b>High neighbourhood trust <sup>5</sup></b>			
Yes †	46	47	39
No <sup>7</sup>	42	36 <sup>†</sup>	33
<b>High level of self-efficacy <sup>6</sup></b>			
Yes †	48	37	41
No	41	45	34



<sup>E</sup> use with caution

\* significantly different from reference category ( $p < 0.05$ )

† reference category

- 1 Includes individuals over the age of 17 years who are eligible to vote, and who have participated in or volunteered for political parties or events in the past 12 months, including municipal, provincial, or federal elections, or expressed views on political or social issues through signing a petition, contacting news agencies or politicians, or attended a meeting involving social or community issues.
- 2 Civic engagement measures individuals over the age of 17 years who were involved in a recreational group or organization in the past 12 months, and includes engagement in political activities. A 'high level' is defined as having been involved in at least 4 activities in the past 12 months.
- 3 A 'high level of social support' is defined as having five or more people whom that individual could turn to for help in an emergency if they are physically injured, require emotional support, shelter, and/or financial assistance.
- 4 A 'strong sense of belonging to community' is rating one's own sense of belonging to their community as a 4 or a 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "very weak" and 5 "very strong".
- 5 'High neighbourhood trust' is rating one's own trust in the people in one's neighbourhood as 4 or 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "cannot be trusted at all" and 5 represents "can be trusted a lot", as well as having a response of "very likely" when asked about the likelihood of someone in their neighbourhood returning a lost wallet or purse containing two hundred dollars with the money still inside.
- 6 A 'high level of self-efficacy' is derived from having a high self-rating on a scale of 1 (poor) to 5 (excellent) for the following three categories: an ability to think clearly and solve day-to-day problems, to handle unexpected and difficult problems, and to figure out what to do if faced with an emergency situation.
- 7 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Fire safety measures'.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents. Households with 'moderately high' or 'high' levels of emergency planning engaged in 3 or 4 of the following: having an exit plan, an emergency supply kit, extra copies of important documents and an emergency contact list. 'Moderately high' or 'high' levels of precautionary measures include having 3 or 4 of the following: a wind-up or battery operated radio, a back-up generator, an alternate source of heat and additional water. 'Moderately high' or 'high' levels of fire safety measure include having all 3 of the following: a working smoke detector, a working fire extinguisher, and a working carbon monoxide detector.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

## Notes

<sup>E</sup> use with caution

- 1 The SEPR covers three types of communities: Census Metropolitan Areas (CMAs), Census Agglomerations (CAs) with population greater than 50,000, and 'smaller communities' which include CAs with population 50,000 or less and those areas that fall outside of CMAs and CAs. All CMAs and CAs (with population greater than 50,000) were included in the SEPR. A sample of households were selected from smaller communities within each province to represent all households within the province in similar communities. Additional information on the SEPR and its sampling methodology can be found in the 'Survey description' section.
- 2 A Census Metropolitan Area (CMA) or a Census Agglomeration (CA) is formed by one or more adjacent municipalities centred on a population centre (known as the core). A CMA must have a total population of at least 100,000 of which 50,000 or more must live in the core. A CA must have a core population of at least 10,000. To be included in the CMA or CA, other adjacent municipalities must have a high degree of integration with the core as measured by commuting flows derived from census data.
- 3 The target population for the SEPR included all persons 15 years of age or older, residing in households in Canada's 10 provinces, excluding full-time residents of institutions (e.g., nursing homes, group homes, hospitals).
- 4 Throughout this fact sheet, responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.
- 5 This section focuses on personal experiences with emergencies or disasters that happened in Canada, in a community where the person was living at the time, and was significant enough to severely interrupt the individual's regular daily activities.

- 6 Emergency planning activities include: having an emergency exit plan, a household emergency supply kit, extra copies of important documents and an emergency contact list.
- 7 Precautionary measures include: having a wind-up or battery-operated radio, an alternate heat source such as a non-electric stove or heater, or a wood-burning fireplace, a back-up generator and an alternative water source such as a well, tank or litres of stored water.
- 8 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Fire safety measures'.
- 9 Unless otherwise specified, differences are statistically significant ( $p < 0.05$ ).
- 10 A 'strong sense of belonging to community' is rating one's own sense of belonging to their community as a 4 or a 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "very weak" and 5 "very strong".
- 11 A proportion (19%) of respondents were not asked questions regarding neighbourhood helpfulness in the event of an emergency and as such these cases are not included in the analysis on neighbourhood helpfulness in general or in the event of an emergency.
- 12 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% when respondents were asked about whether their neighbourhood is a place where neighbours would help each other if there is an emergency.
- 13 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% when respondents were asked about the number of people they could turn to for help if financial support is needed.



## Fact sheet Community of Cornwall (CA), Ontario

---

In 2014, information on the emergency preparedness of people living in the Census Agglomeration<sup>1</sup> of Cornwall was collected through the Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada (SEPR).<sup>2</sup> This fact sheet presents information on the risk awareness and level of emergency preparedness of the residents of Cornwall, which could help improve the understanding of community resilience in the event of an emergency.<sup>3,4</sup>

### **Risk awareness and anticipated sources of help in an emergency or disaster**

- Winter storms (including blizzards, ice storms and extreme cold) (90%), extended power outages lasting 24 hours or longer (80%) and heat waves (58%) were named by residents of Cornwall as the emergencies or disasters most likely to occur within their community.
- Residents named news on the radio as the source of information they would turn to first in the event of a weather-related emergency or natural disaster (31%) or an industrial or transportation accident (32%) (Table 1.1). In the event of rioting or civil unrest (45%) or an act of terrorism or terrorist threat (40%), residents anticipated seeking help and information from law enforcement first. Utility companies were named as the most common source of initial help and information in the event of an extended power outage (34%). In the event of a contamination or shortage of water or food, residents anticipated first turning to their local government (22%<sup>E</sup>), while hospitals, clinics, doctors or other medical professionals were the most commonly anticipated sources of help and information if residents of Cornwall were faced with an outbreak of a serious or life-threatening disease (61%).

### **Prior lifetime experience with a major emergency or disaster<sup>5</sup>**

- Two-thirds (67%) of people living in Cornwall have personally experienced a major emergency or disaster in Canada in a community where they were living at the time. For most (85%), this emergency or disaster was significant enough to have resulted in severe disruptions to their daily activities.
- Winter storms (including blizzards and ice storms) were the most commonly experienced emergencies or disasters by residents (89%). Extended power outages lasting 24 hours or longer followed as the second most commonly experienced emergency (25%<sup>E</sup>).
- Most (83%) people in Cornwall who have endured a major emergency or disaster were unable to use electrical appliances as a result, making it the most common type of disruption to daily activities. Other common disruptions experienced by residents included a need to miss work or school (69%) or an appointment or a planned activity (64%), as well as a need to boil drinking water or drink bottled water (50%). Severe disruptions to daily lives included home evacuation (30%<sup>E</sup>) and an inability to use roads or transportation within the community (34%), both experienced by about one in three victims of emergencies in Cornwall.
- Most residents were able to resume their daily activities within one month of the event. More specifically, 61% of emergency or disaster victims recovered within one week of the event, and for 35%<sup>E</sup>, recovery took between one and four weeks.
- More than half (56%) of people received help either during or immediately following the emergency or disaster. Family members (44%) and neighbours (30%<sup>E</sup>) were the most common sources of help.
- More than one-third (36%) of people in Cornwall who experienced major emergencies or disasters endured a loss of property or some kind of a financial impact. Experiencing other types of serious or long-term implications was rare.

## Emergency planning, precautionary and fire safety behaviours

- Seven in ten (70%) people in Cornwall lived in households that were engaged in at least two emergency planning activities,<sup>6</sup> with half (49%) living in households with three or four such activities (Table 1.2). A small proportion (4%<sup>E</sup>) of residents lived in a household that had not participated in any emergency planning activities.
- Three out of five (59%) residents lived in a household with at least two precautionary measures<sup>7</sup> taken in case of an emergency, with close to one-third (31%) living in a household with three or four such measures. Less than one in ten (8%<sup>E</sup>) people lived in a household with no precautionary measures in place.
- Most (99%) residents reported living in a household with a working smoke detector (Table 1.3). Two-thirds reported living in a household with a working fire extinguisher or a working carbon monoxide detector (65% each). Close to half (46%) of residents stated that they had implemented all three fire safety measures within their households.
- With a few exceptions, the number of emergency planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents of Cornwall did not significantly differ from all Ontario residents or Canadians residing in the 10 provinces in general. Some of the exceptions include: the proportion of Cornwall residents who did not engage in any emergency planning activities (4%<sup>E</sup>) was half the size of the provincial and national proportions (8% each); the proportion of residents who had no precautionary measures set in place (8%<sup>E</sup>) was half the size of the provincial (15%) and national (16%) proportions.<sup>8</sup>
- Residents of Cornwall typically did not significantly differ from Ontario residents or Canadians overall in terms of the types of activities and measures they were involved in. Of the few differences observed, the proportion of residents of Cornwall who had a working carbon monoxide detector within their homes (65%) was significantly lower than Ontario residents overall (80%).

## Social networks and sense of belonging

- Close to half (48%) of Cornwall's residents had a strong sense of belonging<sup>9</sup> to their community.
- Most (92%) residents described their neighbourhood as a place where neighbours generally help each other.<sup>10</sup> Of those who did not describe their neighbourhood this way, the majority (83%) still described it as a place where neighbours would help each other in an emergency.<sup>11</sup>
- About two-thirds of residents had a large network of support in the event of an emergency or disaster, with more than five people to turn to for help for emotional support (65%) or if physically injured (64%). In the event of a home evacuation, more than half of residents had a large network of support (56%). However, one-quarter of residents had such a network of people to turn to for financial help (26%), and 7%<sup>E</sup> reported that they had no one to turn to for financial help.<sup>12</sup>
- Generally, the level of emergency preparedness of residents of Cornwall was not impacted by their social networks, sense of belonging or social and political involvement (Table 1.4).

## Data tables

**Table 1.1**  
Most commonly anticipated sources of initial help and information, by type of emergency or disaster, residents of Cornwall, Ontario, 2014

Most common sources of initial help and information by type of emergency or disaster	percent
<b>Weather-related emergency or natural disaster<sup>1</sup></b>	
News- Radio	31
News- Television	21
Family	16 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Extended power outages</b>	
Utility company	34
News- Radio	22
Family	16 <sup>E</sup>

<b>Outbreak of serious or life-threatening disease</b>		
Hospital, clinic, doctor or other medical professional		61
News- Radio		15 <sup>E</sup>
News- Television		13 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Industrial or transportation accident</b>		
News- Radio		32
Police/law enforcement		21 <sup>E</sup>
News- Television		16 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Contamination or shortage of water or food</b>		
Local government		22 <sup>E</sup>
News- Radio		18 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Act of terrorism or terrorist threat <sup>1</sup></b>		
Police/law enforcement		40
News- Radio		36
News- Television		31 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Rioting or civil unrest</b>		
Police/law enforcement		45
News- Radio		21 <sup>E</sup>
News- Television		20 <sup>E</sup>
<sup>E</sup> use with caution		
1 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% when respondents were asked about their likely sources of initial help and information.		
<b>Note:</b> Respondents who perceived their community was at risk for any form of emergency or disaster were then asked where they would turn to first for information or assistance in the event of the perceived emergency or disaster. Respondents could provide more than one response. Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.		
<b>Source:</b> Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.		

**Table 1.2**  
**Number of emergency planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents, community of Cornwall, Ontario, 2014**

Number of planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents	Cornwall	Ontario	Canada
	percent		
<b>Number of emergency planning activities <sup>1</sup></b>			
None	4 <sup>E ***</sup>	8	8
1 activity	19 <sup>E</sup>	16	17
2 activities	21	25	25
3 activities	26	28	27
4 activities	23	21	19
<b>Number of precautionary measures</b>			
None	8 <sup>E ***</sup>	15	16
1 measure	30	28	27
2 measures	28	29	28
3 measures	26	20	20
4 measures	5 <sup>E</sup>	6	7
<b>Number of fire safety measures <sup>1 2</sup></b>			
None	F	F	1
1 measure	11 <sup>E *</sup>	7	14

2 measures	36	35	38
3 measures	46	53	42
<p>E use with caution  F too unreliable to be published</p> <p>* significantly different from provincial level estimate (p &lt; 0.05)</p> <p>*** significantly different from both provincial and Canada level estimates (p &lt; 0.05)</p> <p>1 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Cornwall'.</p> <p>2 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Canada'.</p> <p><b>Note:</b> Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents. Emergency planning activities include: an emergency exit plan, an emergency supply kit, photocopies/electronic copies of important documents and a list of emergency contact numbers. Precautionary measures include: a battery-operated or wind-up radio, an alternate heat source, a back-up generator and an alternative water source. Fire safety measures include a working smoke detector, a working carbon monoxide detector and a working fire extinguisher.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.</p>			

**Table 1.3**  
**Planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures residents engaged in, community of Cornwall, Ontario, 2014**

Residents whose households were involved in the following:	Cornwall	Ontario	Canada
	percent		
<b>Emergency planning activities</b>			
Emergency exit plan	67	63	60
Exit plan has been practised/reviewed in last 12 months <sup>1</sup>	48	47	46
Designated meeting place for household members <sup>2</sup>	40 *	30	33
Contact plan for household members <sup>2</sup>	61	57	55
Household emergency supply kit	48	47	47
Vehicle emergency supply kit <sup>3</sup>	68 **	62	59
Extra copies of important documents <sup>6</sup>	52	56	53
List of emergency contact numbers	69	71	69
Plan for meeting special health needs <sup>4</sup>	55	61	62
<b>Precautionary measures</b>			
Wind-up or battery-operated radio	63	59	58
Alternate heat source	49	46	48
Back-up generator	23	20	23
Alternate water source	51	44	43
Other <sup>5</sup>	28	22	21
<b>Fire safety measures</b>			
Working smoke detector	99	99	98
Working carbon monoxide detector	65 *	80	60
Working fire extinguisher	65	64	66

\* significantly different from provincial level estimate (p < 0.05)

\*\* significantly different from Canada level estimate (p < 0.05)

1 Percentage based only on those indicating that they have an emergency exit plan.

2 Excludes Canadians living in single-person households.

3 Excludes those who reported that they lived in a household that did not have a vehicle.

4 Percentage based only on those indicating that they or someone in their household has special medical needs.

5 'Other precautionary measures' include having an escape/rescue plan for pets, extra supply of fuel, checking and replenishing emergency supplies, and keeping exits clear.

6 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Cornwall'.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

**Table 1.4**  
**High or moderately high levels of emergency planning, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents, by social and political involvement, community of Cornwall, Ontario, 2014**

Social and political involvement	Percentage of residents who had high or moderately high levels of...		
	Planning activities	Precautionary measures	Fire safety measures
	percent		
<b>Engagement in political activities <sup>1</sup></b>			
Yes <sup>†</sup>	50	30	46
No <sup>7</sup>	48 <sup>E</sup>	26 <sup>E</sup>	54 <sup>E</sup>
<b>High level of civic engagement <sup>2</sup></b>			
Yes <sup>†</sup>	50	31	49
No <sup>7</sup>	47	27 <sup>E</sup>	48
<b>High level of social support <sup>3</sup></b>			
Yes <sup>†</sup>	55 <sup>E</sup>	36 <sup>E</sup>	59 <sup>E</sup>
No <sup>7</sup>	50	30	42
<b>Strong sense of belonging to community <sup>4</sup></b>			
Yes <sup>†</sup>	53	35	41
No <sup>7 8</sup>	47	26 <sup>E</sup>	53
<b>High neighbourhood trust <sup>5</sup></b>			
Yes <sup>†</sup>	62	37 <sup>E</sup>	53
No <sup>7 8</sup>	41 <sup>*</sup>	25	42
<b>High level of self-efficacy <sup>6</sup></b>			
Yes <sup>†</sup>	55	37	52
No <sup>7 8</sup>	43	26 <sup>E</sup>	43

<sup>E</sup> use with caution

\* significantly different from reference category ( $p < 0.05$ )

† reference category

- 1 Includes individuals over the age of 17 years who are eligible to vote, and who have participated in or volunteered for political parties or events in the past 12 months, including municipal, provincial, or federal elections, or expressed views on political or social issues through signing a petition, contacting news agencies or politicians, or attended a meeting involving social or community issues.
- 2 Civic engagement measures individuals over the age of 17 years who were involved in a recreational group or organization in the past 12 months, and includes engagement in political activities. A 'high level' is defined as having been involved in at least 4 activities in the past 12 months.
- 3 A 'high level of social support' is defined as having five or more people whom that individual could turn to for help in an emergency if they are physically injured, require emotional support, shelter, and/or financial assistance.
- 4 A 'strong sense of belonging to community' is rating one's own sense of belonging to their community as a 4 or a 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "very weak" and 5 "very strong".
- 5 'High neighbourhood trust' is rating one's own trust in the people in one's neighbourhood as 4 or 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "cannot be trusted at all" and 5 represents "can be trusted a lot", as well as having a response of "very likely" when asked about the likelihood of someone in their neighbourhood returning a lost wallet or purse containing two hundred dollars with the money still inside.
- 6 A 'high level of self-efficacy' is derived from having a high self-rating on a scale of 1 (poor) to 5 (excellent) for the following three categories: an ability to think clearly and solve day-to-day problems, to handle unexpected and difficult problems, and to figure out what to do if faced with an emergency situation.
- 7 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Fire safety measures'.
- 8 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Planning activities'.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents. Households with 'moderately high' or 'high' levels of emergency planning engaged in 3 or 4 of the following: having an exit plan, an emergency supply kit, extra copies of important documents and an emergency contact list. 'Moderately high' or 'high' levels of precautionary measures include having 3 or 4 of the following: a wind-up or battery operated radio, a back-up generator, an alternate source of heat and additional water. 'Moderately high' or 'high' levels of fire safety measure include having all 3 of the following: a working smoke detector, a working fire extinguisher, and a working carbon monoxide detector.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

## Notes

<sup>E</sup> use with caution

- 1 A Census Metropolitan Area (CMA) or a Census Agglomeration (CA) is formed by one or more adjacent municipalities centred on a population centre (known as the core). A CMA must have a total population of at least 100,000 of which 50,000 or more must live in the core. A CA must have a core population of at least 10,000. To be included in the CMA or CA, other adjacent municipalities must have a high degree of integration with the core as measured by commuting flows derived from census data.
- 2 The target population for the SEPR included all persons 15 years of age or older, residing in households in Canada's 10 provinces, excluding full-time residents of institutions (e.g., nursing homes, group homes, hospitals).
- 3 The SEPR covers three types of communities: Census Metropolitan Areas (CMAs), Census Agglomerations (CAs) with population greater than 50,000, and 'smaller communities' which include CAs with population 50,000 or less and those areas that fall outside of CMAs and CAs. All CMAs and CAs (with population greater than 50,000) were included in the SEPR. A sample of households were selected from smaller communities within each province to represent all households within the province in similar communities. Additional information on the SEPR and its sampling methodology can be found in the 'Survey description' section.
- 4 Throughout this fact sheet, responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.
- 5 This section focuses on personal experiences with emergencies or disasters that happened in Canada, in a community where the person was living at the time, and was significant enough to severely interrupt the individual's regular daily activities.



- 6 Emergency planning activities include: having an emergency exit plan, a household emergency supply kit, extra copies of important documents and an emergency contact list.
- 7 Precautionary measures include: having a wind-up or battery-operated radio, an alternate heat source such as a non-electric stove or heater or a wood-burning fireplace, a back-up generator and an alternative water source such as a well, tank or litres of stored water.
- 8 Unless otherwise specified, differences are statistically significant ( $p < 0.05$ ).
- 9 A 'strong sense of belonging to community' is rating one's own sense of belonging to their community as a 4 or a 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "very weak" and 5 "very strong".
- 10 A proportion (30%) of respondents were not asked questions regarding neighbourhood helpfulness in the event of an emergency and as such these cases are not included in the analysis on neighbourhood helpfulness in general or in the event of an emergency.
- 11 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% when respondents were asked about whether their neighbourhood is a place where neighbours would help each other if there is an emergency.
- 12 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were equal to 11% when respondents were asked about the number of people they could turn to for help if financial support is needed.



## Fact sheet

# Community of Ottawa–Gatineau (CMA), Ontario

---

In 2014, information on the emergency preparedness of people living in the Ontario part of the Census Metropolitan Area<sup>1</sup> of Ottawa–Gatineau was collected through the Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada (SEPR).<sup>2</sup> This fact sheet presents information on the risk awareness and level of emergency preparedness of the residents of Ottawa–Gatineau (Ontario part), which could help improve the understanding of community resilience in the event of an emergency.<sup>3</sup>

### Risk awareness and anticipated sources of help in an emergency or disaster

- Most (94%) residents in Ottawa–Gatineau (Ontario part) anticipated winter storms (including blizzards, ice storms and extreme cold) to be the most likely events to occur within their community. Extended power outages lasting 24 hours or longer (75%), heat waves (62%) and earthquakes (60%) followed as the events most likely to occur.
- Residents most commonly anticipated turning to news on the radio as an initial source of help and information in the event of a weather-related emergency or natural disaster (31%), if faced with an act of terrorism or terrorist threat (31%) or in the event of an industrial or transportation accident (28%) (Table 1.1). If faced with an extended power outage, residents of Ottawa–Gatineau (Ontario part) most commonly anticipated first turning to their utility company (36%), and to a hospital, clinic, doctor or other medical professional (39%) in the event of an outbreak of a serious or life-threatening disease. In the event of rioting or civil unrest, people would commonly first turn to the police (37%), and to their local government if faced with a contamination or shortage of water or food (32%).

### Prior lifetime experience with a major emergency or disaster<sup>6</sup>

- More than half (56%) of residents of Ottawa–Gatineau (Ontario part) have experienced a major emergency or disaster in Canada in a community where they were living at the time. Of those who were faced with a major emergency or disaster, about four out of five (78%) experienced severe disruptions to their daily activities as a result.
- Winter storms which include blizzards and ice storms were the most commonly experienced emergency or disaster (66%), followed by extended power outages lasting 24 hour or longer (34%).
- Those who faced major emergencies or disasters most commonly experienced missing work or school (77%), an inability to use electrical appliances (66%) or missing an appointment or planned activity (57%) as a result. More severe disruptions experienced were home evacuations (21%) and the inability to use roads or transportation within the community (28%).
- About three-quarters (73%) of residents were able to resume their daily activities within a week of the event: 16%<sup>E</sup> within 24 hours, 21% within one to two days, 25% within three to five days and 11%<sup>E</sup> within six to seven days.
- Approximately half (52%) of residents who had experienced an emergency or disaster received help during or immediately following the event. Family members (31%) and neighbours (29%) were the most common sources of help, followed by local government (15%<sup>E</sup>), friends (10%<sup>E</sup>) and first responders (9%<sup>E</sup>).
- One in four (26%) people in Ottawa–Gatineau (Ontario part) who experienced a major emergency or disaster severe enough to disrupt their regular daily routine endured a loss of property or financial impact as a result. Other forms of long-term impacts, such as emotional or psychological consequences (7%<sup>E</sup>), were not as commonly experienced.

### Emergency planning, precautionary and fire safety behaviours

- Seven in ten (71%) residents of Ottawa–Gatineau (Ontario part) lived in households that were engaged in at least two emergency planning activities,<sup>7</sup> with almost half (45%) living in households with three or four such activities (Table 1.2). Less than one in ten (7%<sup>E</sup>) people lived in a household that had not participated in any emergency planning activities.
- About half (52%) of residents lived in a household with at least two precautionary measures<sup>8</sup> taken in case of an emergency. Among them were those who had three or four such measures, representing 21% of residents of Ottawa–Gatineau (Ontario part). Close to one in five (17%) people lived in a household with no precautionary measures in place.
- Most (98%) residents reported living in a household with a working smoke detector, and approximately six in ten (62%) residents reported living in a household with a working fire extinguisher (Table 1.3). Three-quarters (74%) of people reported that they had a working carbon monoxide detector in their household. Half (49%) of residents stated that they had implemented all three fire safety measures within their household.
- Residents of Ottawa–Gatineau (Ontario part) did not significantly differ from the province in general or Canadians residing in the 10 provinces in terms of the number of emergency planning activities they were engaged in. They were, however, less likely than Canadians to have engaged in all four precautionary measures (5%<sup>E</sup> versus 7%) but more likely to have engaged in all three fire safety measures (49% versus 42%).<sup>9</sup>
- In terms of the types of activities and measures residents were involved in, residents of Ottawa–Gatineau (Ontario part) were significantly less like to have a designated meeting place for household members (26%) but more likely to have extra copies of important documents (61%) when compared to the Canadian population (33% and 53%, respectively). People in Ottawa–Gatineau (Ontario part) were less likely to have a back-up generator (14%) or an alternate water source (38%) compared to residents of Ontario overall (20% and 44%, respectively) and to Canadians in general (23% and 43%, respectively). When compared to people living in Ontario (80%), residents of Ottawa–Gatineau (Ontario part) (74%) were less likely to have a working carbon monoxide detector within their homes, however, this proportion was significantly higher than the Canadian proportion (60%).

## Social networks and sense of belonging

- More than half (55%) of residents of Ottawa–Gatineau (Ontario part) had a strong sense of belonging<sup>10</sup> to their community.
- Most (88%) residents described the neighbourhood they lived in as a place where neighbours generally help each other.<sup>11</sup> Of those who did not describe their neighbourhood this way, three-quarters (75%) still described it as a place where neighbours would help each other in an emergency.<sup>12</sup>
- More than half of residents had a large network of support in the event of an emergency or disaster, with more than five people to turn to for emotional support (60%), for help if physically injured (58%) as well as in case of a home evacuation (53%). However, fewer residents had such a large network of support if financial help is needed (24%), and 8% reported that they had no one to turn to for financial help.<sup>13</sup>
- High levels of sense of belonging, self-efficacy, neighbourhood trust and social support, as well as civic engagement and involvement in political activities, were sometimes associated with a higher level of emergency preparedness (Table 1.4).

## Data tables

Table 1.1

Most commonly anticipated sources of initial help and information, by type of emergency or disaster, residents of Ottawa–Gatineau, Ontario, 2014

Most common sources of initial help and information by type of emergency or disaster	percent
<b>Weather-related emergency or natural disaster</b>	
News- Radio	31
News- Internet	26
News- Television	23
<b>Extended power outages</b>	

Utility company	36
News- Radio	23
Local government	12 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Outbreak of serious or life-threatening disease</b>	
Hospital, clinic, doctor or other medical professional	39
News- Internet	26
News- Television	24
<b>Industrial or transportation accident</b>	
News- Radio	28
News- Television	25
News- Internet	22
<b>Contamination or shortage of water or food</b>	
Local government	32
News- Internet	25
News- Radio	24
<b>Act of terrorism or terrorist threat</b>	
News- Radio	31
News- Television	31
News- Internet	28
<b>Rioting or civil unrest</b>	
Police/law enforcement	37
News- Radio	29
News- Television	28
<sup>E</sup> use with caution	
<b>Note:</b> Respondents who perceived their community was at risk for any form of emergency or disaster were then asked where they would turn to first for information or assistance in the event of the perceived emergency or disaster. Respondents could provide more than one response. Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.	
<b>Source:</b> Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.	

**Table 1.2**

**Number of emergency planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents, community of Ottawa–Gatineau, Ontario, 2014**

Number of planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents	Ottawa–Gatineau	Ontario	Canada
	percent		
<b>Number of emergency planning activities</b>			
None	7 <sup>E</sup>	8	8
1 activity	18	16	17
2 activities	26	25	25
3 activities	24	28	27
4 activities	21	21	19
<b>Number of precautionary measures</b>			
None	17	15	16
1 measure	26	28	27
2 measures	31	29	28
3 measures	16	20	20
4 measures	5 <sup>E</sup> **	6	7
<b>Number of fire safety measures <sup>1</sup></b>			

None	F	F	1
1 measure	10 ***	7	14
2 measures	36	35	38
3 measures	49 **	53	42

E use with caution  
F too unreliable to be published

\*\* significantly different from Canada level estimate (p < 0.05)

\*\*\* significantly different from both provincial and Canada level estimates (p < 0.05)

1 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Canada'.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents. Emergency planning activities include: an emergency exit plan, an emergency supply kit, photocopies/electronic copies of important documents and a list of emergency contact numbers. Precautionary measures include: a battery-operated or wind-up radio, an alternate heat source, a back-up generator and an alternative water source. Fire safety measures include a working smoke detector, a working carbon monoxide detector and a working fire extinguisher.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

**Table 1.3**  
**Planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures residents engaged in, community of Ottawa–Gatineau, Ontario, 2014**

Residents whose households were involved in the following:	Ottawa–Gatineau	Ontario	Canada
	percent		
<b>Emergency planning activities</b>			
Emergency exit plan	61	63	60
Exit plan has been practised/reviewed in last 12 months <sup>1</sup>	48	47	46
Designated meeting place for household members <sup>2</sup>	26 **	30	33
Contact plan for household members <sup>2</sup>	51 <sup>†</sup>	57	55
Household emergency supply kit	43	47	47
Vehicle emergency supply kit <sup>3</sup>	62	62	59
Extra copies of important documents	61 **	56	53
List of emergency contact numbers	67	71	69
Plan for meeting special health needs <sup>4</sup>	56	61	62
<b>Precautionary measures</b>			
Wind-up or battery-operated radio	58	59	58
Alternate heat source	48	46	48
Back-up generator	14 ***	20	23
Alternate water source	38 ***	44	43
Other <sup>5</sup>	23	22	21
<b>Fire safety measures</b>			
Working smoke detector	98	99	98
Working carbon monoxide detector	74 ***	80	60
Working fire extinguisher	62	64	66

\* significantly different from provincial level estimate (p < 0.05)

\*\* significantly different from Canada level estimate (p < 0.05)

\*\*\* significantly different from both provincial and Canada level estimates (p < 0.05)

1 Percentage based only on those indicating that they have an emergency exit plan.

2 Excludes Canadians living in single-person households.

3 Excludes those who reported that they lived in a household that did not have a vehicle.

4 Percentage based only on those indicating that they or someone in their household has special medical needs.

5 'Other precautionary measures' include having an escape/rescue plan for pets, extra supply of fuel, checking and replenishing emergency supplies, and keeping exits clear.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

**Table 1.4**

**High or moderately high levels of emergency planning, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents, by social and political involvement, community of Ottawa–Gatineau, Ontario, 2014**

Social and political involvement	Percentage of residents who had high or moderately high levels of...		
	Planning activities	Precautionary measures	Fire safety measures
	percent		
<b>Engagement in political activities <sup>1</sup></b>			
Yes †	46	23	56
No	39 <sup>E</sup>	F	36 <sup>E *</sup>
<b>High level of civic engagement <sup>2</sup></b>			
Yes †	46	23	54
No	45	16 <sup>E</sup>	39 <sup>*</sup>
<b>High level of social support <sup>3</sup></b>			
Yes <sup>7</sup> †	46	33 <sup>E</sup>	62
No	46	18 <sup>*</sup>	46 <sup>*</sup>
<b>Strong sense of belonging to community <sup>4</sup></b>			
Yes †	47	19	55
No <sup>7</sup>	45	24	43 <sup>*</sup>
<b>High neighbourhood trust <sup>5</sup></b>			
Yes †	45	26	58
No	46	18	43 <sup>*</sup>
<b>High level of self-efficacy <sup>6</sup></b>			
Yes †	52	25	51
No	40 <sup>*</sup>	18	49

<sup>E</sup> use with caution

<sup>F</sup> too unreliable to be published

\* significantly different from reference category ( $p < 0.05$ )

† reference category

- 1 Includes individuals over the age of 17 years who are eligible to vote, and who have participated in or volunteered for political parties or events in the past 12 months, including municipal, provincial, or federal elections, or expressed views on political or social issues through signing a petition, contacting news agencies or politicians, or attended a meeting involving social or community issues.
- 2 Civic engagement measures individuals over the age of 17 years who were involved in a recreational group or organization in the past 12 months, and includes engagement in political activities. A 'high level' is defined as having been involved in at least 4 activities in the past 12 months.
- 3 A 'high level of social support' is defined as having five or more people whom that individual could turn to for help in an emergency if they are physically injured, require emotional support, shelter, and/or financial assistance.
- 4 A 'strong sense of belonging to community' is rating one's own sense of belonging to their community as a 4 or a 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "very weak" and 5 "very strong".
- 5 'High neighbourhood trust' is rating one's own trust in the people in one's neighbourhood as 4 or 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "cannot be trusted at all" and 5 represents "can be trusted a lot", as well as having a response of "very likely" when asked about the likelihood of someone in their neighbourhood returning a lost wallet or purse containing two hundred dollars with the money still inside.
- 6 A 'high level of self-efficacy' is derived from having a high self-rating on a scale of 1 (poor) to 5 (excellent) for the following three categories: an ability to think clearly and solve day-to-day problems, to handle unexpected and difficult problems, and to figure out what to do if faced with an emergency situation.
- 7 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Fire safety measures'.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents. Households with 'moderately high' or 'high' levels of emergency planning engaged in 3 or 4 of the following: having an exit plan, an emergency supply kit, extra copies of important documents and an emergency contact list. 'Moderately high' or 'high' levels of precautionary measures include having 3 or 4 of the following: a wind-up or battery operated radio, a back-up generator, an alternate source of heat and additional water. 'Moderately high' or 'high' levels of fire safety measure include having all 3 of the following: a working smoke detector, a working fire extinguisher, and a working carbon monoxide detector.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

## Notes

<sup>E</sup> use with caution

- 1 A Census Metropolitan Area (CMA) or a Census Agglomeration (CA) is formed by one or more adjacent municipalities centred on a population centre (known as the core). A CMA must have a total population of at least 100,000 of which 50,000 or more must live in the core. A CA must have a core population of at least 10,000. To be included in the CMA or CA, other adjacent municipalities must have a high degree of integration with the core as measured by commuting flows derived from census data.
- 2 The target population for the SEPR included all persons 15 years of age or older, residing in households in Canada's 10 provinces, excluding full-time residents of institutions (e.g. nursing homes, group homes, hospitals).
- 3 The SEPR covers three types of communities: Census Metropolitan Areas (CMAs), Census Agglomerations (CAs) with population greater than 50,000, and 'smaller communities' which include CAs with population 50,000 or less and those areas that fall outside of CMAs and CAs. All CMAs and CAs (with population greater than 50,000) were included in the SEPR. A sample of households were selected from smaller communities within each province to represent all households within the province in similar communities. Additional information on the SEPR and its sampling methodology can be found in the 'Survey description' section.
- 4 The Census Metropolitan Area (CMA) of Ottawa–Gatineau crosses the provincial boundaries of Ontario and Quebec. This fact sheet only covers the Ontario part of this CMA. Information on the Quebec part of this CMA can be found in the fact sheet "Community of Ottawa–Gatineau (CMA), Quebec".
- 5 Throughout this fact sheet, responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.

- 6 This section focuses on personal experiences with emergencies or disasters that happened in Canada, in a community where the person was living at the time, and was significant enough to severely interrupt the individual's regular daily activities.
- 7 Emergency planning activities include: having an emergency exit plan, a household emergency supply kit, extra copies of important documents and an emergency contact list.
- 8 Precautionary measures include: having a wind-up or battery-operated radio, an alternate heat source such as a non-electric stove or heater, or a wood-burning fireplace, a back-up generator and an alternative water source such as a well, tank or litres of stored water.
- 9 Unless otherwise specified, differences are statistically significant ( $p < 0.05$ ).
- 10 A 'strong sense of belonging to community' is rating one's own sense of belonging to their community as a 4 or a 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "very weak" and 5 "very strong".
- 11 A proportion (22%) of respondents were not asked questions regarding neighbourhood helpfulness in the event of an emergency and as such these cases are not included in the analysis on neighbourhood helpfulness in general or in the event of an emergency.
- 12 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% when respondents were asked about whether their neighbourhood is a place where neighbours would help each other if there is an emergency.
- 13 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% when respondents were asked about the number of people they could turn to for help if financial support is needed.





## Fact sheet Community of Kingston (CMA), Ontario

---

In 2014, information on the emergency preparedness of people living in the Census Metropolitan Area<sup>1</sup> of Kingston was collected through the Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada (SEPR).<sup>2</sup> This fact sheet presents information on the risk awareness and level of emergency preparedness of the residents of Kingston, which could help improve the understanding of community resilience in the event of an emergency.<sup>3,4</sup>

### **Risk awareness and anticipated sources of help in an emergency or disaster**

- Residents of Kingston anticipated winter storms (including blizzards, ice storms and extreme cold) (96%) and extended power outages lasting 24 hours or longer (86%) as the events most likely to occur within their community, followed by heat waves (56%), industrial or transportation accidents (54%) and outbreaks of serious or life-threatening diseases (51%).
- In the event of a weather-related emergency or natural disaster (37%) or an industrial or transportation accident (31%), news on the radio was most commonly named by residents as the first source of information or assistance they would turn to (Table 1.1). Law enforcement was most commonly named as the first source of information or assistance in the event of rioting or civil unrest (41%) or an act of terrorism or terrorist threat (27%<sup>E</sup>).
- Kingston residents most commonly anticipated first turning to their utility company in the event of an extended power outage (41%), to hospitals, clinics, doctors or other medical professionals if faced with an outbreak of a serious or life-threatening disease (56%), and to their local government in the event of a contamination or shortage of water or food (32%).

### **Prior lifetime experience with a major emergency or disaster<sup>5</sup>**

- Three out of five (61%) people living in the community of Kingston have experienced a major emergency or disaster in Canada in a community where they were living at the time. For most (85%), the emergency or disaster was significant enough to have resulted in severe disruptions to their daily activities.
- Residents who were affected by major emergencies or disasters most commonly experienced winter storms including blizzards and ice storms (79%) followed by extended power outages lasting 24 hours or longer, experienced by one in four emergency victims (26%).
- An inability to use electrical appliances was the most common disruption to daily activities experienced by emergency or disaster victims (73%). Missing work or school (69%) or an appointment or a planned activity (67%), and an inability to use water at home to perform routine tasks (59%) were some of the other common disruptions to daily life experienced. Some of the more serious disruptions experienced included home evacuation or the inability to use roads or transportation within the community, each experienced by 31% of emergency victims residing in Kingston.
- Seven in ten (70%) residents who were affected by a major emergency or disaster were able to resume their daily activities within one week of the event (12%<sup>E</sup> within 24 hours, 15%<sup>E</sup> within one to two days, 30% within three to five days, and 14%<sup>E</sup> within six to seven days).
- More than half (59%) of residents received help from others either during or immediately following the event. Family (32%), neighbours (27%) and friends (23%<sup>E</sup>) were the most common sources of assistance.

- Approximately one in four (27%) residents of Kingston who were affected by major emergencies or disasters experienced a loss of property or financial impact. Other serious or long-term implications were rare.

## Emergency planning, precautionary and fire safety behaviours

- Three-quarters (75%) of residents of Kingston lived in households that were engaged in at least two emergency planning activities,<sup>6</sup> with almost half (48%) living in households with three or four such activities (Table 1.2). A small proportion (5%<sup>E</sup>) of people had not participated in any emergency planning activities.
- More than half (58%) of residents lived in a household with at least two precautionary measures<sup>7</sup> taken in case of an emergency, with about one-quarter (27%) living in a household with three or four such measures. About one in seven (13%) had no precautionary measures set in place within their homes.
- The majority (99%) of residents reported living in a household with a working smoke detector, three-quarters (75%) reported that they had a working carbon monoxide detector and two-thirds (65%) stated that they had a working fire extinguisher (Table 1.3). Half (51%) of residents stated that they had implemented all three fire safety measures within their households.
- In terms of the number of emergency planning activities set in place, residents of Kingston (5%<sup>E</sup>) were less likely to have no activities set in place compared to Ontario residents overall (8%) and to Canadians living in the 10 provinces in general (8%). In addition, residents of Kingston were more likely to have taken all three fire safety measures (51%) than Canadians (42%).<sup>8</sup>
- Significant differences were found between residents of Kingston and Ontario residents overall, as well as Canadians in general, in terms of the types of activities and measures people were involved in. For example, Kingston residents were more likely than both Ontario residents and Canadians in general to have an emergency exit plan (70%, 63% and 60%, respectively), a vehicle emergency supply kit (68%, 62% and 59%, respectively) and an alternate water source (50%, 44% and 43%, respectively). Although the proportion of Kingston residents who had a working carbon monoxide detector (75%) was lower than that of the province overall (80%), this proportion was still significantly higher than that of Canada as a whole (60%).

## Social networks and sense of belonging

- About half (52%) of the residents of Kingston had a strong sense of belonging<sup>9</sup> to their community.
- The majority (85%) of residents believed their neighbourhood is a place where, in general, neighbours help each other.<sup>10</sup> Of those who described their neighbourhood as a place where neighbours generally do not help each other, three-quarters (75%) still believed it is a place where neighbours would help each other in an emergency.<sup>11</sup>
- In the event of an emergency or disaster, more than half of residents had large networks of support with more than five people to turn to for emotional support (63%), for help if physically injured (61%) as well as in the event of a home evacuation (56%). About one in four had a large network for financial support in the event of an emergency (24%). However, more than one in ten (12%) reported that they had no one to turn to for financial help.
- High levels of sense of belonging, self-efficacy and neighbourhood trust, social support as well as civic engagement and involvement in political activities were often associated with a higher level of emergency preparedness (Table 1.4).

## Data tables

**Table 1.1**  
Most commonly anticipated sources of initial help and information, by type of emergency or disaster, residents of Kingston, Ontario, 2014

Most common sources of initial help and information by type of emergency or disaster	percent
<b>Weather-related emergency or natural disaster</b>	
News- Radio	37
News- Television	24
News- Internet	22
<b>Extended power outages<sup>1</sup></b>	

Utility company	41
News- Radio	20
Family	12
<b>Outbreak of serious or life-threatening disease</b>	
Hospital, clinic, doctor or other medical professional	56
News- Radio	21
News- Internet	17 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Industrial or transportation accident</b>	
News- Radio	31
News- Television	24
News- Internet	23
<b>Contamination or shortage of water or food <sup>1</sup></b>	
Local government	32
News- Radio	24
News- Internet	14 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Act of terrorism or terrorist threat <sup>1</sup></b>	
Police/law enforcement	27 <sup>E</sup>
News- Radio	26 <sup>E</sup>
News- Television	22 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Rioting or civil unrest</b>	
Police/law enforcement	41
News- Radio	28 <sup>E</sup>
News- Television	22 <sup>E</sup>
<sup>E</sup> use with caution	
<sup>1</sup> Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% when respondents were asked about their likely sources of initial help and information.	
<b>Note:</b> Respondents who perceived their community was at risk for any form of emergency or disaster were then asked where they would turn to first for information or assistance in the event of the perceived emergency or disaster. Respondents could provide more than one response. Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.	
<b>Source:</b> Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.	

**Table 1.2**  
**Number of emergency planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents, community of Kingston, Ontario, 2014**

Number of planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents	Kingston	Ontario	Canada
	percent		
<b>Number of emergency planning activities</b>			
None	5 <sup>E</sup> ***	8	8
1 activity	19	16	17
2 activities	27	25	25
3 activities	26	28	27
4 activities	22	21	19
<b>Number of precautionary measures</b>			
None	13	15	16
1 measure	27	28	27
2 measures	31	29	28
3 measures	20	20	20

4 measures	7 <sup>E</sup>	6	7
<b>Number of fire safety measures <sup>1</sup></b>			
None	F	F	1
1 measure	10 <sup>***</sup>	7	14
2 measures	33	35	38
3 measures	51 <sup>**</sup>	53	42
<sup>E</sup> use with caution <sup>F</sup> too unreliable to be published <sup>**</sup> significantly different from Canada level estimate (p < 0.05) <sup>***</sup> significantly different from both provincial and Canada level estimates (p < 0.05) <sup>1</sup> Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Canada'.  <b>Note:</b> Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents. Emergency planning activities include: an emergency exit plan, an emergency supply kit, photocopies/electronic copies of important documents and a list of emergency contact numbers. Precautionary measures include: a battery-operated or wind-up radio, an alternative heat source, a back-up generator and an alternative water source. Fire safety measures include a working smoke detector, a working carbon monoxide detector and a working fire extinguisher. <b>Source:</b> Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.			

**Table 1.3**  
**Planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures residents engaged in, community of Kingston, Ontario, 2014**

Residents whose households were involved in the following:	Kingston	Ontario	Canada
	percent		
<b>Emergency planning activities</b>			
Emergency exit plan	70 <sup>***</sup>	63	60
Exit plan has been practised/reviewed in last 12 months <sup>1</sup>	46	47	46
Designated meeting place for household members <sup>2</sup>	35	30	33
Contact plan for household members <sup>2</sup>	54	57	55
Household emergency supply kit	46	47	47
Vehicle emergency supply kit <sup>3</sup>	68 <sup>***</sup>	62	59
Extra copies of important documents	56	56	53
List of emergency contact numbers	69	71	69
Plan for meeting special health needs <sup>4</sup>	62	61	62
<b>Precautionary measures</b>			
Wind-up or battery-operated radio	64 <sup>**</sup>	59	58
Alternate heat source	44	46	48
Back-up generator	21	20	23
Alternate water source	50 <sup>***</sup>	44	43
Other <sup>5</sup>	25	22	21
<b>Fire safety measures</b>			
Working smoke detector	99 <sup>**</sup>	99	98
Working carbon monoxide detector	75 <sup>***</sup>	80	60
Working fire extinguisher	65	64	66

\*\* significantly different from Canada level estimate (p < 0.05)

\*\*\* significantly different from both provincial and Canada level estimates (p < 0.05)

1 Percentage based only on those indicating that they have an emergency exit plan.

2 Excludes Canadians living in single-person households.

3 Excludes those who reported that they lived in a household that did not have a vehicle.

4 Percentage based only on those indicating that they or someone in their household has special medical needs.

5 'Other precautionary measures' include having an escape/rescue plan for pets, extra supply of fuel, checking and replenishing emergency supplies, and keeping exits clear.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

**Table 1.4**

**High or moderately high levels of emergency planning, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents, by social and political involvement, community of Kingston, Ontario, 2014**

Social and political involvement	Percentage of residents who had high or moderately high levels of...		
	Planning activities	Precautionary measures	Fire safety measures
	percent		
<b>Engagement in political activities <sup>1</sup></b>			
Yes <sup>†</sup>	51	30	54
No <sup>7</sup>	33 <sup>E *</sup>	19 <sup>E</sup>	45
<b>High level of civic engagement <sup>2</sup></b>			
Yes <sup>†</sup>	54	33	54
No <sup>8</sup>	38 <sup>*</sup>	21 <sup>E *</sup>	49
<b>High level of social support <sup>3</sup></b>			
Yes <sup>†</sup>	48	34	62
No <sup>8</sup>	48	25	49 <sup>*</sup>
<b>Strong sense of belonging to community <sup>4</sup></b>			
Yes <sup>†</sup>	51	27	58
No	45	28	43 <sup>*</sup>
<b>High neighbourhood trust <sup>5</sup></b>			
Yes <sup>†</sup>	54	33	55
No <sup>8</sup>	43 <sup>*</sup>	23 <sup>*</sup>	49
<b>High level of self-efficacy <sup>6</sup></b>			
Yes <sup>†</sup>	54	30	58
No <sup>8</sup>	40 <sup>*</sup>	24	44 <sup>*</sup>

<sup>E</sup> use with caution

\* significantly different from reference category ( $p < 0.05$ )

† reference category

- 1 Includes individuals over the age of 17 years who are eligible to vote, and who have participated in or volunteered for political parties or events in the past 12 months, including municipal, provincial, or federal elections, or expressed views on political or social issues through signing a petition, contacting news agencies or politicians, or attended a meeting involving social or community issues.
- 2 Civic engagement measures individuals over the age of 17 years who were involved in a recreational group or organization in the past 12 months, and includes engagement in political activities. A 'high level' is defined as having been involved in at least 4 activities in the past 12 months.
- 3 A 'high level of social support' is defined as having five or more people whom that individual could turn to for help in an emergency if they are physically injured, require emotional support, shelter, and/or financial assistance.
- 4 A 'strong sense of belonging to community' is rating one's own sense of belonging to their community as a 4 or a 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "very weak" and 5 "very strong".
- 5 'High neighbourhood trust' is rating one's own trust in the people in one's neighbourhood as 4 or 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "cannot be trusted at all" and 5 represents "can be trusted a lot", as well as having a response of "very likely" when asked about the likelihood of someone in their neighbourhood returning a lost wallet or purse containing two hundred dollars with the money still inside.
- 6 A 'high level of self-efficacy' is derived from having a high self-rating on a scale of 1 (poor) to 5 (excellent) for the following three categories: an ability to think clearly and solve day-to-day problems, to handle unexpected and difficult problems, and to figure out what to do if faced with an emergency situation.
- 7 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were equal to 13% for 'Fire safety measures'.
- 8 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Fire safety measures'.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents. Households with 'moderately high' or 'high' levels of emergency planning engaged in 3 or 4 of the following: having an exit plan, an emergency supply kit, extra copies of important documents and an emergency contact list. 'Moderately high' or 'high' levels of precautionary measures include having 3 or 4 of the following: a wind-up or battery operated radio, a back-up generator, an alternate source of heat and additional water. 'Moderately high' or 'high' levels of fire safety measure include having all 3 of the following: a working smoke detector, a working fire extinguisher, and a working carbon monoxide detector.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

## Notes

<sup>E</sup> use with caution

- 1 A Census Metropolitan Area (CMA) or a Census Agglomeration (CA) is formed by one or more adjacent municipalities centred on a population centre (known as the core). A CMA must have a total population of at least 100,000 of which 50,000 or more must live in the core. A CA must have a core population of at least 10,000. To be included in the CMA or CA, other adjacent municipalities must have a high degree of integration with the core as measured by commuting flows derived from census data.
- 2 The target population for the SEPR included all persons 15 years of age or older, residing in households in Canada's 10 provinces, excluding full-time residents of institutions (e.g. nursing homes, group homes, hospitals).
- 3 The SEPR covers three types of communities: Census Metropolitan Areas (CMAs), Census Agglomerations (CAs) with population greater than 50,000, and 'smaller communities' which include CAs with population 50,000 or less and those areas that fall outside of CMAs and CAs. All CMAs and CAs (with population greater than 50,000) were included in the SEPR. A sample of households were selected from smaller communities within each province to represent all households within the province in similar communities. Additional information on the SEPR and its sampling methodology can be found in the 'Survey description' section.
- 4 Throughout this fact sheet, responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.
- 5 This section focuses on personal experiences with emergencies or disasters that happened in Canada, in a community where the person was living at the time, and was significant enough to severely interrupt the individual's regular daily activities.

- 6 Emergency planning activities include: having an emergency exit plan, a household emergency supply kit, extra copies of important documents and an emergency contact list.
- 7 Precautionary measures include: having a wind-up or battery-operated radio, an alternate heat source such as a non-electric stove or heater or a wood-burning fireplace, a back-up generator and an alternative water source such as a well, tank or litres of stored water.
- 8 Unless otherwise specified, differences are statistically significant ( $p < 0.05$ ).
- 9 A 'strong sense of belonging to community' is rating one's own sense of belonging to their community as a 4 or a 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "very weak" and 5 "very strong".
- 10 A proportion (9%) of respondents were not asked questions regarding neighbourhood helpfulness in the event of an emergency and as such these cases are not included in the analysis on neighbourhood helpfulness in general or in the event of an emergency.
- 11 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were equal to 14% when respondents were asked about whether their neighbourhood is a place where neighbours would help each other if there is an emergency.



## Fact sheet Community of Belleville (CA), Ontario

---

In 2014, information on the emergency preparedness of people living in the Census Agglomeration<sup>1</sup> of Belleville was collected through the Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada (SEPR).<sup>2</sup> This fact sheet presents information on the risk awareness and level of emergency preparedness of the residents of Belleville, which could help improve the understanding of community resilience in the event of an emergency.<sup>3,4</sup>

### **Risk awareness and anticipated sources of help in an emergency or disaster**

- Winter storms (including blizzards, ice storms and extreme cold) (94%), extended power outages lasting 24 hours or longer (79%), heat waves (59%) and industrial or transportation accidents (57%) were named by people in Belleville as the emergencies or disasters most likely to occur within their community.
- Residents most commonly anticipated turning to news on the radio as an initial source of help and information in the event of a weather-related emergency or natural disaster (33%), an industrial or transportation accident (33%) or an act of terrorism or terrorist threat (27%) (Table 1.1). In the event of rioting or civil unrest (42%) residents most commonly anticipated seeking help and information from law enforcement first. Utility companies were named as the most common source of initial help and information in the event of an extended power outage (48%). In the event of a contamination or shortage of water or food, residents would most commonly turn first to their local government (30%), while hospitals, clinics, doctors or other medical professionals were the most commonly anticipated sources of help and information if residents of Belleville were faced with an outbreak of a serious or life-threatening disease (56%).

### **Prior lifetime experience with a major emergency or disaster<sup>5</sup>**

- More than one-third (38%) of residents of Belleville have experienced a major emergency or disaster in Canada in a community where they were living at the time. For nearly three-quarters (72%), the emergency or disaster was significant enough to have resulted in severe disruptions to their daily activities.
- Winter storms (including blizzards and ice storms) were the most commonly experienced emergencies or disasters faced by residents (49%), followed by extended power outages lasting 24 hours or longer (43%).
- The majority of residents who experienced an emergency or disaster were unable to use electrical appliances as a result (74%), making it the most common type of disruption to daily activities. Other common disruptions experienced by residents included the inability to heat or cool their homes (50%), a need to boil drinking water or drink bottled water (47%) or the inability to use water at home for tasks (46%). More serious disruptions included home evacuation (24%<sup>E</sup>) or an inability to use roads or transportation within the community (26%<sup>E</sup>).
- Most residents (79%) were able to resume their daily activities within five days of the event (32%<sup>E</sup> within 24 hours, 24%<sup>E</sup> in one to two days and 23%<sup>E</sup> in three to five days).
- More than half (57%) of victims received help either during or immediately following the event, most commonly from a family member (53%).<sup>6</sup>
- About three in ten (31%) people in Belleville who experienced a major emergency or disaster in a community where they were living at the time of the event and which was significant enough to disrupt their regular daily routine also endured a loss of property or some kind of a financial impact. Experiencing other types of serious or long-term implications was rare.



## Emergency planning, precautionary and fire safety behaviours

- Three-quarters (76%) of residents of Belleville lived in households that were engaged in at least two emergency planning activities,<sup>7</sup> with over half (53%) living in households with three or four such activities (Table 1.2). Less than one in ten (7%<sup>E</sup>) residents lived in a household that had not participated in any emergency planning activities.
- Three out of five (61%) residents lived in a household with at least two precautionary measures<sup>8</sup> taken in case of an emergency, and about one-third (32%) lived in a household with three or four such measures. About one in ten (12%<sup>E</sup>) people lived in a household with no precautionary measures in place.
- Most residents reported living in a household with a working smoke detector (99%) or a working carbon monoxide detector (80%) (Table 1.3). Seven in ten (69%) reported living in homes with a working fire extinguisher. Three out of five (59%) residents stated that they had implemented all three fire safety measures within their households.
- For the most part, the number of emergency planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents of Belleville did not significantly differ from Ontario residents overall, however, there were some significant differences when compared to residents of Canada's 10 provinces. Some of the differences include: the proportion of Belleville residents who engaged in all four emergency planning activities (25%) or all three fire safety measures (59%) was significantly higher than the national proportion (19% and 42% respectively).<sup>9</sup>
- In terms of the types of activities and measures taken by residents of Belleville, some of the differences observed included: having an emergency exit plan (73%), a vehicle emergency supply kit (69%), a wind-up or battery-operated radio (67%) or an alternate water source (52%), all of which were more common among residents of Belleville compared to residents of Ontario and Canada.

## Social networks and sense of belonging

- Close to half (47%) of Belleville's residents had a strong sense of belonging<sup>10</sup> to their community.
- Most residents (89%) described their neighbourhood as a place where neighbours generally help each other.<sup>11</sup> Of those who did not describe their neighbourhood this way, the majority (89%) still described it as a place where neighbours would help each other in an emergency.
- More than half of residents had a large network of support in the event of an emergency or disaster, with more than five people to turn to for help for emotional support (65%), if physically injured (59%) or in the event of a home evacuation (56%). However, about one-quarter of residents had a similar network of people to turn to for financial help (27%), and one in ten (10%) reported that they had no one to turn to for financial help.<sup>12</sup>
- High levels of sense of belonging, self-efficacy and neighbourhood trust, as well as civic engagement were often associated with a higher level of emergency preparedness (Table 1.4).

## Data tables

**Table 1.1**  
Most commonly anticipated sources of initial help and information, by type of emergency or disaster, residents of Belleville, Ontario, 2014

Most common sources of initial help and information by type of emergency or disaster	percent
<b>Weather-related emergency or natural disaster</b>	
News- Radio	33
News- Television	21
News- Internet	17
<b>Extended power outages<sup>1</sup></b>	
Utility company	48
News- Radio	16
Family	13 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Outbreak of serious or life-threatening disease</b>	
Hospital, clinic, doctor or other medical professional	56

News- Radio	18 <sup>E</sup>
News- Television	14 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Industrial or transportation accident</b>	
News- Radio	33
Police/law enforcement	18
News- Television	17
<b>Contamination or shortage of water or food <sup>1</sup></b>	
Local government	30
News- Radio	26
Family	10 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Act of terrorism or terrorist threat</b>	
News- Radio	27
Police/law enforcement	27
News- Television	22 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Rioting or civil unrest</b>	
Police/law enforcement	42
News- Radio	29 <sup>E</sup>
News- Television	18 <sup>E</sup>
<sup>E</sup> use with caution	
1 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% when respondents were asked about their likely sources of initial help and information.	
<b>Note:</b> Respondents who perceived their community was at risk for any form of emergency or disaster were then asked where they would turn to first for information or assistance in the event of the perceived emergency or disaster. Respondents could provide more than one response. Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.	
<b>Source:</b> Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.	

**Table 1.2**  
**Number of emergency planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents, community of Belleville, Ontario, 2014**

Number of planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents	Belleville	Ontario	Canada
	percent		
<b>Number of emergency planning activities</b>			
None	7 <sup>E</sup>	8	8
1 activity	14	16	17
2 activities	23	25	25
3 activities	28	28	27
4 activities	25 **	21	19
<b>Number of precautionary measures</b>			
None	12 <sup>E</sup>	15	16
1 measure	24	28	27
2 measures	29	29	28
3 measures	25 ***	20	20
4 measures	7 <sup>E</sup>	6	7
<b>Number of fire safety measures <sup>1</sup></b>			
None	F	F	1
1 measure	7 <sup>E</sup> **	7	14
2 measures	31 **	35	38

3 measures	59 **	53	42
<p><sup>E</sup> use with caution  <sup>F</sup> too unreliable to be published</p> <p>** significantly different from Canada level estimate (p &lt; 0.05)</p> <p>*** significantly different from both provincial and Canada level estimates (p &lt; 0.05)</p> <p>1 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Canada'.</p> <p><b>Note:</b> Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents. Emergency planning activities include: an emergency exit plan, an emergency supply kit, photocopies/electronic copies of important documents and a list of emergency contact numbers. Precautionary measures include: a battery-operated or wind-up radio, an alternate heat source, a back-up generator and an alternative water source. Fire safety measures include a working smoke detector, a working carbon monoxide detector and a working fire extinguisher.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.</p>			

**Table 1.3**  
**Planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures residents engaged in, community of Belleville, Ontario, 2014**

Residents whose households were involved in the following:	Belleville	Ontario	Canada
	percent		
<b>Emergency planning activities</b>			
Emergency exit plan	73 ***	63	60
Exit plan has been practised/reviewed in last 12 months <sup>1</sup>	48	47	46
Designated meeting place for household members <sup>2</sup>	36	30	33
Contact plan for household members <sup>2</sup>	58	57	55
Household emergency supply kit	50	47	47
Vehicle emergency supply kit <sup>3</sup>	69 ***	62	59
Extra copies of important documents	55	56	53
List of emergency contact numbers	71	71	69
Plan for meeting special health needs <sup>4 6</sup>	70	61	62
<b>Precautionary measures</b>			
Wind-up or battery-operated radio	67 ***	59	58
Alternate heat source	41 **	46	48
Back-up generator	27 *	20	23
Alternate water source	52 ***	44	43
Other <sup>5</sup>	23	22	21
<b>Fire safety measures</b>			
Working smoke detector	99 **	99	98
Working carbon monoxide detector	80 **	80	60
Working fire extinguisher	69	64	66

\* significantly different from provincial level estimate (p < 0.05)

\*\* significantly different from Canada level estimate (p < 0.05)

\*\*\* significantly different from both provincial and Canada level estimates (p < 0.05)

1 Percentage based only on those indicating that they have an emergency exit plan.

2 Excludes Canadians living in single-person households.

3 Excludes those who reported that they lived in a household that did not have a vehicle.

4 Percentage based only on those indicating that they or someone in their household has special medical needs.

5 'Other precautionary measures' include having an escape/rescue plan for pets, extra supply of fuel, checking and replenishing emergency supplies, and keeping exits clear.

6 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Belleville'.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

**Table 1.4**

**High or moderately high levels of emergency planning, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents, by social and political involvement, community of Belleville, Ontario, 2014**

Social and political involvement	Percentage of residents who had high or moderately high levels of...		
	Planning activities	Precautionary measures	Fire safety measures
	percent		
<b>Engagement in political activities <sup>1</sup></b>			
Yes <sup>†</sup>	55	35	60
No <sup>7</sup>	40 <sup>E</sup>	F	49
<b>High level of civic engagement <sup>2</sup></b>			
Yes <sup>†</sup>	59	36	62
No	44 *	24 <sup>E</sup> *	50
<b>High level of social support <sup>3</sup></b>			
Yes <sup>†</sup>	60	34 <sup>E</sup>	63
No	51	31	57
<b>Strong sense of belonging to community <sup>4</sup></b>			
Yes <sup>†</sup>	60	36	59
No	48 *	27	59
<b>High neighbourhood trust <sup>5</sup></b>			
Yes <sup>†</sup>	61	36	67
No	48 *	29	53 *
<b>High level of self-efficacy <sup>6</sup></b>			
Yes <sup>†</sup>	60	34	60
No	45 *	29	58

<sup>E</sup> use with caution

<sup>F</sup> too unreliable to be published

\* significantly different from reference category ( $p < 0.05$ )

† reference category

1 Includes individuals over the age of 17 years who are eligible to vote, and who have participated in or volunteered for political parties or events in the past 12 months, including municipal, provincial, or federal elections, or expressed views on political or social issues through signing a petition, contacting news agencies or politicians, or attended a meeting involving social or community issues.

2 Civic engagement measures individuals over the age of 17 years who were involved in a recreational group or organization in the past 12 months, and includes engagement in political activities. A 'high level' is defined as having been involved in at least 4 activities in the past 12 months.

3 A 'high level of social support' is defined as having five or more people whom that individual could turn to for help in an emergency if they are physically injured, require emotional support, shelter, and/or financial assistance.

4 A 'strong sense of belonging to community' is rating one's own sense of belonging to their community as a 4 or a 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "very weak" and 5 "very strong".

5 'High neighbourhood trust' is rating one's own trust in the people in one's neighbourhood as 4 or 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "cannot be trusted at all" and 5 represents "can be trusted a lot", as well as having a response of "very likely" when asked about the likelihood of someone in their neighbourhood returning a lost wallet or purse containing two hundred dollars with the money still inside.

6 A 'high level of self-efficacy' is derived from having a high self-rating on a scale of 1 (poor) to 5 (excellent) for the following three categories: an ability to think clearly and solve day-to-day problems, to handle unexpected and difficult problems, and to figure out what to do if faced with an emergency situation.

7 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Planning activities'.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents. Households with 'moderately high' or 'high' levels of emergency planning engaged in 3 or 4 of the following: having an exit plan, an emergency supply kit, extra copies of important documents and an emergency contact list. 'Moderately high' or 'high' levels of precautionary measures include having 3 or 4 of the following: a wind-up or battery operated radio, a back-up generator, an alternate source of heat and additional water. 'Moderately high' or 'high' levels of fire safety measure include having all 3 of the following: a working smoke detector, a working fire extinguisher, and a working carbon monoxide detector.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

## Notes

<sup>E</sup> use with caution

1 A Census Metropolitan Area (CMA) or a Census Agglomeration (CA) is formed by one or more adjacent municipalities centred on a population centre (known as the core). A CMA must have a total population of at least 100,000 of which 50,000 or more must live in the core. A CA must have a core population of at least 10,000. To be included in the CMA or CA, other adjacent municipalities must have a high degree of integration with the core as measured by commuting flows derived from census data.

2 The target population for the SEPR included all persons 15 years of age or older, residing in households in Canada's 10 provinces, excluding full-time residents of institutions (e.g. nursing homes, group homes, hospitals).

3 The SEPR covers three types of communities: Census Metropolitan Areas (CMAs), Census Agglomerations (CAs) with population greater than 50,000, and 'smaller communities' which include CAs with population 50,000 or less and those areas that fall outside of CMAs and CAs. All CMAs and CAs (with population greater than 50,000) were included in the SEPR. A sample of households were selected from smaller communities within each province to represent all households within the province in similar communities. Additional information on the SEPR and its sampling methodology can be found in the 'Survey description' section.

4 Throughout this fact sheet, responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.

5 This section focuses on personal experiences with emergencies or disasters that happened in Canada, in a community where the person was living at the time, and was significant enough to severely interrupt the individual's regular daily activities.

- 6 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% when respondents were asked about the source of information or assistance they received during or immediately following the emergency they experienced.
- 7 Emergency planning activities include: having an emergency exit plan, a household emergency supply kit, extra copies of important documents and an emergency contact list.
- 8 Precautionary measures include: having a wind-up or battery-operated radio, an alternate heat source such as a non-electric stove or heater or a wood-burning fireplace, a back-up generator and an alternative water source such as a well, tank or litres of stored water.
- 9 Unless otherwise specified, differences are statistically significant ( $p < 0.05$ ).
- 10 A 'strong sense of belonging to community' is rating one's own sense of belonging to their community as a 4 or a 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "very weak" and 5 "very strong".
- 11 A proportion (20%) of respondents were not asked questions regarding neighbourhood helpfulness in the event of an emergency and as such these cases are not included in the analysis on neighbourhood helpfulness in general or in the event of an emergency.
- 12 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% when respondents were asked about the number of people they could turn to for help if financial support is needed.



## Fact sheet Community of Peterborough (CMA), Ontario

---

In 2014, information on the emergency preparedness of people living in the Census Metropolitan Area <sup>1</sup> of Peterborough was collected through the Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada (SEPR). <sup>2</sup> This fact sheet presents information on the risk awareness and level of emergency preparedness of the residents of Peterborough, which could help improve the understanding of community resilience in the event of an emergency. <sup>3,4</sup>

### Risk awareness and anticipated sources of help in an emergency or disaster

- People living in the community of Peterborough anticipated winter storms (including blizzards, ice storms and extreme cold) (94%), extended power outages lasting 24 hours or longer (85%) and floods (73%) to be the events most likely to occur within their community. Heat waves (60%) and outbreaks of serious or life-threatening diseases (52%) were also among the events residents believed were likely to occur within their community.
- In the event of a weather-related emergency or natural disaster (36%), an industrial or transportation accident (37%) and rioting or civil unrest (33%<sup>E</sup>), news on the radio was most commonly named by residents as the first source of information or assistance they would turn to (Table 1.1). Law enforcement was most commonly named as the first source of information or assistance in the event of an act of terrorism or terrorist threat (37%). Residents most commonly anticipated turning to their utility company in the event of an extended power outage (45%), to hospitals, clinics, doctors or other medical professionals if faced with an outbreak of a serious or life-threatening disease (56%), and to their local government in the event of a contamination or shortage of water or food (23%).

### Prior lifetime experience with a major emergency or disaster <sup>5</sup>

- More than half (55%) of residents of Peterborough have experienced a major emergency or disaster within Canada in a community where they were living at the time. For the majority (73%) of these individuals, the emergency or disaster was significant enough to have resulted in severe disruptions to their daily activities.
- Residents who were affected by major emergencies or disasters most commonly experienced floods (52%) followed by extended power outages lasting 24 hours or longer (38%). About one in seven residents reported experiences with winter storms (including blizzards and ice storms) (15%<sup>E</sup>).
- Missing work or school (62%), needing to boil drinking water or having to drink bottled water (55%), missing appointments or planned activities (50%) and the inability to use electrical appliances (47%) were some of the most common disruptions to daily activities experienced by emergency or disaster victims. Some of the more serious disruptions experienced included the inability to use roads or transportation within the community, experienced by 38% of emergency victims residing in Peterborough, and home evacuation, experienced by one in five (21%).
- The majority of residents (78%) who were affected by a major emergency or disaster were able to resume their daily activities within one week of the event; approximately two in five (42%) were able to resume daily activities in two days or less.
- Just over half (53%) of residents received help from others either during or immediately following the emergency or disaster. Family (30%<sup>E</sup>), neighbours (28%<sup>E</sup>) and local government (21%<sup>E</sup>) were the most common sources of assistance.
- Almost half (47%) of Peterborough's residents who were affected by a major emergency or disaster significant enough to disrupt their regular daily routines experienced a loss of property or other financial impacts. Fewer than one in ten

(7%<sup>E</sup>) experienced long-term emotional or psychological consequences. Other serious or long-term implications were rare.

## Emergency planning, precautionary and fire safety behaviours

- Three-quarters (74%) of residents of Peterborough lived in households that were engaged in at least two emergency planning activities,<sup>6</sup> with about half (49%) living in households with three or four such activities (Table 1.2). Less than one in ten (7%<sup>E</sup>) people had no emergency planning activities in place.
- Two-thirds (65%) of residents lived in a household with at least two precautionary measures<sup>7</sup> taken in case of an emergency, and about one-third (35%) lived in a household with three or four such measures. About one in ten (12%) people had no precautionary measures set in place within their homes.
- Almost all (99%) residents reported living in a household with a working smoke detector, four out of five (80%) stated that they had a working carbon monoxide detector and seven out of ten (71%) residents reported having a working fire extinguisher (Table 1.3). Three out of five (59%) residents stated that they had all three fire safety measures within their households.
- The number of fire safety and precautionary measures that residents of Peterborough engaged in sometimes differed from Ontario residents overall and from Canadians residing in the 10 provinces in general. For example, residents of Peterborough were more likely than Ontario residents to have taken all four precautionary measures (10% versus 6%) and more likely than Canadians overall to have taken all three fire safety measures (59% versus 42%).<sup>8</sup>
- In terms of the types of activities and measures people were involved in, Peterborough residents were more likely than both Ontario residents and Canadians in general to have an emergency exit plan (69%, 63% and 60%, respectively), a wind-up or battery-operated radio (67%, 59% and 58%, respectively), an alternate water source (56%, 44% and 43%, respectively) and a working fire extinguisher within their homes (71%, 64% and 66%, respectively).

## Social networks and sense of belonging

- More than half (55%) of residents of Peterborough had a strong sense of belonging<sup>9</sup> to their community.
- The majority (87%) of residents believed their neighbourhood is a place where, in general, neighbours help each other.<sup>10</sup> Of those who described their neighbourhood as a place where neighbours generally do not help each other, approximately three-quarters (77%) still believed it is a place where neighbours would help each other in an emergency.<sup>11</sup>
- In the event of an emergency or disaster, many residents had large networks of more than five people to turn to for emotional support (68%), for help if physically injured (66%) as well as in the event of a home evacuation (55%). However, fewer than one in three residents had a similar network for financial support in the event of an emergency (29%), and approximately one in ten (9%) reported that they had no one to turn to for financial help.<sup>12</sup>
- For the most part, the level of emergency preparedness of residents of Peterborough was not significantly impacted by their social and political involvement (Table 1.4).

## Data tables

**Table 1.1**  
Most commonly anticipated sources of initial help and information, by type of emergency or disaster, residents of Peterborough, Ontario, 2014

Most common sources of initial help and information by type of emergency or disaster	percent
<b>Weather-related emergency or natural disaster</b>	
News- Radio	36
News- Internet	23
News- Television	21
<b>Extended power outages</b>	
Utility company	45
News- Radio	21



Family	11 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Outbreak of serious or life-threatening disease</b>	
Hospital, clinic, doctor or other medical professional	56
News- Internet	20
News- Radio	18
<b>Industrial or transportation accident</b>	
News- Radio	37
News- Internet	24
News- Television	21
<b>Contamination or shortage of water or food <sup>1</sup></b>	
Local government	23
News- Radio	19
News- Internet	14 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Act of terrorism or terrorist threat</b>	
Police/law enforcement	37
News- Television	28 <sup>E</sup>
News- Radio	28 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Rioting or civil unrest <sup>2</sup></b>	
News- Radio	33 <sup>E</sup>
News- Television	26 <sup>E</sup>
Police/law enforcement	25 <sup>E</sup>
<sup>E</sup> use with caution	
1 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were equal to 11% for sources of initial help and information.	
2 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% when respondents were asked about their likely sources of initial help and information.	
<b>Note:</b> Respondents who perceived their community was at risk for any form of emergency or disaster were then asked where they would turn to first for information or assistance in the event of the perceived emergency or disaster. Respondents could provide more than one response. Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.	
<b>Source:</b> Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.	

**Table 1.2**

**Number of emergency planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents, community of Peterborough, Ontario, 2014**

Number of planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents	Peterborough	Ontario	Canada
	percent		
<b>Number of emergency planning activities</b>			
None	7 <sup>E</sup>	8	8
1 activity	16	16	17
2 activities	25	25	25
3 activities	28	28	27
4 activities	21	21	19
<b>Number of precautionary measures</b>			
None	12	15	16
1 measure	22 <sup>***</sup>	28	27
2 measures	30	29	28
3 measures	25 <sup>***</sup>	20	20
4 measures	10 <sup>+</sup>	6	7

Number of fire safety measures <sup>1</sup>			
None		F	F
1 measure		6 <sup>E</sup> **	7
2 measures		30**	35
3 measures		59**	53

<sup>E</sup> use with caution  
<sup>F</sup> too unreliable to be published

\* significantly different from provincial level estimate (p < 0.05)

\*\* significantly different from Canada level estimate (p < 0.05)

\*\*\* significantly different from both provincial and Canada level estimates (p < 0.05)

<sup>1</sup> Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Canada'.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents. Emergency planning activities include: an emergency exit plan, an emergency supply kit, photocopies/electronic copies of important documents and a list of emergency contact numbers. Precautionary measures include: a battery-operated or wind-up radio, an alternative heat source, a back-up generator and an alternative water source. Fire safety measures include a working smoke detector, a working carbon monoxide detector and a working fire extinguisher.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

**Table 1.3**  
**Planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures residents engaged in, community of Peterborough, Ontario, 2014**

Residents whose households were involved in the following:	Peterborough	Ontario	Canada
	percent		
<b>Emergency planning activities</b>			
Emergency exit plan	69***	63	60
Exit plan has been practised/reviewed in last 12 months <sup>1</sup>	49	47	46
Designated meeting place for household members <sup>2</sup>	34	30	33
Contact plan for household members <sup>2</sup>	58	57	55
Household emergency supply kit	44	47	47
Vehicle emergency supply kit <sup>3</sup>	64**	62	59
Extra copies of important documents	54	56	53
List of emergency contact numbers	71	71	69
Plan for meeting special health needs <sup>4</sup>	62	61	62
<b>Precautionary measures</b>			
Wind-up or battery-operated radio	67***	59	58
Alternate heat source	48	46	48
Back-up generator	25	20	23
Alternate water source	56***	44	43
Other <sup>5</sup>	23	22	21
<b>Fire safety measures</b>			
Working smoke detector	99	99	98
Working carbon monoxide detector	80**	80	60
Working fire extinguisher	71***	64	66

\*\* significantly different from Canada level estimate (p < 0.05)

\*\*\* significantly different from both provincial and Canada level estimates (p < 0.05)

1 Percentage based only on those indicating that they have an emergency exit plan.

2 Excludes Canadians living in single-person households.

3 Excludes those who reported that they lived in a household that did not have a vehicle.

4 Percentage based only on those indicating that they or someone in their household has special medical needs.

5 'Other precautionary measures' include having an escape/rescue plan for pets, extra supply of fuel, checking and replenishing emergency supplies, and keeping exits clear.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

**Table 1.4**

**High or moderately high levels of emergency planning, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents, by social and political involvement, community of Peterborough, Ontario, 2014**

Social and political involvement	Percentage of residents who had high or moderately high levels of...		
	Planning activities	Precautionary measures	Fire safety measures
	percent		
<b>Engagement in political activities <sup>1</sup></b>			
Yes <sup>†</sup>	52	36	62
No <sup>7 8</sup>	42	34 <sup>E</sup>	49
<b>High level of civic engagement <sup>2</sup></b>			
Yes <sup>†</sup>	52	34	61
No	45	40	58
<b>High level of social support <sup>3</sup></b>			
Yes <sup>†</sup>	56	43	71
No	47	32	56 <sup>*</sup>
<b>Strong sense of belonging to community <sup>4</sup></b>			
Yes <sup>†</sup>	51	37	59
No	48	33	60
<b>High neighbourhood trust <sup>5</sup></b>			
Yes <sup>†</sup>	51	42	65
No	49	29 <sup>*</sup>	55
<b>High level of self-efficacy <sup>6</sup></b>			
Yes <sup>†</sup>	56	38	64
No	43 <sup>*</sup>	32	56

<sup>E</sup> use with caution

\* significantly different from reference category ( $p < 0.05$ )

† reference category

- 1 Includes individuals over the age of 17 years who are eligible to vote, and who have participated in or volunteered for political parties or events in the past 12 months, including municipal, provincial, or federal elections, or expressed views on political or social issues through signing a petition, contacting news agencies or politicians, or attended a meeting involving social or community issues.
- 2 Civic engagement measures individuals over the age of 17 years who were involved in a recreational group or organization in the past 12 months, and includes engagement in political activities. A 'high level' is defined as having been involved in at least 4 activities in the past 12 months.
- 3 A 'high level of social support' is defined as having five or more people whom that individual could turn to for help in an emergency if they are physically injured, require emotional support, shelter, and/or financial assistance.
- 4 A 'strong sense of belonging to community' is rating one's own sense of belonging to their community as a 4 or a 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "very weak" and 5 "very strong".
- 5 'High neighbourhood trust' is rating one's own trust in the people in one's neighbourhood as 4 or 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "cannot be trusted at all" and 5 represents "can be trusted a lot", as well as having a response of "very likely" when asked about the likelihood of someone in their neighbourhood returning a lost wallet or purse containing two hundred dollars with the money still inside.
- 6 A 'high level of self-efficacy' is derived from having a high self-rating on a scale of 1 (poor) to 5 (excellent) for the following three categories: an ability to think clearly and solve day-to-day problems, to handle unexpected and difficult problems, and to figure out what to do if faced with an emergency situation.
- 7 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Planning activities'.
- 8 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Fire safety measures'.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents. Households with 'moderately high' or 'high' levels of emergency planning engaged in 3 or 4 of the following: having an exit plan, an emergency supply kit, extra copies of important documents and an emergency contact list. 'Moderately high' or 'high' levels of precautionary measures include having 3 or 4 of the following: a wind-up or battery operated radio, a back-up generator, an alternate source of heat and additional water. 'Moderately high' or 'high' levels of fire safety measure include having all 3 of the following: a working smoke detector, a working fire extinguisher, and a working carbon monoxide detector.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

## Notes

<sup>E</sup> use with caution

- 1 A Census Metropolitan Area (CMA) or a Census Agglomeration (CA) is formed by one or more adjacent municipalities centred on a population centre (known as the core). A CMA must have a total population of at least 100,000 of which 50,000 or more must live in the core. A CA must have a core population of at least 10,000. To be included in the CMA or CA, other adjacent municipalities must have a high degree of integration with the core as measured by commuting flows derived from census data.
- 2 The target population for the SEPR included all persons 15 years of age or older, residing in households in Canada's 10 provinces, excluding full-time residents of institutions (e.g., nursing homes, group homes, hospitals).
- 3 The SEPR covers three types of communities: Census Metropolitan Areas (CMAs), Census Agglomerations (CAs) with population greater than 50,000, and 'smaller communities' which include CAs with population 50,000 or less and those areas that fall outside of CMAs and CAs. All CMAs and CAs (with population greater than 50,000) were included in the SEPR. A sample of households were selected from smaller communities within each province to represent all households within the province in similar communities. Additional information on the SEPR and its sampling methodology can be found in the 'Survey description' section.
- 4 Throughout this fact sheet, responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.
- 5 This section focuses on personal experiences with emergencies or disasters that happened in Canada, in a community where the person was living at the time, and was significant enough to severely interrupt the individual's regular daily activities.

- 6 Emergency planning activities include: having an emergency exit plan, a household emergency supply kit, extra copies of important documents and an emergency contact list.
- 7 Precautionary measures include: having a wind-up or battery-operated radio, an alternate heat source such as a non-electric stove or heater or a wood-burning fireplace, a back-up generator and an alternative water source such as a well, tank or litres of stored water.
- 8 Unless otherwise specified, differences are statistically significant ( $p < 0.05$ ).
- 9 A 'strong sense of belonging to community' is rating one's own sense of belonging to their community as a 4 or a 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "very weak" and 5 "very strong".
- 10 A proportion (14%) of respondents were not asked questions regarding neighbourhood helpfulness in the event of an emergency and as such these cases are not included in the analysis on neighbourhood helpfulness in general or in the event of an emergency.
- 11 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were equal to 12% when respondents were asked about whether their neighbourhood is a place where neighbours would help each other if there is an emergency.
- 12 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% when respondents were asked about the number of people they could turn to for help if financial support is needed.



## Fact sheet Community of Kawartha Lakes (CA), Ontario

---

In 2014, information on the emergency preparedness of people living in the Census Agglomeration<sup>1</sup> of Kawartha Lakes was collected through the Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada (SEPR).<sup>2</sup> This fact sheet presents information on the risk awareness and level of emergency preparedness of the residents of Kawartha Lakes, which could help improve the understanding of community resilience in the event of an emergency.<sup>3,4</sup>

### **Risk awareness and anticipated sources of help in an emergency or disaster**

- Residents of Kawartha Lakes anticipated winter storms (including blizzards, ice storms and extreme cold) (96%), extended power outages lasting 24 hours or longer (83%), heat waves (52%) and tornadoes (50%) to be the most likely emergency-type events to occur within their community.
- Residents of Kawartha Lakes most commonly anticipated turning to news on the radio as an initial source of help and information in the event of a weather-related emergency or natural disaster (33%) or an industrial or transportation accident (30%<sup>E</sup>) (Table 1.1). Residents most commonly anticipated turning to police or law enforcement if they were faced with rioting or civil unrest (66%<sup>E</sup>) or an act of terrorism or terrorist threat (58%). In the event of an extended power outage, utility companies (55%) were most commonly anticipated to be the first source of help and information, and hospitals, clinics, doctors or other medical professionals (58%) were the most commonly anticipated sources of initial help and information in the event of an outbreak of a serious or life-threatening disease. Residents of Kawartha Lakes anticipated turning to their local government (29%<sup>E</sup>) as an initial source of help and information in the event of a contamination or shortage of water or food.

### **Prior lifetime experience with a major emergency or disaster<sup>5</sup>**

- Approximately four out of ten (43%) residents of Kawartha Lakes had personally experienced a major emergency or disaster in Canada within a community where they were living at the time. Three-quarters (74%) of these people had experienced emergencies that were severe enough to disrupt their regular daily activities.
- Extended power outages lasting 24 hours or longer were named by residents as the most common type of major emergency or disaster they had experienced (74%), followed by winter storms (including blizzards and ice storms) (15%<sup>E</sup>).
- As a result of experiencing the emergencies and disasters, residents most often needed to boil drinking water or had to drink bottled water (80%), were unable to use electrical appliances (75%), were unable to use water at home for routine tasks (61%), or were unable to heat or cool their home (57%). More serious disruptions such as home evacuations or the inability to use roads or transportation within the community were not as common, each experienced by one in six residents (17%<sup>E</sup> each).
- Most (90%) emergency or disaster victims were able to resume their daily activities within one week of the event; three in five (60%) were able to resume daily activities in two days or less.
- About two in five (43%) residents who were affected by major emergencies or disasters received help either during or immediately following the event, most commonly from neighbours (38%<sup>E</sup>), family members (36%<sup>E</sup>) and friends (27%<sup>E</sup>).
- Approximately one-third (35%) of the residents of Kawartha Lakes who had experienced major emergencies or disasters endured a loss of property or another financial impact as a result.

## Emergency planning, precautionary and fire safety behaviours

- About three-quarters (77%) of people in Kawartha Lakes lived in households that were engaged in at least two emergency planning activities<sup>6</sup> (Table 1.2). Half (51%) lived in a household with three or four such activities. About one in ten (9%<sup>E</sup>) people lived in a household that had not participated in any emergency planning activities.
- Similarly, most (78%) residents lived in a household with at least two precautionary measures<sup>7</sup> taken in case of an emergency. Half (51%) lived in a household with three or four such measures. A small proportion (6%<sup>E</sup>) of residents lived in a household with no precautionary measures in place.
- Nearly all (99.7%) residents of Kawartha Lakes reported living in a household with a working smoke detector (Table 1.3). The majority (82%) stated that they had a working carbon monoxide detector in their home and approximately three-quarters (77%) reported living in a household with a working fire extinguisher. Two out of three (65%) people stated that they had all three fire safety measures within their households.
- Residents of Kawartha Lakes differed significantly from the behaviours of residents of Ontario and Canadians residing in the 10 provinces in general, in terms of both the number of fire safety and precautionary measures taken and the types of activities that residents were involved in. For example, residents of Kawartha Lakes were significantly more likely to have all four precautionary measures (25%) and all three fire safety measures (65%) within their homes compared to both Ontario residents (6% and 53%, respectively) and Canadians overall (7% and 42%, respectively).<sup>8</sup>
- In terms of the types of activities and measures that residents were involved in, people in Kawartha Lakes were significantly more likely to have an emergency exit plan (71%), a vehicle emergency supply kit (71%), a back-up generator (47%) and a working fire extinguisher within their home (77%) than both residents of Ontario (63%, 62%, 20% and 64%, respectively) and Canada overall (60%, 59%, 23% and 66%, respectively). In terms of other types of activities and measures, where there were significant differences between residents of Kawartha Lakes and Ontario residents or Canadians in general, rates of participation in these activities were generally higher among the residents of Kawartha Lakes.

## Social networks and sense of belonging

- Half (50%) of residents of Kawartha Lakes had a strong sense of belonging<sup>9</sup> to their community.
- Most (94%) residents described the neighbourhood they lived in as a place where neighbours generally help each other.<sup>10</sup> Of those who did not describe their neighbourhood this way, the majority (82%) still described it as a place where neighbours would help each other in an emergency.<sup>11</sup>
- Many residents had a large network of support in the event of an emergency or disaster, with more than five people to turn to if physically injured (68%), for emotional support (66%) or in case of a home evacuation (59%). However, about one in four people had a large network of support if financial help was needed (27%), and about one in ten (12%<sup>E</sup>) reported that they had no one to turn to for financial help.<sup>12</sup>
- High levels of sense of belonging, self-efficacy and neighbourhood trust, as well as civic engagement, were sometimes associated with a higher level of emergency preparedness (Table 1.4).

## Data tables

Table 1.1

Most commonly anticipated sources of initial help and information, by type of emergency or disaster, residents of Kawartha Lakes, Ontario, 2014

Most common sources of initial help and information by type of emergency or disaster	percent
<b>Weather-related emergency or natural disaster</b>	
News- Radio	33
News- Television	24
News- Internet	19
<b>Extended power outages</b>	
Utility company	55
News- Radio	16 <sup>E</sup>

Family	14 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Outbreak of serious or life-threatening disease</b>	
Hospital, clinic, doctor or other medical professional	58
News- Television	18 <sup>E</sup>
News- Radio	17 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Industrial or transportation accident</b>	
News- Radio	30 <sup>E</sup>
News- Internet	22 <sup>E</sup>
News- Television	18 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Contamination or shortage of water or food <sup>1</sup></b>	
Local government	29 <sup>E</sup>
News- Internet	17 <sup>E</sup>
Hospital, clinic, doctor or other medical professional	12 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Act of terrorism or terrorist threat</b>	
Police/law enforcement	58
<b>Rioting or civil unrest <sup>1</sup></b>	
Police/law enforcement	66 <sup>E</sup>
<sup>E</sup> use with caution	
1 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% when respondents were asked about their likely sources of initial help and information.	
<b>Note:</b> Respondents who perceived their community was at risk for any form of emergency or disaster were then asked where they would turn to first for information or assistance in the event of the perceived emergency or disaster. Respondents could provide more than one response. Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.	
<b>Source:</b> Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.	

**Table 1.2**

**Number of emergency planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents, community of Kawartha Lakes, Ontario, 2014**

Number of planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents	Kawartha Lakes	Ontario	Canada
	percent		
<b>Number of emergency planning activities</b>			
None	9 <sup>E</sup>	8	8
1 activity	13 <sup>E</sup>	16	17
2 activities	26	25	25
3 activities	27	28	27
4 activities	24	21	19
<b>Number of precautionary measures</b>			
None	6 <sup>E</sup> ***	15	16
1 measure	15 ***	28	27
2 measures	27	29	28
3 measures	26 ***	20	20
4 measures	25 ***	6	7
<b>Number of fire safety measures <sup>1</sup></b>			
None	F	F	1
1 measure	6 <sup>E</sup> **	7	14
2 measures	28 ***	35	38
3 measures	65 ***	53	42



<sup>E</sup> use with caution  
<sup>F</sup> too unreliable to be published

\*\* significantly different from Canada level estimate (p < 0.05)

\*\*\* significantly different from both provincial and Canada level estimates (p < 0.05)

1 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Canada'.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents. Emergency planning activities include: an emergency exit plan, an emergency supply kit, photocopies/electronic copies of important documents and a list of emergency contact numbers. Precautionary measures include: a battery-operated or wind-up radio, an alternate heat source, a back-up generator and an alternative water source. Fire safety measures include a working smoke detector, a working carbon monoxide detector and a working fire extinguisher.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

**Table 1.3**  
**Planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures residents engaged in, community of Kawartha Lakes, Ontario, 2014**

Residents whose households were involved in the following:	Kawartha Lakes	Ontario	Canada
	percent		
<b>Emergency planning activities</b>			
Emergency exit plan	71 ***	63	60
Exit plan has been practised/reviewed in last 12 months <sup>1</sup>	55 **	47	46
Designated meeting place for household members <sup>2</sup>	33	30	33
Contact plan for household members <sup>2</sup>	58	57	55
Household emergency supply kit	53	47	47
Vehicle emergency supply kit <sup>3</sup>	71 ***	62	59
Extra copies of important documents	48	56	53
List of emergency contact numbers	73	71	69
Plan for meeting special health needs <sup>4</sup>	61	61	62
<b>Precautionary measures</b>			
Wind-up or battery-operated radio	71 ***	59	58
Alternate heat source	60 ***	46	48
Back-up generator	47 ***	20	23
Alternate water source	71 ***	44	43
Other <sup>5</sup>	26	22	21
<b>Fire safety measures</b>			
Working smoke detector	100 ***	99	98
Working carbon monoxide detector	82 **	80	60
Working fire extinguisher	77 ***	64	66

\*\* significantly different from Canada level estimate (p < 0.05)

\*\*\* significantly different from both provincial and Canada level estimates (p < 0.05)

1 Percentage based only on those indicating that they have an emergency exit plan.

2 Excludes Canadians living in single-person households.

3 Excludes those who reported that they lived in a household that did not have a vehicle.

4 Percentage based only on those indicating that they or someone in their household has special medical needs.

5 'Other precautionary measures' include having an escape/rescue plan for pets, extra supply of fuel, checking and replenishing emergency supplies, and keeping exits clear.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

**Table 1.4**

**High or moderately high levels of emergency planning, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents, by social and political involvement, community of Kawartha Lakes, Ontario, 2014**

Social and political involvement	Percentage of residents who had high or moderately high levels of...		
	Planning activities	Precautionary measures	Fire safety measures
	percent		
<b>Engagement in political activities <sup>1</sup></b>			
Yes †	51	53	65
No	46 <sup>E</sup>	38 <sup>E</sup>	62
<b>High level of civic engagement <sup>2</sup></b>			
Yes †	55	56	68
No	44	41 *	59
<b>High level of social support <sup>3</sup></b>			
Yes †	51	59	69
No	51	48	64
<b>Strong sense of belonging to community <sup>4</sup></b>			
Yes †	55	53	73
No	47	48	58 *
<b>High neighbourhood trust <sup>5</sup></b>			
Yes †	49	55	72
No	54	46	57 *
<b>High level of self-efficacy <sup>6</sup></b>			
Yes †	58	55	68
No	43 *	46	63

<sup>E</sup> use with caution

\* significantly different from reference category ( $p < 0.05$ )

† reference category

1 Includes individuals over the age of 17 years who are eligible to vote, and who have participated in or volunteered for political parties or events in the past 12 months, including municipal, provincial, or federal elections, or expressed views on political or social issues through signing a petition, contacting news agencies or politicians, or attended a meeting involving social or community issues.

2 Civic engagement measures individuals over the age of 17 years who were involved in a recreational group or organization in the past 12 months, and includes engagement in political activities. A 'high level' is defined as having been involved in at least 4 activities in the past 12 months.

3 A 'high level of social support' is defined as having five or more people whom that individual could turn to for help in an emergency if they are physically injured, require emotional support, shelter, and/or financial assistance.

4 A 'strong sense of belonging to community' is rating one's own sense of belonging to their community as a 4 or a 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "very weak" and 5 "very strong".

5 'High neighbourhood trust' is rating one's own trust in the people in one's neighbourhood as 4 or 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "cannot be trusted at all" and 5 represents "can be trusted a lot", as well as having a response of "very likely" when asked about the likelihood of someone in their neighbourhood returning a lost wallet or purse containing two hundred dollars with the money still inside.

6 A 'high level of self-efficacy' is derived from having a high self-rating on a scale of 1 (poor) to 5 (excellent) for the following three categories: an ability to think clearly and solve day-to-day problems, to handle unexpected and difficult problems, and to figure out what to do if faced with an emergency situation.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents. Households with 'moderately high' or 'high' levels of emergency planning engaged in 3 or 4 of the following: having an exit plan, an emergency supply kit, extra copies of important documents and an emergency contact list. 'Moderately high' or 'high' levels of precautionary measures include having 3 or 4 of the following: a wind-up or battery operated radio, a back-up generator, an alternate source of heat and additional water. 'Moderately high' or 'high' levels of fire safety measure include having all 3 of the following: a working smoke detector, a working fire extinguisher, and a working carbon monoxide detector.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

## Notes

<sup>E</sup> use with caution

- 1 A Census Metropolitan Area (CMA) or a Census Agglomeration (CA) is formed by one or more adjacent municipalities centred on a population centre (known as the core). A CMA must have a total population of at least 100,000 of which 50,000 or more must live in the core. A CA must have a core population of at least 10,000. To be included in the CMA or CA, other adjacent municipalities must have a high degree of integration with the core as measured by commuting flows derived from census data.
- 2 The target population for the SEPR included all persons 15 years of age or older, residing in households in Canada's 10 provinces, excluding full-time residents of institutions (e.g. nursing homes, group homes, hospitals).
- 3 The SEPR covers three types of communities: Census Metropolitan Areas (CMAs), Census Agglomerations (CAs) with population greater than 50,000, and 'smaller communities' which include CAs with population 50,000 or less and those areas that fall outside of CMAs and CAs. All CMAs and CAs (with population greater than 50,000) were included in the SEPR. A sample of households were selected from smaller communities within each province to represent all households within the province in similar communities. Additional information on the SEPR and its sampling methodology can be found in the 'Survey description' section.
- 4 Throughout this fact sheet, responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.
- 5 This section focuses on personal experiences with emergencies or disasters that happened in Canada, in a community where the person was living at the time, and was significant enough to severely interrupt the individual's regular daily activities.
- 6 Emergency planning activities include: having an emergency exit plan, a household emergency supply kit, extra copies of important documents and an emergency contact list.
- 7 Precautionary measures include: having a wind-up or battery-operated radio, an alternate heat source such as a non-electric stove or heater, or a wood-burning fireplace, a back-up generator and an alternative water source such as a well, tank or litres of stored water.
- 8 Unless otherwise specified, differences are statistically significant ( $p < 0.05$ ).
- 9 A 'strong sense of belonging to community' is rating one's own sense of belonging to their community as a 4 or a 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "very weak" and 5 "very strong".
- 10 A proportion (13%) of respondents were not asked questions regarding neighbourhood helpfulness in the event of an emergency and as such these cases are not included in the analysis on neighbourhood helpfulness in general or in the event of an emergency.
- 11 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were equal to 10% when respondents were asked about whether their neighbourhood is a place where neighbours would help each other if there is an emergency.
- 12 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% when respondents were asked about the number of people they could turn to for help if financial support is needed.



## Fact sheet Community of Oshawa (CMA), Ontario

---

In 2014, information on the emergency preparedness of people living in the Census Metropolitan Area<sup>1</sup> of Oshawa was collected through the Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada (SEPR).<sup>2</sup> This fact sheet presents information on the risk awareness and level of emergency preparedness of the residents of Oshawa, which could help improve the understanding of community resilience in the event of an emergency.<sup>3,4</sup>

### **Risk awareness and anticipated sources of help in an emergency or disaster**

- Winter storms (including blizzards, ice storms and extreme cold) (94%), extended power outages lasting 24 hours or longer (84%) and industrial or transportation accidents (63%) were named by residents of Oshawa as the most likely events to occur within their community.
- Residents most commonly anticipated turning to television news as an initial source for help and information if they were faced with an act of terrorism or terrorist threat (43%), an industrial or transportation accident (36%) or in the event of a contamination or shortage of water or food (27%). Radio news was the anticipated source of information for a weather-related emergency or natural disaster (33%) (Table 1.1).
- Residents also stated that hospitals, clinics, doctors and other medical professionals were the most commonly anticipated sources of initial help and information in the event of an outbreak of a serious or life-threatening disease (43%), while police would be their first source of help in the event of rioting or civil unrest (40%<sup>E</sup>). In the event of an extended power outage, residents would commonly first turn to their utility company (28%).

### **Prior lifetime experience with a major emergency or disaster<sup>5</sup>**

- Nearly six in ten (59%) Oshawa residents have faced a major emergency or disaster in Canada in a community they were living in at the time of the event, a large majority (71%) of whom reported experiencing severe disruptions to their daily activities as a result of the event.
- Extended power outages lasting 24 hours or longer (65%) and winter storms which include blizzards and ice storms (38%) were the most commonly experienced emergencies or disasters by residents.
- The most common types of disruption to daily activities endured by residents who had experienced major emergencies or disasters included the inability to use electrical appliances (91%) and the inability to heat or cool their home (73%). In addition, approximately six in ten residents reported that they were unable to prepare hot meals at home (62%) and had to boil drinking water or use bottled water (59%). More severe disruptions experienced were home evacuations experienced by about one-quarter (26%<sup>E</sup>) of people faced with an emergency, as well as the inability to communicate outside of the home (17%<sup>E</sup>) or use roads or transportation within the community (15%<sup>E</sup>).
- The majority (91%) of Oshawa residents who experienced an emergency or disaster were able to resume their daily activities within one week of the event; two-thirds (67%) were able to resume their daily activities in two days or less.
- Almost half (47%) of residents who had experienced an emergency or disaster received help during or immediately following the event, most commonly from a family member (50%).
- Just over one-quarter (27%) of residents of Oshawa who experienced a major emergency or disaster in Canada in a community where they were living at the time of the event and which was significant enough to disrupt their regular daily routine also endured a loss of property or financial impact.

## Emergency planning, precautionary and fire safety behaviours

- Seven out of ten (71%) people residing in Oshawa lived in households that were engaged in at least two emergency planning activities,<sup>6</sup> almost one-half (45%) lived in households with three or four such activities (Table 1.2). Almost one in ten (8%<sup>E</sup>) people lived in a household that had not participated in any emergency planning activities.
- About half (51%) lived in a household with at least two precautionary measures<sup>7</sup> taken in case of an emergency, but less than one-quarter (22%) lived in a household with three or four such measures. One in ten (10%) people lived in a household with no precautionary measures in place.
- The vast majority (99%) of residents reported living in a household with a working smoke detector, and seven out of ten (71%) reported living in a household with a working fire extinguisher (Table 1.3). A large majority (89%) of Oshawa's residents stated that they had a working carbon monoxide detector in their household, significantly higher than the national proportion (60%). As a result, the majority (63%) of residents in Oshawa stated that they had implemented all three fire safety measures within their households, significantly more than in Ontario (53%) and Canada's 10 provinces overall (42%).<sup>8</sup>
- While Oshawa residents were more likely to have all three fire safety measures in place than those in Ontario and Canada, they were less prepared in other ways. Oshawa residents were more likely than Canadians overall to have a wind-up or battery-operated radio (65% versus 58%), but they were less likely to have a back-up generator (13% versus 23%) or a household emergency supply kit (38% versus 47%).

## Social networks and sense of belonging

- Close to half (48%) of Oshawa residents had a strong sense of belonging<sup>9</sup> to their community.
- The vast majority (91%) of residents described the neighbourhood they lived in as a place where neighbours generally help each other.<sup>10</sup> Of those who did not describe their neighbourhood this way, most (78%) still described it as a place where neighbours would help each other in an emergency.<sup>11</sup>
- Many individuals in Oshawa had a large network of support in the event of an emergency or disaster, with more than five people to turn to for emotional support (69%), for help if physically injured (66%) as well as in case of a home evacuation (61%). About three in ten (29%) residents had a large support network if financial help was needed. However, one in ten (10%) reported that they had no one to turn to for financial help.<sup>12</sup>
- High levels of sense of belonging, self-efficacy, neighbourhood trust and social support, as well involvement in political activities, were sometimes associated with a higher level of emergency preparedness (Table 1.4).

## Data tables

Table 1.1

Most commonly anticipated sources of initial help and information, by type of emergency or disaster, residents of Oshawa, Ontario, 2014

Most common sources of initial help and information by type of emergency or disaster	percent
<b>Weather-related emergency or natural disaster</b>	
News- Radio	33
News- Television	28
News- Internet	25
<b>Extended power outages</b>	
Utility company	28
News- Radio	25
Family	15 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Outbreak of serious or life-threatening disease</b>	
Hospital, clinic, doctor or other medical professional	43
News- Television	29
News- Radio	25

<b>Industrial or transportation accident</b>	
News- Television	36
News- Radio	33
News- Internet	21
<b>Contamination or shortage of water or food <sup>1</sup></b>	
News- Television	27
Local government	24
News- Radio	20
<b>Act of terrorism or terrorist threat</b>	
News- Television	43
News- Radio	35
Police/law enforcement	24 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Rioting or civil unrest</b>	
Police/law enforcement	40 <sup>E</sup>
News- Radio	29 <sup>E</sup>
News- Television	25 <sup>E</sup>
<sup>E</sup> use with caution	
1 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% when respondents were asked about their likely sources of initial help and information.	
<b>Note:</b> Respondents who perceived their community was at risk for any form of emergency or disaster were then asked where they would turn to first for information or assistance in the event of the perceived emergency or disaster. Respondents could provide more than one response. Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.	
<b>Source:</b> Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.	

**Table 1.2**  
**Number of emergency planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents, community of Oshawa, Ontario, 2014**

Number of planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents	Oshawa	Ontario	Canada
	percent		
<b>Number of emergency planning activities</b>			
None	8 <sup>E</sup>	8	8
1 activity	19	16	17
2 activities	26	25	25
3 activities	28	28	27
4 activities	17	21	19
<b>Number of precautionary measures</b>			
None	10 <sup>***</sup>	15	16
1 measure	36 <sup>***</sup>	28	27
2 measures	29	29	28
3 measures	17	20	20
4 measures	5 <sup>E</sup> **	6	7
<b>Number of fire safety measures <sup>1</sup></b>			
None	F	F	1
1 measure	3 <sup>E</sup> ***	7	14
2 measures	31 <sup>**</sup>	35	38
3 measures	63 <sup>***</sup>	53	42

<sup>E</sup> use with caution  
<sup>F</sup> too unreliable to be published

\*\* significantly different from Canada level estimate (p < 0.05)

\*\*\* significantly different from both provincial and Canada level estimates (p < 0.05)

1 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Canada'.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents. Emergency planning activities include: an emergency exit plan, an emergency supply kit, photocopies/electronic copies of important documents and a list of emergency contact numbers. Precautionary measures include: a battery-operated or wind-up radio, an alternate heat source, a back-up generator and an alternative water source. Fire safety measures include a working smoke detector, a working carbon monoxide detector and a working fire extinguisher.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

**Table 1.3**  
**Planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures residents engaged in, community of Oshawa, Ontario, 2014**

Residents whose households were involved in the following:	Oshawa	Ontario	Canada
	percent		
<b>Emergency planning activities</b>			
Emergency exit plan	64	63	60
Exit plan has been practised/reviewed in last 12 months <sup>1</sup>	48	47	46
Designated meeting place for household members <sup>2</sup>	33	30	33
Contact plan for household members <sup>2</sup>	57	57	55
Household emergency supply kit	38 ***	47	47
Vehicle emergency supply kit <sup>3</sup>	61	62	59
Extra copies of important documents	51	56	53
List of emergency contact numbers	74 **	71	69
Plan for meeting special health needs <sup>4</sup>	68	61	62
<b>Precautionary measures</b>			
Wind-up or battery-operated radio	65 **	59	58
Alternate heat source	47	46	48
Back-up generator	13 ***	20	23
Alternate water source	43	44	43
Other <sup>5</sup>	18	22	21
<b>Fire safety measures</b>			
Working smoke detector	99	99	98
Working carbon monoxide detector	89 ***	80	60
Working fire extinguisher	71 *	64	66

\* significantly different from provincial level estimate (p < 0.05)

\*\* significantly different from Canada level estimate (p < 0.05)

\*\*\* significantly different from both provincial and Canada level estimates (p < 0.05)

1 Percentage based only on those indicating that they have an emergency exit plan.

2 Excludes Canadians living in single-person households.

3 Excludes those who reported that they lived in a household that did not have a vehicle.

4 Percentage based only on those indicating that they or someone in their household has special medical needs.

5 'Other precautionary measures' include having an escape/rescue plan for pets, extra supply of fuel, checking and replenishing emergency supplies, and keeping exits clear.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

**Table 1.4**

**High or moderately high levels of emergency planning, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents, by social and political involvement, community of Oshawa, Ontario, 2014**

Social and political involvement	Percentage of residents who had high or moderately high levels of...		
	Planning activities	Precautionary measures	Fire safety measures
	percent		
<b>Engagement in political activities <sup>1</sup></b>			
Yes †	48	24	66
No	38 <sup>E</sup>	16 <sup>E</sup>	50 *
<b>High level of civic engagement <sup>2</sup></b>			
Yes †	47	24	66
No	43	20 <sup>E</sup>	57
<b>High level of social support <sup>3</sup></b>			
Yes †	56	29 <sup>E</sup>	78
No	43	20	59 *
<b>Strong sense of belonging to community <sup>4</sup></b>			
Yes †	46	23	71
No	46	22 <sup>E</sup>	57 *
<b>High neighbourhood trust <sup>5</sup></b>			
Yes †	57	36	73
No	41 *	16 *	59 *
<b>High level of self-efficacy <sup>6</sup></b>			
Yes †	53	24	67
No	40 *	22 <sup>E</sup>	61

<sup>E</sup> use with caution

\* significantly different from reference category ( $p < 0.05$ )

† reference category

1 Includes individuals over the age of 17 years who are eligible to vote, and who have participated in or volunteered for political parties or events in the past 12 months, including municipal, provincial, or federal elections, or expressed views on political or social issues through signing a petition, contacting news agencies or politicians, or attended a meeting involving social or community issues.

2 Civic engagement measures individuals over the age of 17 years who were involved in a recreational group or organization in the past 12 months, and includes engagement in political activities. A 'high level' is defined as having been involved in at least 4 activities in the past 12 months.

3 A 'high level of social support' is defined as having five or more people whom that individual could turn to for help in an emergency if they are physically injured, require emotional support, shelter, and/or financial assistance.

4 A 'strong sense of belonging to community' is rating one's own sense of belonging to their community as a 4 or a 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "very weak" and 5 "very strong".

5 'High neighbourhood trust' is rating one's own trust in the people in one's neighbourhood as 4 or 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "cannot be trusted at all" and 5 represents "can be trusted a lot", as well as having a response of "very likely" when asked about the likelihood of someone in their neighbourhood returning a lost wallet or purse containing two hundred dollars with the money still inside.

6 A 'high level of self-efficacy' is derived from having a high self-rating on a scale of 1 (poor) to 5 (excellent) for the following three categories: an ability to think clearly and solve day-to-day problems, to handle unexpected and difficult problems, and to figure out what to do if faced with an emergency situation.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents. Households with 'moderately high' or 'high' levels of emergency planning engaged in 3 or 4 of the following: having an exit plan, an emergency supply kit, extra copies of important documents and an emergency contact list. 'Moderately high' or 'high' levels of precautionary measures include having 3 or 4 of the following: a wind-up or battery operated radio, a back-up generator, an alternate source of heat and additional water. 'Moderately high' or 'high' levels of fire safety measure include having all 3 of the following: a working smoke detector, a working fire extinguisher, and a working carbon monoxide detector.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

## Notes

<sup>E</sup> use with caution



- 1 A Census Metropolitan Area (CMA) or a Census Agglomeration (CA) is formed by one or more adjacent municipalities centred on a population centre (known as the core). A CMA must have a total population of at least 100,000 of which 50,000 or more must live in the core. A CA must have a core population of at least 10,000. To be included in the CMA or CA, other adjacent municipalities must have a high degree of integration with the core as measured by commuting flows derived from census data.
- 2 The target population for the SEPR included all persons 15 years of age or older, residing in households in Canada's 10 provinces, excluding full-time residents of institutions (e.g. nursing homes, group homes, hospitals).
- 3 The SEPR covers three types of communities: Census Metropolitan Areas (CMAs), Census Agglomerations (CAs) with population greater than 50,000, and 'smaller communities' which include CAs with population 50,000 or less and those areas that fall outside of CMAs and CAs. All CMAs and CAs (with population greater than 50,000) were included in the SEPR. A sample of households were selected from smaller communities within each province to represent all households within the province in similar communities. Additional information on the SEPR and its sampling methodology can be found in the 'Survey description' section.
- 4 Throughout this fact sheet, responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.
- 5 This section focuses on personal experiences with emergencies or disasters that happened in Canada, in a community where the person was living at the time, and was significant enough to severely interrupt the individual's regular daily activities.
- 6 Emergency planning activities include: having an emergency exit plan, a household emergency supply kit, extra copies of important documents and an emergency contact list.
- 7 Precautionary measures include: having a wind-up or battery-operated radio, an alternate heat source such as a non-electric stove or heater or a wood-burning fireplace, a back-up generator and an alternative water source such as a well, tank or litres of stored water.
- 8 Unless otherwise specified, differences are statistically significant ( $p < 0.05$ ).
- 9 A 'strong sense of belonging to community' is rating one's own sense of belonging to their community as a 4 or a 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "very weak" and 5 "very strong".
- 10 A proportion (23%) of respondents were not asked questions regarding neighbourhood helpfulness in the event of an emergency and as such these cases are not included in the analysis on neighbourhood helpfulness in general or in the event of an emergency.
- 11 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were equal to 17% when respondents were asked about whether their neighbourhood is a place where neighbours would help each other if there is an emergency.
- 12 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% when respondents were asked about the number of people they could turn to for help if financial support is needed.



## Fact sheet Community of Toronto (CMA), Ontario

---

In 2014, information on the emergency preparedness of people living in the Census Metropolitan Area<sup>1</sup> of Toronto was collected through the Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada (SEPR).<sup>2</sup> This fact sheet presents information on the risk awareness and level of emergency preparedness of the residents of Toronto, which could help improve the understanding of community resilience in the event of an emergency.<sup>3,4</sup>

### **Risk awareness and anticipated sources of help in an emergency or disaster**

- Winter storms (including blizzards, ice storms and extreme cold) (93%), extended power outages lasting 24 hours or longer (81%) and heat waves (58%) were named by residents of Toronto as the events most likely to occur in their community.
- Residents most commonly anticipated turning to news on the radio as an initial source for help and information if they were faced with an industrial or transportation accident (32%) or a weather-related emergency or natural disaster (30%) (Table 1.1). News on the television was listed by residents as the most commonly anticipated source of initial help and information in the event of an act of terrorism or terrorist threat (37%) or in the event of rioting or civil unrest (31%).
- Residents most frequently stated a hospital, clinic, doctor or other medical professional as the anticipated first source of information or assistance in the event of an outbreak of a serious illness or life-threatening disease (40%). In the event of a contamination or shortage of water or food, residents most commonly said they would first seek information or assistance from local government (27%), and in the event of an extended power outage, residents anticipated first turning to their utility company (30%).

### **Prior lifetime experience with a major emergency or disaster<sup>5</sup>**

- Approximately half (52%) of Toronto residents have personally experienced a major emergency or disaster in Canada in a community where they were living at the time of the event. For most (78%), the emergency or disaster was significant enough to have resulted in severe disruptions to their daily activities.
- Extended power outages lasting 24 hours or longer (62%) and winter storms (including blizzards and ice storms) (42%) were the most commonly experienced emergencies or disasters by residents of Toronto.
- The most frequently endured types of disruption to daily activities by residents who experienced emergencies or disasters included an inability to use electrical appliances (78%), an inability to heat or cool their home (61%), having to miss work or school (58%), as well as having to boil water for drinking or drink bottled water (55%). More serious disruptions experienced were home evacuations experienced by one-quarter (25%) of people faced with an emergency or disaster, as well as an inability to use roads or transportation within the community (21%) or communicate outside of the home (10%<sup>E</sup>).
- Approximately nine in ten (92%) residents who experienced an emergency or disaster were able to resume their daily activities within one week of the event, with just over half (53%) in two days or less.
- Half (49%) of residents who had experienced an emergency or disaster received help during or immediately following the event, many of whom turned to family (35%) for the help, followed by neighbours (29%<sup>E</sup>) and friends (15%<sup>E</sup>).

- Three in ten (30%) residents of Toronto who experienced a major emergency or disaster in Canada in a community where they were living at the time of the event and which was severe enough to disrupt their regular daily activities also endured a loss of property or some kind of a financial impact. In addition, enduring some sort of long-term emotional or psychological impact was reported by nearly one in ten (8%<sup>E</sup>) residents.

## Emergency planning, precautionary and fire safety behaviours

- Three-quarters (74%) of Toronto residents lived in a household that engaged in at least two emergency planning activities,<sup>6</sup> with half (48%) living in a household with three or four such activities (Table 1.2). Close to one in ten (8%) people in Toronto lived in a household that had not participated in any emergency planning activities.
- Close to half (48%) of Toronto residents lived in a household with at least two precautionary measures<sup>7</sup> taken in case of an emergency, with close to one-quarter (21%) living in a household with three or four such measures. Conversely, two in ten residents (20%) lived in a household with no precautionary measures in place.
- The majority (98%) of residents reported living in a household with a working smoke detector, while over half (56%) reported living in a household with a working fire extinguisher (Table 1.3). Approximately eight in ten (82%) stated that they had a working carbon monoxide detector in their household. Close to half (48%) of Toronto residents stated that they had implemented all three fire safety measures within their household.
- The number of emergency planning activities put in place by residents of Toronto did not significantly differ from residents of Ontario overall or residents of Canada's 10 provinces. When considering precautionary measures, however, Toronto residents were more likely to have not employed any precautionary measures (20%) compared to residents of Ontario as a whole (15%) and Canadians in general (16%). In addition, while a slightly lower proportion of Toronto residents reported engaging in all three fire safety measures (48%) than those residing in Ontario (53%), they were more likely than Canadians in general to have employed all three measures (42%).<sup>8</sup>
- There were some differences in the types of activities and measures set in place by residents of Toronto when compared to Ontario and Canada in general. For example, residents of Toronto were often less likely than residents of Ontario and Canadians in general to have engaged in certain precautionary measures (specifically, having an alternate heat source, a back-up generator or an alternate water source). Toronto residents (56%) were also less likely to report having a working fire extinguisher in their home than residents of Ontario (64%) and Canadians in general (66%).

## Social networks and sense of belonging

- Just over half (52%) of Toronto residents had a strong sense of belonging<sup>9</sup> to their community.
- Most (86%) residents described the neighbourhood they lived in as a place where neighbours generally help each other.<sup>10</sup> Of those who did not describe their neighbourhood this way, the majority (72%) still described it as a place where neighbours would help each other in an emergency.<sup>11</sup>
- Around half of residents had a strong network of support in the event of an emergency or disaster, with more than five people to turn to for help if physically injured (54%), for emotional support (49%), as well as in the event of a home evacuation (48%). Less than one-quarter (21%) of residents had a large support network if financial help was needed, and 12% reported that they had no one to turn to for financial help.<sup>12</sup>
- High levels of neighbourhood trust and sense of belonging, as well as engagement in civic and political activities, were often associated with a higher level of emergency preparedness (Table 1.4).

## Data tables

**Table 1.1**  
Most commonly anticipated sources of initial help and information, by type of emergency or disaster, residents of Toronto, Ontario, 2014

Most common sources of initial help and information by type of emergency or disaster	percent
<b>Weather-related emergency or natural disaster</b>	
News- Radio	30
News- Television	28

News- Internet	25
<b>Extended power outages</b>	
Utility company	30
News- Radio	25
Family	14
<b>Outbreak of serious or life-threatening disease</b>	
Hospital, clinic, doctor or other medical professional	40
News- Television	26
News- Internet	26
<b>Industrial or transportation accident</b>	
News- Radio	32
News- Television	31
News- Internet	30
<b>Contamination or shortage of water or food</b>	
Local government	27
News- Television	25
News- Radio	24
<b>Act of terrorism or terrorist threat</b>	
News- Television	37
News- Radio	33
News- Internet	29
<b>Rioting or civil unrest</b>	
News- Television	31
News- Internet	27 <sup>E</sup>
News- Radio	27 <sup>E</sup>
<sup>E</sup> use with caution	
<b>Note:</b> Respondents who perceived their community was at risk for any form of emergency or disaster were then asked where they would turn to first for information or assistance in the event of the perceived emergency or disaster. Respondents could provide more than one response. Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.	
<b>Source:</b> Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.	

**Table 1.2**  
**Number of emergency planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents, community of Toronto, Ontario, 2014**

Number of planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents	Toronto	Ontario	Canada
	percent		
<b>Number of emergency planning activities</b>			
None	8	8	8
1 activity	15	16	17
2 activities	26	25	25
3 activities	29	28	27
4 activities	19	21	19
<b>Number of precautionary measures</b>			
None	20 ***	15	16
1 measure	30	28	27
2 measures	27	29	28
3 measures	18	20	20

4 measures	3 <sup>E ***</sup>	6	7
<b>Number of fire safety measures<sup>1 2</sup></b>			
None	F	F	1
1 measure	6 <sup>E **</sup>	7	14
2 measures	39 <sup>*</sup>	35	38
3 measures	48 <sup>***</sup>	53	42
<sup>E</sup> use with caution <sup>F</sup> too unreliable to be published * significantly different from provincial level estimate (p < 0.05) ** significantly different from Canada level estimate (p < 0.05) *** significantly different from both provincial and Canada level estimates (p < 0.05) 1 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Canada'. 2 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Toronto'.  <b>Note:</b> Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents. Emergency planning activities include: an emergency exit plan, an emergency supply kit, photocopies/electronic copies of important documents and a list of emergency contact numbers. Precautionary measures include: a battery-operated or wind-up radio, an alternative heat source, a back-up generator and an alternative water source. Fire safety measures include a working smoke detector, a working carbon monoxide detector and a working fire extinguisher. <b>Source:</b> Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.			

**Table 1.3**  
**Planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures residents engaged in, community of Toronto, Ontario, 2014**

Residents whose households were involved in the following:	Toronto	Ontario	Canada
	percent		
<b>Emergency planning activities</b>			
Emergency exit plan	56 <sup>*</sup>	63	60
Exit plan has been practised/reviewed in last 12 months <sup>1</sup>	45	47	46
Designated meeting place for household members <sup>2</sup>	25 <sup>***</sup>	30	33
Contact plan for household members <sup>2</sup>	58	57	55
Household emergency supply kit	49	47	47
Vehicle emergency supply kit <sup>3</sup>	58 <sup>*</sup>	62	59
Extra copies of important documents	55	56	53
List of emergency contact numbers	72	71	69
Plan for meeting special health needs <sup>4</sup>	61	61	62
<b>Precautionary measures</b>			
Wind-up or battery-operated radio	55 <sup>*</sup>	59	58
Alternate heat source	42 <sup>***</sup>	46	48
Back-up generator	14 <sup>***</sup>	20	23
Alternate water source	37 <sup>***</sup>	44	43
Other <sup>5</sup>	20	22	21
<b>Fire safety measures</b>			
Working smoke detector	98	99	98
Working carbon monoxide detector	82 <sup>**</sup>	80	60
Working fire extinguisher	56 <sup>***</sup>	64	66

\* significantly different from provincial level estimate (p < 0.05)

\*\* significantly different from Canada level estimate (p < 0.05)

\*\*\* significantly different from both provincial and Canada level estimates (p < 0.05)

1 Percentage based only on those indicating that they have an emergency exit plan.

2 Excludes Canadians living in single-person households.

3 Excludes those who reported that they lived in a household that did not have a vehicle.

4 Percentage based only on those indicating that they or someone in their household has special medical needs.

5 'Other precautionary measures' include having an escape/rescue plan for pets, extra supply of fuel, checking and replenishing emergency supplies, and keeping exits clear.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

**Table 1.4**  
**High or moderately high levels of emergency planning, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents, by social and political involvement, community of Toronto, Ontario, 2014**

Social and political involvement	Percentage of residents who had high or moderately high levels of...		
	Planning activities	Precautionary measures	Fire safety measures
	percent		
<b>Engagement in political activities <sup>1</sup></b>			
Yes <sup>†</sup>	48	22	54
No <sup>7</sup>	46	F	30 <sup>E *</sup>
<b>High level of civic engagement <sup>2</sup></b>			
Yes <sup>†</sup>	55	23	59
No <sup>8</sup>	39 *	16 <sup>E</sup>	33 *
<b>High level of social support <sup>3</sup></b>			
Yes <sup>†</sup>	56	24 <sup>E</sup>	54
No <sup>8</sup>	47	21	47
<b>Strong sense of belonging to community <sup>4</sup></b>			
Yes <sup>†</sup>	54	25	53
No <sup>8</sup>	43 *	16 <sup>E *</sup>	43
<b>High neighbourhood trust <sup>5</sup></b>			
Yes <sup>†</sup>	48	21 <sup>E</sup>	62
No <sup>8</sup>	49	20	44 *
<b>High level of self-efficacy <sup>6</sup></b>			
Yes <sup>†</sup>	54	23	54
No <sup>8</sup>	45	19 <sup>E</sup>	44

<sup>E</sup> use with caution

<sup>F</sup> too unreliable to be published

\* significantly different from reference category ( $p < 0.05$ )

† reference category

1 Includes individuals over the age of 17 years who are eligible to vote, and who have participated in or volunteered for political parties or events in the past 12 months, including municipal, provincial, or federal elections, or expressed views on political or social issues through signing a petition, contacting news agencies or politicians, or attended a meeting involving social or community issues.

2 Civic engagement measures individuals over the age of 17 years who were involved in a recreational group or organization in the past 12 months, and includes engagement in political activities. A 'high level' is defined as having been involved in at least 4 activities in the past 12 months.

3 A 'high level of social support' is defined as having five or more people whom that individual could turn to for help in an emergency if they are physically injured, require emotional support, shelter, and/or financial assistance.

4 A 'strong sense of belonging to community' is rating one's own sense of belonging to their community as a 4 or a 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "very weak" and 5 "very strong".

5 'High neighbourhood trust' is rating one's own trust in the people in one's neighbourhood as 4 or 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "cannot be trusted at all" and 5 represents "can be trusted a lot", as well as having a response of "very likely" when asked about the likelihood of someone in their neighbourhood returning a lost wallet or purse containing two hundred dollars with the money still inside.

6 A 'high level of self-efficacy' is derived from having a high self-rating on a scale of 1 (poor) to 5 (excellent) for the following three categories: an ability to think clearly and solve day-to-day problems, to handle unexpected and difficult problems, and to figure out what to do if faced with an emergency situation.

7 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were equal to 11% for 'Fire safety measures'.

8 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Fire safety measures'.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents. Households with 'moderately high' or 'high' levels of emergency planning engaged in 3 or 4 of the following: having an exit plan, an emergency supply kit, extra copies of important documents and an emergency contact list. 'Moderately high' or 'high' levels of precautionary measures include having 3 or 4 of the following: a wind-up or battery operated radio, a back-up generator, an alternate source of heat and additional water. 'Moderately high' or 'high' levels of fire safety measure include having all 3 of the following: a working smoke detector, a working fire extinguisher, and a working carbon monoxide detector.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

## Notes

<sup>E</sup> use with caution

1 A Census Metropolitan Area (CMA) or a Census Agglomeration (CA) is formed by one or more adjacent municipalities centred on a population centre (known as the core). A CMA must have a total population of at least 100,000 of which 50,000 or more must live in the core. A CA must have a core population of at least 10,000. To be included in the CMA or CA, other adjacent municipalities must have a high degree of integration with the core as measured by commuting flows derived from census data.

2 The target population for the SEPR included all persons 15 years of age or older, residing in households in Canada's 10 provinces, excluding full-time residents of institutions (e.g. nursing homes, group homes, hospitals).

3 The SEPR covers three types of communities: Census Metropolitan Areas (CMAs), Census Agglomerations (CAs) with population greater than 50,000, and 'smaller communities' which include CAs with population 50,000 or less and those areas that fall outside of CMAs and CAs. All CMAs and CAs (with population greater than 50,000) were included in the SEPR. A sample of households were selected from smaller communities within each province to represent all households within the province in similar communities. Additional information on the SEPR and its sampling methodology can be found in the 'Survey description' section.

4 Throughout this fact sheet, responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.

5 This section focuses on personal experiences with emergencies or disasters that happened in Canada, in a community where the person was living at the time, and was significant enough to severely interrupt the individual's regular daily activities.

- 6 Emergency planning activities include: having an emergency exit plan, a household emergency supply kit, extra copies of important documents and an emergency contact list.
- 7 Precautionary measures include: having a wind-up or battery-operated radio, an alternate heat source such as a non-electric stove or heater or a wood-burning fireplace, a back-up generator and an alternative water source such as a well, tank or litres of stored water.
- 8 Unless otherwise specified, differences are statistically significant ( $p < 0.05$ ).
- 9 A 'strong sense of belonging to community' is rating one's own sense of belonging to their community as a 4 or a 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "very weak" and 5 "very strong".
- 10 A proportion (13%) of respondents were not asked questions regarding neighbourhood helpfulness in the event of an emergency and as such these cases are not included in the analysis on neighbourhood helpfulness in general or in the event of an emergency.
- 11 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were equal to 13% when respondents were asked about whether their neighbourhood is a place where neighbours would help each other if there is an emergency.
- 12 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% when respondents were asked about the number of people they could turn to for help if financial support is needed.





## Fact sheet Community of Hamilton (CMA), Ontario

---

In 2014, information on the emergency preparedness of people living in the Census Metropolitan Area<sup>1</sup> of Hamilton was collected through the Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada (SEPR).<sup>2</sup> This fact sheet presents information on the risk awareness and level of emergency preparedness of the residents of Hamilton, which could help improve the understanding of community resilience in the event of an emergency.<sup>3,4</sup>

### **Risk awareness and anticipated sources of help in an emergency or disaster**

- Winter storms (including blizzards, ice storms and extreme cold) (93%), extended power outages lasting 24 hours or longer (86%), as well as heat waves (60%) and industrial or transportation accidents (57%) were named by residents of Hamilton as the most likely events to occur within their community.
- Residents commonly anticipated turning to television news as an initial source for help and information if they were faced with an act of terrorism or terrorist threat (48%), an industrial or transportation accident (40%), a weather-related emergency or natural disaster (39%) or in the event of rioting or civil unrest (37%) (Table 1.1).
- Residents also stated (52%) that they would turn to hospitals, clinics, doctors or other medical professionals as sources of initial help and information in the event of an outbreak of a serious or life-threatening disease. In the event of a contamination or shortage of water or food, residents reported that they would seek help from local government (30%). Utility companies (35%) were frequently listed by residents as an initial source of help in the event of an extended power outage.

### **Prior lifetime experience with a major emergency or disaster<sup>5</sup>**

- Nearly one-half (47%) of Hamilton residents has faced a major emergency or disaster in Canada in a community they were living in at the time of the event, a majority (72%) of whom reported experiencing severe disruptions to their daily activities as a result of the event.
- Extended power outages lasting 24 hours or longer (58%) and winter storms (including blizzards and ice storms) (36%) were the most commonly experienced emergency or disaster by residents.
- The most common types of disruption to daily activities endured by residents who had experienced a major emergency or disaster included the inability to use electrical appliances (76%), or to heat or cool their home (59%). More severe disruptions experienced by those who had endured an emergency or disaster were home evacuations (22%<sup>E</sup>) and an inability to use roads or transportation within the community (25%<sup>E</sup>). Four in ten reported issues related to water: an inability to use water for tasks such as laundry or bathing (40%), or a need to boil drinking water or use bottled water for drinking (40%).
- Most (89%) residents who experienced an emergency or disaster were able to resume their daily activities within one week of the event, almost two-thirds (65%) in two days or less.
- Almost half (47%) of residents who had experienced an emergency or disaster received help during or immediately following the event, frequently from a family member (43%).
- Almost one-quarter (24%) of residents who experienced a major emergency or disaster in Canada in a community where they were living at the time of the event and which was significant enough to disrupt their regular daily routine also endured a loss of property or financial impact.

## Emergency planning, precautionary and fire safety behaviours

- A majority (72%) of Hamilton residents lived in a household that were engaged in at least two emergency planning activities,<sup>6</sup> almost half (47%) lived in a household with three or four such activities (Table 1.2). A small proportion (6%<sup>E</sup>) of residents lived in a household that had not participated in any emergency planning activities.
- About half (52%) lived in a household with at least two precautionary measures<sup>7</sup> taken in case of an emergency, and approximately one in five (18%) lived in a household with three or four such measures. Over one in ten (14%) people lived in a household with no precautionary measures in place.
- The vast majority (99%) of residents reported living in a household with a working smoke detector (Table 1.3). A large majority (85%) reported that they had a working carbon monoxide detector, significantly more than the provincial or national proportions (80% and 60%, respectively). Approximately three in five (62%) residents reported that they had a working fire extinguisher. Hamilton residents were significantly more likely than residents of Canada's 10 provinces to have implemented all three fire safety measures within their household (55% versus 42%).<sup>8</sup>
- Despite the fact that Hamilton residents were more likely to have all three fire safety measures in place than Canadians overall and were more likely to have a contact plan for household members (61% versus 55%), they were less prepared in other ways. Residents were less likely to have a plan for meeting special health needs than Canadians overall<sup>9</sup> (41% versus 62%) and less likely to have a back-up generator (13% versus 23%).

## Social networks and sense of belonging

- More than half (58%) of Hamilton's residents had a strong sense of belonging<sup>10</sup> to their community.
- Most (91%) residents described the neighbourhood they lived in as a place where neighbours generally help each other.<sup>11</sup> Of those who did not describe their neighbourhood this way, most (78%) still described it as a place where neighbours would help each other in an emergency.
- Many individuals had a large network of support in the event of an emergency or disaster, with more than five people to turn to for emotional support (65%), for help if physically injured (62%) and in case of a home evacuation (59%). However, fewer than one in three residents had such a large support network if financial help was needed (29%), and 8%<sup>E</sup> reported that they had no one to turn to for financial help.
- High levels of sense of belonging, self-efficacy, neighbourhood trust and social support were often associated with a higher level of emergency preparedness (Table 1.4).

## Data tables

Table 1.1

Most commonly anticipated sources of initial help and information, by type of emergency or disaster, residents of Hamilton, Ontario, 2014

Most common sources of initial help and information by type of emergency or disaster	percent
<b>Weather-related emergency or natural disaster</b>	
News- Television	39
News- Radio	33
News- Internet	23
<b>Extended power outages</b>	
Utility company	35
News- Radio	21
Family	16
<b>Outbreak of serious or life-threatening disease</b>	
Hospital, clinic, doctor or other medical professional	52
News- Television	30
News- Radio	22
<b>Industrial or transportation accident</b>	

News- Television	40
News- Radio	36
News- Internet	21
<b>Contamination or shortage of water or food</b>	
Local government	30
News- Television	29
News- Radio	23
<b>Act of terrorism or terrorist threat</b>	
News- Television	48
News- Radio	31
Police/law enforcement	27 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Rioting or civil unrest</b>	
News- Television	37
Police/law enforcement	32 <sup>E</sup>
News- Radio	25 <sup>E</sup>
<sup>E</sup> use with caution	
<b>Note:</b> Respondents who perceived their community was at risk for any form of emergency or disaster were then asked where they would turn to first for information or assistance in the event of the perceived emergency or disaster. Respondents could provide more than one response. Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.	
<b>Source:</b> Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.	

**Table 1.2**

**Number of emergency planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents, community of Hamilton, Ontario, 2014**

Number of planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents	Hamilton	Ontario	Canada
	percent		
<b>Number of emergency planning activities</b>			
None	6 <sup>E</sup>	8	8
1 activity	19	16	17
2 activities	25	25	25
3 activities	25	28	27
4 activities	22	21	19
<b>Number of precautionary measures</b>			
None	14	15	16
1 measure	31	28	27
2 measures	34 <sup>**</sup>	29	28
3 measures	12 <sup>***</sup>	20	20
4 measures	6 <sup>E</sup>	6	7
<b>Number of fire safety measures <sup>1</sup></b>			
None	F	F	1
1 measure	6 <sup>E**</sup>	7	14
2 measures	35	35	38
3 measures	55 <sup>**</sup>	53	42

<sup>E</sup> use with caution  
<sup>F</sup> too unreliable to be published

\*\* significantly different from Canada level estimate (p < 0.05)

\*\*\* significantly different from both provincial and Canada level estimates (p < 0.05)

1 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Canada'.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents. Emergency planning activities include: an emergency exit plan, an emergency supply kit, photocopies/electronic copies of important documents and a list of emergency contact numbers. Precautionary measures include: a battery-operated or wind-up radio, an alternate heat source, a back-up generator and an alternative water source. Fire safety measures include a working smoke detector, a working carbon monoxide detector and a working fire extinguisher.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

**Table 1.3**  
**Planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures residents engaged in, community of Hamilton, Ontario, 2014**

Residents whose households were involved in the following:	Hamilton	Ontario	Canada
	percent		
<b>Emergency planning activities</b>			
Emergency exit plan	61	63	60
Exit plan has been practised/reviewed in last 12 months <sup>1</sup>	44	47	46
Designated meeting place for household members <sup>2</sup>	34	30	33
Contact plan for household members <sup>2</sup>	61 **	57	55
Household emergency supply kit	44	47	47
Vehicle emergency supply kit <sup>3</sup>	64	62	59
Extra copies of important documents	59 **	56	53
List of emergency contact numbers	71	71	69
Plan for meeting special health needs <sup>4,5</sup>	41 ***	61	62
<b>Precautionary measures</b>			
Wind-up or battery-operated radio	60	59	58
Alternate heat source	51	46	48
Back-up generator	13 ***	20	23
Alternate water source	40	44	43
Other <sup>6</sup>	20	22	21
<b>Fire safety measures</b>			
Working smoke detector	99 **	99	98
Working carbon monoxide detector	85 ***	80	60
Working fire extinguisher	62	64	66

\*\* significantly different from Canada level estimate (p < 0.05)

\*\*\* significantly different from both provincial and Canada level estimates (p < 0.05)

1 Percentage based only on those indicating that they have an emergency exit plan.

2 Excludes Canadians living in single-person households.

3 Excludes those who reported that they lived in a household that did not have a vehicle.

4 Percentage based only on those indicating that they or someone in their household has special medical needs.

5 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Hamilton'.

6 'Other precautionary measures' include having an escape/rescue plan for pets, extra supply of fuel, checking and replenishing emergency supplies, and keeping exits clear.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

Table 1.4

High or moderately high levels of emergency planning, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents, by social and political involvement, community of Hamilton, Ontario, 2014

Social and political involvement	Percentage of residents who had high or moderately high levels of...		
	Planning activities	Precautionary measures	Fire safety measures
	percent		
<b>Engagement in political activities <sup>1</sup></b>			
Yes †	49	18	56
No	49	24 <sup>E</sup>	58
<b>High level of civic engagement <sup>2</sup></b>			
Yes †	51	19	60
No	46	20 <sup>E</sup>	53
<b>High level of social support <sup>3</sup></b>			
Yes †	61	23 <sup>E</sup>	70
No	42 <sup>*</sup>	17	50 <sup>*</sup>
<b>Strong sense of belonging to community <sup>4</sup></b>			
Yes †	53	20	51
No	38 <sup>*</sup>	17 <sup>E</sup>	59
<b>High neighbourhood trust <sup>5</sup></b>			
Yes †	51	24	66
No	44	15 <sup>E</sup>	48 <sup>*</sup>
<b>High level of self-efficacy <sup>6</sup></b>			
Yes †	53	22	55
No	39 <sup>*</sup>	14 <sup>E</sup>	57

<sup>E</sup> use with caution

\* significantly different from reference category ( $p < 0.05$ )

† reference category

1 Includes individuals over the age of 17 years who are eligible to vote, and who have participated in or volunteered for political parties or events in the past 12 months, including municipal, provincial, or federal elections, or expressed views on political or social issues through signing a petition, contacting news agencies or politicians, or attended a meeting involving social or community issues.

2 Civic engagement measures individuals over the age of 17 years who were involved in a recreational group or organization in the past 12 months, and includes engagement in political activities. A 'high level' is defined as having been involved in at least 4 activities in the past 12 months.

3 A 'high level of social support' is defined as having five or more people whom that individual could turn to for help in an emergency if they are physically injured, require emotional support, shelter, and/or financial assistance.

4 A 'strong sense of belonging to community' is rating one's own sense of belonging to their community as a 4 or a 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "very weak" and 5 "very strong".

5 'High neighbourhood trust' is rating one's own trust in the people in one's neighbourhood as 4 or 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "cannot be trusted at all" and 5 represents "can be trusted a lot", as well as having a response of "very likely" when asked about the likelihood of someone in their neighbourhood returning a lost wallet or purse containing two hundred dollars with the money still inside.

6 A 'high level of self-efficacy' is derived from having a high self-rating on a scale of 1 (poor) to 5 (excellent) for the following three categories: an ability to think clearly and solve day-to-day problems, to handle unexpected and difficult problems, and to figure out what to do if faced with an emergency situation.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents. Households with 'moderately high' or 'high' levels of emergency planning engaged in 3 or 4 of the following: having an exit plan, an emergency supply kit, extra copies of important documents and an emergency contact list. 'Moderately high' or 'high' levels of precautionary measures include having 3 or 4 of the following: a wind-up or battery operated radio, a back-up generator, an alternate source of heat and additional water. 'Moderately high' or 'high' levels of fire safety measure include having all 3 of the following: a working smoke detector, a working fire extinguisher, and a working carbon monoxide detector.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

## Notes

<sup>E</sup> use with caution

- 1 A Census Metropolitan Area (CMA) or a Census Agglomeration (CA) is formed by one or more adjacent municipalities centred on a population centre (known as the core). A CMA must have a total population of at least 100,000 of which 50,000 or more must live in the core. A CA must have a core population of at least 10,000. To be included in the CMA or CA, other adjacent municipalities must have a high degree of integration with the core as measured by commuting flows derived from census data.
- 2 The target population for the SEPR included all persons 15 years of age or older, residing in households in Canada's 10 provinces, excluding full-time residents of institutions (e.g. nursing homes, group homes, hospitals).
- 3 The SEPR covers three types of communities: Census Metropolitan Areas (CMAs), Census Agglomerations (CAs) with population greater than 50,000, and 'smaller communities' which include CAs with population 50,000 or less and those areas that fall outside of CMAs and CAs. All CMAs and CAs (with population greater than 50,000) were included in the SEPR. A sample of households were selected from smaller communities within each province to represent all households within the province in similar communities. Additional information on the SEPR and its sampling methodology can be found in the 'Survey description' section.
- 4 Throughout this fact sheet, responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.
- 5 This section focuses on personal experiences with emergencies or disasters that happened in Canada, in a community where the person was living at the time, and was significant enough to severely interrupt the individual's regular daily activities.
- 6 Emergency planning activities include: having an emergency exit plan, a household emergency supply kit, extra copies of important documents and an emergency contact list.
- 7 Precautionary measures include: having a wind-up or battery-operated radio, an alternate heat source such as a non-electric stove or heater or a wood-burning fireplace, a back-up generator and an alternative water source such as a well, tank or litres of stored water.
- 8 Unless otherwise specified, differences are statistically significant ( $p < 0.05$ ).
- 9 Percentage based only on those indicating that they or someone in their household has special medical needs.
- 10 A 'strong sense of belonging to community' is rating one's own sense of belonging to their community as a 4 or a 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "very weak" and 5 "very strong".
- 11 A proportion (14%) of respondents were not asked questions regarding neighbourhood helpfulness in the event of an emergency and as such these cases are not included in the analysis on neighbourhood helpfulness in general or in the event of an emergency.



## Fact sheet

# Community of St. Catharines–Niagara (CMA), Ontario

---

In 2014, information on the emergency preparedness of people living in the Census Metropolitan Area<sup>1</sup> of St. Catharines–Niagara was collected through the Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada (SEPR).<sup>2</sup> This fact sheet presents information on the risk awareness and level of emergency preparedness of the residents of St. Catharines–Niagara, which could help improve the understanding of community resilience in the event of an emergency.<sup>3,4</sup>

### **Risk awareness and anticipated sources of help in an emergency or disaster**

- Winter storms (including blizzards, ice storms and extreme cold) (92%), extended power outages lasting 24 hours or longer (76%) and heat waves (64%) were named by residents of St. Catharines–Niagara as the most likely events to occur within their community.
- Residents most frequently anticipated turning to news on the radio or television as initial sources for help and information if they were faced with a weather-related emergency or natural disaster (39% and 38%, respectively), an industrial or transportation accident (38% and 31%, respectively), or in the event of an act of terrorism or terrorist threat (34% and 38%, respectively) (Table 1.1).
- Residents stated that hospitals, clinics, doctors or other medical professionals were the most commonly anticipated sources of initial help and information in the event of an outbreak of a serious or life-threatening disease (49%). In the event of a contamination or shortage of water or food, they most commonly said they would first seek help from local government (37%), and in the event of an extended power outage, residents anticipated first turning to their utility company (42%). If faced with rioting or civil unrest, slightly more than one-third said they would first turn to police or law enforcement (36%<sup>E</sup>).

### **Prior lifetime experience with a major emergency or disaster<sup>5</sup>**

- Over four in ten (44%) St. Catharines–Niagara residents has faced a major emergency or disaster in Canada in a community they were living in at the time of the event, nearly three-quarters (73%) of whom reported experiencing severe disruptions to their daily activities as a result of the event.
- Extended power outages lasting 24 hours or longer (49%) and winter storms which include blizzards and ice storms (49%) were the most commonly experienced emergencies or disasters by residents of St. Catharines–Niagara.
- The most common types of disruption to daily activities endured by residents who had experienced major emergencies or disasters included the inability to use electrical appliances (70%) or missing work or school (67%). More severe disruptions experienced were home evacuations experienced by nearly one out of five (18%<sup>E</sup>) people faced with an emergency, as well as an inability to use roads or transportation within the community experienced by close to two in five residents (38%).
- Almost all (95%) residents who experienced an emergency or disaster were able to resume their daily activities within one week of the event; over half (58%) were able to resume daily activities in two days or less.
- About half (49%) of residents who had experienced an emergency or disaster received help during or immediately following the event, most commonly from a family member (31%<sup>E</sup>).
- Just over one-quarter (27%) of residents of St. Catharines–Niagara who experienced a major emergency or disaster in Canada in a community where they were living at the time of the event and which was significant enough to disrupt

their regular daily routine also endured a loss of property or financial impact.

## Emergency planning, precautionary and fire safety behaviours

- Almost three-quarters (72%) of people residing in St. Catharines–Niagara lived in households that were engaged in at least two emergency planning activities,<sup>6</sup> with half (49%) living in households with three or four such activities (Table 1.2). Fewer than one in ten (7%<sup>E</sup>) people lived in a household that had not participated in any emergency planning activities.
- Over half (59%) lived in a household with at least two precautionary measures<sup>7</sup> taken in case of an emergency, about three in ten (28%) living in a household with three or four such measures. About one in seven (15%) people lived in a household with no precautionary measures in place.
- Almost all (99.7%) residents reported living in a household with a working smoke detector, and 85% reported living in a household with a working carbon monoxide detector (Table 1.3). About two out of three (69%) residents stated that they had a working fire extinguisher in their household. Three in five (60%) of the residents of St. Catharines–Niagara stated that they had implemented all three fire safety measures within their households, significantly more compared to Ontario and Canada’s 10 provinces overall (53% and 42%, respectively).<sup>8</sup>
- There were some differences in the types of activities and measures set in place by residents of St. Catharines–Niagara when compared to the rest of Canada. For example, the proportion of St. Catharines–Niagara residents who had an emergency exit plan (66%) or an alternative water source (52%) was significantly higher than for the rest of Canada (60% and 43%, respectively).

## Social networks and sense of belonging

- More than half (57%) of St. Catharines–Niagara’s residents had a strong sense of belonging<sup>9</sup> to their community.
- Most (87%) residents described the neighbourhood they lived in as a place where neighbours generally help each other.<sup>10</sup> Of those who did not describe their neighbourhood this way, most (83%) still described it as a place where neighbours would help each other in an emergency.
- Many individuals had a large network of support in the event of an emergency or disaster, with more than five people to turn to for emotional support (72%), for help if physically injured (67%) as well as in case of a home evacuation (60%). However, about one in four residents had such a large support network if financial help was needed (27%). Fewer than one in ten (8%) reported that they had no one to turn to for financial help.<sup>11</sup>
- High levels of sense of belonging, self-efficacy and neighbourhood trust, as well as civic engagement, were often associated with a higher level of emergency preparedness (Table 1.4).

## Data tables

Table 1.1

Most commonly anticipated sources of initial help and information, by type of emergency or disaster, residents of St. Catharines–Niagara, Ontario, 2014

Most common sources of initial help and information by type of emergency or disaster	percent
<b>Weather-related emergency or natural disaster</b>	
News- Radio	39
News- Television	38
News- Internet	23
<b>Extended power outages<sup>1</sup></b>	
Utility company	42
News- Radio	24
Family	11 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Outbreak of serious or life-threatening disease</b>	
Hospital, clinic, doctor or other medical professional	49
News- Television	24



News- Internet	22
<b>Industrial or transportation accident</b>	
News- Radio	38
News- Television	31
News- Internet	25
<b>Contamination or shortage of water or food <sup>1</sup></b>	
Local government	37
News- Radio	21
News- Television	19 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Act of terrorism or terrorist threat</b>	
News- Television	38
News- Radio	34
Police/law enforcement	25
<b>Rioting or civil unrest</b>	
Police/law enforcement	36 <sup>E</sup>
News- Radio	28 <sup>E</sup>
News- Television	24 <sup>E</sup>
<sup>E</sup> use with caution	
1 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% when respondents were asked about their likely sources of initial help and information.	
<b>Note:</b> Respondents who perceived their community was at risk for any form of emergency or disaster were then asked where they would turn to first for information or assistance in the event of the perceived emergency or disaster. Respondents could provide more than one response. Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.	
<b>Source:</b> Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.	

**Table 1.2**

**Number of emergency planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents, community of St. Catharines–Niagara, Ontario, 2014**

Number of planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents	St. Catharines–Niagara	Ontario	Canada
	percent		
<b>Number of emergency planning activities</b>			
None	7 <sup>E</sup>	8	8
1 activity	17	16	17
2 activities	23	25	25
3 activities	28	28	27
4 activities	21	21	19
<b>Number of precautionary measures</b>			
None	15	15	16
1 measure	24	28	27
2 measures	31	29	28
3 measures	20	20	20
4 measures	8 <sup>E</sup>	6	7
<b>Number of fire safety measures <sup>1</sup></b>			
None	F	F	1
1 measure	5 <sup>E</sup> **	7	14
2 measures	30 ***	35	38
3 measures	60 ***	53	42

E use with caution  
 F too unreliable to be published

\*\* significantly different from Canada level estimate (p < 0.05)

\*\*\* significantly different from both provincial and Canada level estimates (p < 0.05)

1 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Canada'.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents. Emergency planning activities include: an emergency exit plan, an emergency supply kit, photocopies/electronic copies of important documents and a list of emergency contact numbers. Precautionary measures include: a battery-operated or wind-up radio, an alternate heat source, a back-up generator and an alternative water source. Fire safety measures include a working smoke detector, a working carbon monoxide detector and a working fire extinguisher.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

**Table 1.3**  
**Planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures residents engaged in, community of St. Catharines–Niagara, Ontario, 2014**

Residents whose households were involved in the following:	St. Catharines–Niagara	Ontario	Canada
	percent		
<b>Emergency planning activities</b>			
Emergency exit plan	66 **	63	60
Exit plan has been practised/reviewed in last 12 months <sup>1</sup>	49	47	46
Designated meeting place for household members <sup>2</sup>	32	30	33
Contact plan for household members <sup>2</sup>	55	57	55
Household emergency supply kit	45	47	47
Vehicle emergency supply kit <sup>3</sup>	63	62	59
Extra copies of important documents	54	56	53
List of emergency contact numbers	72	71	69
Plan for meeting special health needs <sup>4</sup>	68	61	62
<b>Precautionary measures</b>			
Wind-up or battery-operated radio	59	59	58
Alternate heat source	47	46	48
Back-up generator	22	20	23
Alternate water source	52 ***	44	43
Other <sup>5</sup>	24	22	21
<b>Fire safety measures</b>			
Working smoke detector	100 ***	99	98
Working carbon monoxide detector	85 ***	80	60
Working fire extinguisher	69	64	66

\*\* significantly different from Canada level estimate (p < 0.05)

\*\*\* significantly different from both provincial and Canada level estimates (p < 0.05)

1 Percentage based only on those indicating that they have an emergency exit plan.

2 Excludes Canadians living in single-person households.

3 Excludes those who reported that they lived in a household that did not have a vehicle.

4 Percentage based only on those indicating that they or someone in their household has special medical needs.

5 'Other precautionary measures' include having an escape/rescue plan for pets, extra supply of fuel, checking and replenishing emergency supplies, and keeping exits clear.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

**Table 1.4**

High or moderately high levels of emergency planning, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents, by social and political involvement, community of St. Catharines–Niagara, Ontario, 2014

Social and political involvement	Percentage of residents who had high or moderately high levels of...		
	Planning activities	Precautionary measures	Fire safety measures
	percent		
<b>Engagement in political activities <sup>1</sup></b>			
Yes †	49	28	61
No <sup>7 8</sup>	48	24 <sup>E</sup>	52
<b>High level of civic engagement <sup>2</sup></b>			
Yes †	54	31	65
No <sup>7 8</sup>	40 *	22 <sup>E</sup>	51 *
<b>High level of social support <sup>3</sup></b>			
Yes <sup>7 8 †</sup>	49	32 <sup>E</sup>	59
No	49	25	60
<b>Strong sense of belonging to community <sup>4</sup></b>			
Yes <sup>7 †</sup>	54	31	66
No	42 *	21 *	50 *
<b>High neighbourhood trust <sup>5</sup></b>			
Yes †	57	31	69
No <sup>8</sup>	43 *	23	53 *
<b>High level of self-efficacy <sup>6</sup></b>			
Yes †	55	28	66
No	41 *	26	53 *

<sup>E</sup> use with caution

\* significantly different from reference category ( $p < 0.05$ )

† reference category

1 Includes individuals over the age of 17 years who are eligible to vote, and who have participated in or volunteered for political parties or events in the past 12 months, including municipal, provincial, or federal elections, or expressed views on political or social issues through signing a petition, contacting news agencies or politicians, or attended a meeting involving social or community issues.

2 Civic engagement measures individuals over the age of 17 years who were involved in a recreational group or organization in the past 12 months, and includes engagement in political activities. A 'high level' is defined as having been involved in at least 4 activities in the past 12 months.

3 A 'high level of social support' is defined as having five or more people whom that individual could turn to for help in an emergency if they are physically injured, require emotional support, shelter, and/or financial assistance.

4 A 'strong sense of belonging to community' is rating one's own sense of belonging to their community as a 4 or a 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "very weak" and 5 "very strong".

5 'High neighbourhood trust' is rating one's own trust in the people in one's neighbourhood as 4 or 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "cannot be trusted at all" and 5 represents "can be trusted a lot", as well as having a response of "very likely" when asked about the likelihood of someone in their neighbourhood returning a lost wallet or purse containing two hundred dollars with the money still inside.

6 A 'high level of self-efficacy' is derived from having a high self-rating on a scale of 1 (poor) to 5 (excellent) for the following three categories: an ability to think clearly and solve day-to-day problems, to handle unexpected and difficult problems, and to figure out what to do if faced with an emergency situation.

7 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Planning activities'.

8 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Fire safety measures'.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents. Households with 'moderately high' or 'high' levels of emergency planning engaged in 3 or 4 of the following: having an exit plan, an emergency supply kit, extra copies of important documents and an emergency contact list. 'Moderately high' or 'high' levels of precautionary measures include having 3 or 4 of the following: a wind-up or battery operated radio, a back-up generator, an alternate source of heat and additional water. 'Moderately high' or 'high' levels of fire safety measure include having all 3 of the following: a working smoke detector, a working fire extinguisher, and a working carbon monoxide detector.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

## Notes

<sup>E</sup> use with caution

- 1 A Census Metropolitan Area (CMA) or a Census Agglomeration (CA) is formed by one or more adjacent municipalities centred on a population centre (known as the core). A CMA must have a total population of at least 100,000 of which 50,000 or more must live in the core. A CA must have a core population of at least 10,000. To be included in the CMA or CA, other adjacent municipalities must have a high degree of integration with the core as measured by commuting flows derived from census data.
- 2 The target population for the SEPR included all persons 15 years of age or older, residing in households in Canada's 10 provinces, excluding full-time residents of institutions (e.g. nursing homes, group homes, hospitals).
- 3 The SEPR covers three types of communities: Census Metropolitan Areas (CMAs), Census Agglomerations (CAs) with population greater than 50,000, and 'smaller communities' which include CAs with population 50,000 or less and those areas that fall outside of CMAs and CAs. All CMAs and CAs (with population greater than 50,000) were included in the SEPR. A sample of households were selected from smaller communities within each province to represent all households within the province in similar communities. Additional information on the SEPR and its sampling methodology can be found in the 'Survey description' section.
- 4 Throughout this fact sheet, responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.
- 5 This section focuses on personal experiences with emergencies or disasters that happened in Canada, in a community where the person was living at the time, and was significant enough to severely interrupt the individual's regular daily activities.
- 6 Emergency planning activities include: having an emergency exit plan, a household emergency supply kit, extra copies of important documents and an emergency contact list.
- 7 Precautionary measures include: having a wind-up or battery-operated radio, an alternate heat source such as a non-electric stove or heater or a wood-burning fireplace, a back-up generator and an alternative water source such as a well, tank or litres of stored water.
- 8 Unless otherwise specified, differences are statistically significant ( $p < 0.05$ ).
- 9 A 'strong sense of belonging to community' is rating one's own sense of belonging to their community as a 4 or a 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "very weak" and 5 "very strong".
- 10 A proportion (11%) of respondents were not asked questions regarding neighbourhood helpfulness in the event of an emergency and as such these cases are not included in the analysis on neighbourhood helpfulness in general or in the event of an emergency.
- 11 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% when respondents were asked about the number of people they could turn to for help if financial support is needed.



## Fact sheet

# Community of Kitchener–Cambridge–Waterloo (CMA), Ontario

---

In 2014, information on the emergency preparedness of people living in the Census Metropolitan Area<sup>1</sup> of Kitchener–Cambridge–Waterloo was collected through the Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada (SEPR).<sup>2</sup> This fact sheet presents information on the risk awareness and level of emergency preparedness of the residents of Kitchener–Cambridge–Waterloo, which could help improve the understanding of community resilience in the event of an emergency.<sup>3,4</sup>

### Risk awareness and anticipated sources of help in an emergency or disaster

- Winter storms (including blizzards, ice storms and extreme cold) (96%), extended power outages lasting 24 hours or longer (84%) and heat waves (64%) were named by residents of Kitchener–Cambridge–Waterloo as the events most likely to occur in their community.
- Residents of Kitchener–Cambridge–Waterloo most commonly anticipated turning to news on the radio as an initial source for help and information if they were faced with a weather-related emergency or natural disaster (37%), an industrial or transportation accident (34%), or an act of terrorism or terrorist threat (30%) (Table 1.1).
- Residents most commonly stated that hospitals, clinics, doctors or other medical professionals would be the first source of initial help and information in the event of an outbreak of a serious or life-threatening disease (43%), while police would be their first source of help in the event of rioting or civil unrest (33%<sup>E</sup>). In the event of an extended power outage, residents would first turn to their utility company (29%), and they would most commonly turn to local government in the event of a contamination or shortage of water or food (29%).

### Prior lifetime experience with a major emergency or disaster<sup>5</sup>

- Nearly half (46%) of Kitchener–Cambridge–Waterloo residents have faced a major emergency or disaster in Canada in a community they were living in at the time of the event, three-quarters (75%) of whom reported experiencing severe disruptions to their daily activities as a result of the event.
- Extended power outages lasting 24 hours or longer (71%) and winter storms (including blizzards and ice storms) (28%) were the most commonly experienced emergency or disaster by residents of Kitchener–Cambridge–Waterloo.
- The most common types of disruption to daily activities endured by residents who had experienced a major emergency or disaster included the inability to use electrical appliances (85%) or to heat or cool their home (72%). More severe disruptions experienced were home evacuations, experienced by almost one in five (19%<sup>E</sup>) people faced with an emergency, as well as an inability to communicate outside of the home (19%<sup>E</sup>) or use roads or transportation within the community (19%<sup>E</sup>).
- The vast majority (94%) of residents who experienced an emergency or disaster were able to resume their daily activities within one week of the event, half (50%) in less than 24 hours.
- Almost half (45%) of residents who had experienced an emergency or disaster received help during or immediately following the event, most commonly from a family member (47%<sup>E</sup>) or a neighbour (22%<sup>E</sup>).
- About one in five (21%<sup>E</sup>) residents of Kitchener–Cambridge–Waterloo who experienced a major emergency or disaster in Canada in a community where they were living at the time of the event and which was significant enough to disrupt their regular daily routine also endured a loss of property or financial impact.

## Emergency planning, precautionary and fire safety behaviours

- Almost three-quarters (73%) of people residing in Kitchener–Cambridge–Waterloo lived in households that were engaged in at least two emergency planning activities,<sup>6</sup> and almost half (48%) lived in households with three or four such activities (Table 1.2). Less than one in ten (7%<sup>E</sup>) people lived in a household that had not participated in any emergency planning activities.
- About half (51%) lived in a household with at least two precautionary measures<sup>7</sup> taken in case of an emergency, and one in five (19%) lived in a household with three or four such measures. About one in ten (12%) people lived in a household with no precautionary measures in place.
- Almost all (99.6%) residents reported living in a household with a working smoke detector, and three-quarters (75%) reported living in a household with a working carbon monoxide detector (Table 1.3). Nearly seven in ten (69%) stated that they had a working fire extinguisher in their household. Just over half (55%) of the residents in Kitchener–Cambridge–Waterloo stated that they had implemented all three fire safety measures in their households.
- Generally, the number of fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents of Kitchener–Cambridge–Waterloo did not significantly differ from Ontario residents, but they did often vary compared to Canadians residing in the 10 provinces. For instance, while residents of Kitchener–Cambridge–Waterloo (4%<sup>E</sup>) were less likely than Canadians (7%) in general to have implemented all four precautionary measures, they were more likely to have implemented all three fire safety measures (55% and 42%, respectively).<sup>8</sup>
- There were some significant differences for the specific types of emergency planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures set in place by residents of Kitchener–Cambridge–Waterloo when compared to residents of Ontario and Canadians in general. For instance, Kitchener–Cambridge–Waterloo residents were more likely to have an emergency exit plan or a vehicle emergency supply kit than residents of Ontario and Canada overall, but less likely to have a back-up generator.

## Social networks and sense of belonging

- More than half (53%) of Kitchener–Cambridge–Waterloo residents had a strong sense of belonging<sup>9</sup> to their community.
- Most (88%) residents described the neighbourhood they lived in as a place where neighbours generally help each other.<sup>10</sup> Of those who did not describe their neighbourhood this way, most (82%) still described it as a place where neighbours would help each other in an emergency.<sup>11</sup>
- Many individuals had a large network of support in the event of an emergency or disaster, with more than five people to turn to for emotional support (72%), for help if physically injured (74%) as well as in case of a home evacuation (65%). About one in three (32%) residents had a large support network if financial help was needed, and nearly one in ten (8%) reported that they had no one to turn to for financial support.
- High levels of sense of belonging, self-efficacy, neighbourhood trust and social support, as well as civic engagement, were often associated with a higher level of emergency preparedness (Table 1.4).

## Data tables

Table 1.1

Most commonly anticipated sources of initial help and information, by type of emergency or disaster, residents of Kitchener–Cambridge–Waterloo, Ontario, 2014

Most common sources of initial help and information by type of emergency or disaster	percent
<b>Weather-related emergency or natural disaster</b>	
News- Radio	37
News- Internet	30
News- Television	30
<b>Extended power outages<sup>1</sup></b>	
Utility company	29

News- Radio	28
News- Internet	11 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Outbreak of serious or life-threatening disease</b>	
Hospital, clinic, doctor or other medical professional	43
News- Internet	25
News- Television	24
<b>Industrial or transportation accident</b>	
News- Radio	34
Police/law enforcement	25
News- Television	25
<b>Contamination or shortage of water or food</b>	
Local government	29
News- Internet	24
News- Radio	24
<b>Act of terrorism or terrorist threat</b>	
News- Radio	30
News- Television	30
News- Internet	26
<b>Rioting or civil unrest <sup>1</sup></b>	
Police/law enforcement	33 <sup>E</sup>
News- Radio	29 <sup>E</sup>
News- Television	19 <sup>E</sup>
<sup>E</sup> use with caution	
1 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% when respondents were asked about their likely sources of initial help and information.	
<b>Note:</b> Respondents who perceived their community was at risk for any form of emergency or disaster were then asked where they would turn to first for information or assistance in the event of the perceived emergency or disaster. Respondents could provide more than one response. Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.	
<b>Source:</b> Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.	

**Table 1.2**  
**Number of emergency planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents, community of Kitchener–Cambridge–Waterloo, Ontario, 2014**

Number of planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents	Kitchener–Cambridge–Waterloo	Ontario	Canada
	percent		
<b>Number of emergency planning activities</b>			
None	7 <sup>E</sup>	8	8
1 activity	18	16	17
2 activities	25	25	25
3 activities	30	28	27
4 activities	18	21	19
<b>Number of precautionary measures</b>			
None	12	15	16
1 measure	33 <sup>**</sup>	28	27
2 measures	32	29	28
3 measures	15 <sup>***</sup>	20	20
4 measures	4 <sup>E **</sup>	6	7

Number of fire safety measures <sup>1</sup>			
None		F	F 1
1 measure		9 <sup>E</sup> **	7 14
2 measures		32 **	35 38
3 measures		55 **	53 42

<sup>E</sup> use with caution  
<sup>F</sup> too unreliable to be published

\*\* significantly different from Canada level estimate (p < 0.05)

\*\*\* significantly different from both provincial and Canada level estimates (p < 0.05)

1 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Canada'.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents. Emergency planning activities include: an emergency exit plan, an emergency supply kit, photocopies/electronic copies of important documents and a list of emergency contact numbers. Precautionary measures include: a battery-operated or wind-up radio, an alternative heat source, a back-up generator and an alternative water source. Fire safety measures include a working smoke detector, a working carbon monoxide detector and a working fire extinguisher.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

**Table 1.3**  
**Planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures residents engaged in, community of Kitchener–Cambridge–Waterloo, Ontario, 2014**

Residents whose households were involved in the following:	Kitchener–Cambridge–Waterloo	Ontario	Canada
	percent		
<b>Emergency planning activities</b>			
Emergency exit plan	70 ***	63	60
Exit plan has been practised/reviewed in last 12 months <sup>1</sup>	43	47	46
Designated meeting place for household members <sup>2</sup>	33	30	33
Contact plan for household members <sup>2</sup>	56	57	55
Household emergency supply kit	42	47	47
Vehicle emergency supply kit <sup>3</sup>	69 ***	62	59
Extra copies of important documents	59 **	56	53
List of emergency contact numbers	64 *	71	69
Plan for meeting special health needs <sup>4</sup>	54	61	62
<b>Precautionary measures</b>			
Wind-up or battery-operated radio	64 **	59	58
Alternate heat source	45	46	48
Back-up generator	13 ***	20	23
Alternate water source	42	44	43
Other <sup>5</sup>	19	22	21
<b>Fire safety measures</b>			
Working smoke detector	100 ***	99	98
Working carbon monoxide detector	75 ***	80	60
Working fire extinguisher	69 *	64	66



\* significantly different from provincial level estimate (p < 0.05)

\*\* significantly different from Canada level estimate (p < 0.05)

\*\*\* significantly different from both provincial and Canada level estimates (p < 0.05)

1 Percentage based only on those indicating that they have an emergency exit plan.

2 Excludes Canadians living in single-person households.

3 Excludes those who reported that they lived in a household that did not have a vehicle.

4 Percentage based only on those indicating that they or someone in their household has special medical needs.

5 'Other precautionary measures' include having an escape/rescue plan for pets, extra supply of fuel, checking and replenishing emergency supplies, and keeping exits clear.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

**Table 1.4**

**High or moderately high levels of emergency planning, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents, by social and political involvement, community of Kitchener–Cambridge–Waterloo, Ontario, 2014**

Social and political involvement	Percentage of residents who had high or moderately high levels of...		
	Planning activities	Precautionary measures	Fire safety measures
	percent		
<b>Engagement in political activities <sup>1</sup></b>			
Yes †	51	23	57
No	38 <sup>E</sup>	F	50
<b>High level of civic engagement <sup>2</sup></b>			
Yes †	50	26	60
No	44	13 <sup>E *</sup>	50
<b>High level of social support <sup>3</sup></b>			
Yes †	59	22 <sup>E</sup>	59
No	44 *	19	53
<b>Strong sense of belonging to community <sup>4</sup></b>			
Yes †	59	25	60
No	36 *	13 <sup>E *</sup>	50
<b>High neighbourhood trust <sup>5</sup></b>			
Yes †	49	28	65
No	49	15 *	50 *
<b>High level of self-efficacy <sup>6</sup></b>			
Yes †	55	26	56
No	43 *	15 <sup>E *</sup>	53

<sup>E</sup> use with caution

<sup>F</sup> too unreliable to be published

\* significantly different from reference category ( $p < 0.05$ )

† reference category

- 1 Includes individuals over the age of 17 years who are eligible to vote, and who have participated in or volunteered for political parties or events in the past 12 months, including municipal, provincial, or federal elections, or expressed views on political or social issues through signing a petition, contacting news agencies or politicians, or attended a meeting involving social or community issues.
- 2 Civic engagement measures individuals over the age of 17 years who were involved in a recreational group or organization in the past 12 months, and includes engagement in political activities. A 'high level' is defined as having been involved in at least 4 activities in the past 12 months.
- 3 A 'high level of social support' is defined as having five or more people whom that individual could turn to for help in an emergency if they are physically injured, require emotional support, shelter, and/or financial assistance.
- 4 A 'strong sense of belonging to community' is rating one's own sense of belonging to their community as a 4 or a 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "very weak" and 5 "very strong".
- 5 'High neighbourhood trust' is rating one's own trust in the people in one's neighbourhood as 4 or 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "cannot be trusted at all" and 5 represents "can be trusted a lot", as well as having a response of "very likely" when asked about the likelihood of someone in their neighbourhood returning a lost wallet or purse containing two hundred dollars with the money still inside.
- 6 A 'high level of self-efficacy' is derived from having a high self-rating on a scale of 1 (poor) to 5 (excellent) for the following three categories: an ability to think clearly and solve day-to-day problems, to handle unexpected and difficult problems, and to figure out what to do if faced with an emergency situation.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents. Households with 'moderately high' or 'high' levels of emergency planning engaged in 3 or 4 of the following: having an exit plan, an emergency supply kit, extra copies of important documents and an emergency contact list. 'Moderately high' or 'high' levels of precautionary measures include having 3 or 4 of the following: a wind-up or battery operated radio, a back-up generator, an alternate source of heat and additional water. 'Moderately high' or 'high' levels of fire safety measure include having all 3 of the following: a working smoke detector, a working fire extinguisher, and a working carbon monoxide detector.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

## Notes

<sup>E</sup> use with caution

- 1 A Census Metropolitan Area (CMA) or a Census Agglomeration (CA) is formed by one or more adjacent municipalities centred on a population centre (known as the core). A CMA must have a total population of at least 100,000 of which 50,000 or more must live in the core. A CA must have a core population of at least 10,000. To be included in the CMA or CA, other adjacent municipalities must have a high degree of integration with the core as measured by commuting flows derived from census data.
- 2 The target population for the SEPR included all persons 15 years of age or older, residing in households in Canada's 10 provinces, excluding full-time residents of institutions (e.g. nursing homes, group homes, hospitals).
- 3 The SEPR covers three types of communities: Census Metropolitan Areas (CMAs), Census Agglomerations (CAs) with population greater than 50,000, and 'smaller communities' which include CAs with population 50,000 or less and those areas that fall outside of CMAs and CAs. All CMAs and CAs (with population greater than 50,000) were included in the SEPR. A sample of households were selected from smaller communities within each province to represent all households within the province in similar communities. Additional information on the SEPR and its sampling methodology can be found in the 'Survey description' section.
- 4 Throughout this fact sheet, responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.
- 5 This section focuses on personal experiences with emergencies or disasters that happened in Canada, in a community where the person was living at the time, and was significant enough to severely interrupt the individual's regular daily activities.
- 6 Emergency planning activities include: having an emergency exit plan, a household emergency supply kit, extra copies of important documents and an emergency contact list.

- 7 Precautionary measures include: having a wind-up or battery-operated radio, an alternate heat source such as a non-electric stove or heater or a wood-burning fireplace, a back-up generator and an alternative water source such as a well, tank or litres of stored water.
- 8 Unless otherwise specified, differences are statistically significant ( $p < 0.05$ ).
- 9 A 'strong sense of belonging to community' is rating one's own sense of belonging to their community as a 4 or a 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "very weak" and 5 "very strong".
- 10 A proportion (6%) of respondents were not asked questions regarding neighbourhood helpfulness in the event of an emergency and as such these cases are not included in the analysis on neighbourhood helpfulness in general or in the event of an emergency.
- 11 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% when respondents were asked if the neighbourhood they lived in was a place where neighbours would help each other in an emergency.



## Fact sheet Community of Brantford (CMA), Ontario

---

In 2014, information on the emergency preparedness of people living in the Census Metropolitan Area<sup>1</sup> of Brantford was collected through the Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada (SEPR).<sup>2</sup> This fact sheet presents information on the risk awareness and level of emergency preparedness of the residents of Brantford, which could help improve the understanding of community resilience in the event of an emergency.<sup>3,4</sup>

### **Risk awareness and anticipated sources of help in an emergency or disaster**

- Winter storms (including blizzards, ice storms and extreme cold) (89%), extended power outages lasting 24 hours or longer (79%) and heat waves (64%) were named by residents of Brantford as the events most likely to occur within their community.
- Residents most commonly anticipated turning to radio news as an initial source for help and information if they were faced with a weather-related emergency or natural disaster (30%) or an industrial or transportation accident (30%) (Table 1.1).
- Residents stated that they would turn to hospitals, clinics, doctors or other medical professionals as sources of initial help and information in the event of an outbreak of a serious or life-threatening disease (61%) while police would be their first source of help in the event of an act of terrorism or terrorist threat (37%) or rioting or civil unrest (39%), and local government (25%) in the event of a contamination or shortage of water or food. In an extended power outage, residents would first turn to their utility company (42%).

### **Prior lifetime experience with a major emergency or disaster<sup>5</sup>**

- Over one-third (38%) of Brantford residents has faced a major emergency or disaster in Canada in a community they were living in at the time of the event, two-thirds (67%) of whom reported experiencing severe disruptions to their daily activities as a result of the event.
- The most commonly experienced emergency or disaster for residents of Brantford was extended power outages lasting 24 hours or longer (70%), in addition to winter storms which include blizzards and ice storms (20%).
- The most common types of disruption to daily activities endured by residents who had experienced a major emergency or disaster included the inability to use electrical appliances (75%) or to heat or cool their home (64%). About one-half (52%) reported that they had to boil water or use bottled water for drinking. More severe disruptions experienced were home evacuations, experienced by 13% of people faced with an emergency or disaster, as well as an inability to use roads or transportation within the community (13%<sup>E</sup>) and the inability to communicate outside of the home (14%<sup>E</sup>).
- The vast majority (92%) of residents who experienced an emergency or disaster were able to resume their daily activities within one week of the event; over two-thirds (69%) were able to resume daily activities within two days or less.
- About four in ten (43%) residents who had experienced an emergency or disaster received help during or immediately following the event, frequently from a family member (38%<sup>E</sup>).<sup>6</sup>
- Just over one-quarter (28%<sup>E</sup>) of residents of Brantford who experienced a major emergency or disaster in Canada in a community where they were living at the time of the event and which was significant enough to disrupt their regular

daily routine also endured a loss of property or financial impact.

## Emergency planning, precautionary and fire safety behaviours

- Over two-thirds (71%) of people residing in Brantford lived in a household that was engaged in at least two emergency planning activities,<sup>7</sup> with almost half (48%) living in a household with three or four such activities (Table 1.2). One in ten (10%<sup>E</sup>) people lived in a household that had not participated in any emergency planning activities.
- Almost two-thirds (63%) lived in a household with at least two precautionary measures<sup>8</sup> taken in case of an emergency, with less than one-third (29%) living in a household with three or four such measures. About one in ten (12%) people lived in a household with no precautionary measures in place, significantly fewer than was typical in both Ontario and Canada's 10 provinces more broadly.<sup>9</sup>
- Almost all (99%) residents reported living in a household with a working smoke detector and 84% reported living in a household with a working carbon monoxide detector (Table 1.3). Two out of three (66%) residents stated that they had a working fire extinguisher in their household. Almost six in ten (58%) of the residents of Brantford stated that they had implemented all three fire safety measures within their households, significantly more compared to Canada overall (42%).
- There were other differences in the types of activities and measures set in place by residents of Brantford when compared to the rest of Canada. For example, the proportion of Brantford residents who had a vehicle emergency supply kit or an alternate water source was significantly higher than the rest of Canada. However, residents were less likely than Canadians overall to have a household emergency supply kit or a plan for meeting special health needs.<sup>10</sup>

## Social networks and sense of belonging

- About half (51%) of Brantford's residents had a strong sense of belonging<sup>11</sup> to their community.
- Most (90%) residents described the neighbourhood they lived in as a place where neighbours generally help each other.<sup>12</sup> Of those who did not describe their neighbourhood this way, two-thirds (67%) still described it as a place where neighbours would help each other in an emergency.<sup>13</sup>
- Many individuals had a large network of support in the event of an emergency or disaster, with more than five people to turn to for emotional support (70%), for help if physically injured (62%) as well as in case of a home evacuation (56%). About three in ten residents had a large support network if financial help was needed (31%). However, one in ten (10%) reported that they had no one to turn to for financial help.<sup>14</sup>
- High levels of social support, sense of belonging, neighbourhood trust and self-efficacy, as well as engagement in civic activities, were often associated with a higher level of emergency preparedness (Table 1.4).

## Data tables

**Table 1.1**  
Most commonly anticipated sources of initial help and information, by type of emergency or disaster, residents of Brantford, Ontario, 2014

Most common sources of initial help and information by type of emergency or disaster	percent
<b>Weather-related emergency or natural disaster</b>	
News- Radio	30
News- Television	29
News- Internet	28
<b>Extended power outages<sup>1</sup></b>	
Utility company	42
News- Radio	21
Family	16 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Outbreak of serious or life-threatening disease</b>	
Hospital, clinic, doctor or other medical professional	61
News- Internet	21 <sup>E</sup>

News- Radio	19 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Industrial or transportation accident</b>	
News- Radio	30
Police/law enforcement	25
News- Television	23
<b>Contamination or shortage of water or food <sup>1</sup></b>	
Local government	25
News- Radio	21 <sup>E</sup>
Family	17 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Act of terrorism or terrorist threat <sup>1</sup></b>	
Police/law enforcement	37
News- Television	19 <sup>E</sup>
News- Radio	18 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Rioting or civil unrest</b>	
Police/law enforcement	39
News- Television	25 <sup>E</sup>
News- Radio	19 <sup>E</sup>
<sup>E</sup> use with caution	
1 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% when respondents were asked about their likely sources of initial help and information.	
<b>Note:</b> Respondents who perceived their community was at risk for any form of emergency or disaster were then asked where they would turn to first for information or assistance in the event of the perceived emergency or disaster. Respondents could provide more than one response. Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.	
<b>Source:</b> Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.	

**Table 1.2**

**Number of emergency planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents, community of Brantford, Ontario, 2014**

Number of planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents	Brantford	Ontario	Canada
	percent		
<b>Number of emergency planning activities</b>			
None	10 <sup>E</sup>	8	8
1 activity	17	16	17
2 activities	23	25	25
3 activities	27	28	27
4 activities	21	21	19
<b>Number of precautionary measures</b>			
None	12 <sup>***</sup>	15	16
1 measure	24	28	27
2 measures	34 <sup>**</sup>	29	28
3 measures	21	20	20
4 measures	8 <sup>E</sup>	6	7
<b>Number of fire safety measures <sup>1 2</sup></b>			
None	F	F	1
1 measure	6 <sup>E</sup> <sup>**</sup>	7	14
2 measures	29 <sup>***</sup>	35	38
3 measures	58 <sup>**</sup>	53	42

E use with caution  
 F too unreliable to be published

\*\* significantly different from Canada level estimate (p < 0.05)

\*\*\* significantly different from both provincial and Canada level estimates (p < 0.05)

1 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Canada'.

2 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Brantford'.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents. Emergency planning activities include: an emergency exit plan, an emergency supply kit, photocopies/electronic copies of important documents and a list of emergency contact numbers. Precautionary measures include: a battery-operated or wind-up radio, an alternative heat source, a back-up generator and an alternative water source. Fire safety measures include a working smoke detector, a working carbon monoxide detector and a working fire extinguisher.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

**Table 1.3**  
**Planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures residents engaged in, community of Brantford, Ontario, 2014**

Residents whose households were involved in the following:	Brantford	Ontario	Canada
	percent		
<b>Emergency planning activities</b>			
Emergency exit plan	66	63	60
Exit plan has been practised/reviewed in last 12 months <sup>1</sup>	49	47	46
Designated meeting place for household members <sup>2</sup>	33	30	33
Contact plan for household members <sup>2</sup>	55	57	55
Household emergency supply kit	41 **	47	47
Vehicle emergency supply kit <sup>3</sup>	64 **	62	59
Extra copies of important documents	52	56	53
List of emergency contact numbers	71	71	69
Plan for meeting special health needs <sup>4</sup>	48 ***	61	62
<b>Precautionary measures</b>			
Wind-up or battery-operated radio	63	59	58
Alternate heat source	49	46	48
Back-up generator	21	20	23
Alternate water source	54 ***	44	43
Other <sup>5</sup>	24	22	21
<b>Fire safety measures</b>			
Working smoke detector	99	99	98
Working carbon monoxide detector	84 ***	80	60
Working fire extinguisher	66	64	66

\*\* significantly different from Canada level estimate (p < 0.05)

\*\*\* significantly different from both provincial and Canada level estimates (p < 0.05)

1 Percentage based only on those indicating that they have an emergency exit plan.

2 Excludes Canadians living in single-person households.

3 Excludes those who reported that they lived in a household that did not have a vehicle.

4 Percentage based only on those indicating that they or someone in their household has special medical needs.

5 'Other precautionary measures' include having an escape/rescue plan for pets, extra supply of fuel, checking and replenishing emergency supplies, and keeping exits clear.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.  
**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

**Table 1.4**

**High or moderately high levels of emergency planning, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents, by social and political involvement, community of Brantford, Ontario, 2014**

Social and political involvement	Percentage of residents who had high or moderately high levels of...		
	Planning activities	Precautionary measures	Fire safety measures
	percent		
<b>Engagement in political activities <sup>1</sup></b>			
Yes †	47	30	58
No <sup>7</sup>	54	27 <sup>E</sup>	60
<b>High level of civic engagement <sup>2</sup></b>			
Yes †	50	35	62
No <sup>7</sup>	45	20 <sup>E *</sup>	52
<b>High level of social support <sup>3</sup></b>			
Yes †	50	30	67
No <sup>7</sup>	49	29	56 *
<b>Strong sense of belonging to community <sup>4</sup></b>			
Yes †	55	29	68
No <sup>7</sup>	43 *	31	49 *
<b>High neighbourhood trust <sup>5</sup></b>			
Yes †	57	40	67
No <sup>7</sup>	44 *	21 *	52 *
<b>High level of self-efficacy <sup>6</sup></b>			
Yes †	53	39	63
No <sup>7</sup>	43	19 <sup>E *</sup>	54

<sup>E</sup> use with caution

\* significantly different from reference category ( $p < 0.05$ )

† reference category

1 Includes individuals over the age of 17 years who are eligible to vote, and who have participated in or volunteered for political parties or events in the past 12 months, including municipal, provincial, or federal elections, or expressed views on political or social issues through signing a petition, contacting news agencies or politicians, or attended a meeting involving social or community issues.

2 Civic engagement measures individuals over the age of 17 years who were involved in a recreational group or organization in the past 12 months, and includes engagement in political activities. A 'high level' is defined as having been involved in at least 4 activities in the past 12 months.

3 A 'high level of social support' is defined as having five or more people whom that individual could turn to for help in an emergency if they are physically injured, require emotional support, shelter, and/or financial assistance.

4 A 'strong sense of belonging to community' is rating one's own sense of belonging to their community as a 4 or a 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "very weak" and 5 "very strong".

5 'High neighbourhood trust' is rating one's own trust in the people in one's neighbourhood as 4 or 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "cannot be trusted at all" and 5 represents "can be trusted a lot", as well as having a response of "very likely" when asked about the likelihood of someone in their neighbourhood returning a lost wallet or purse containing two hundred dollars with the money still inside.

6 A 'high level of self-efficacy' is derived from having a high self-rating on a scale of 1 (poor) to 5 (excellent) for the following three categories: an ability to think clearly and solve day-to-day problems, to handle unexpected and difficult problems, and to figure out what to do if faced with an emergency situation.

7 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Fire safety measures'.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents. Households with 'moderately high' or 'high' levels of emergency planning engaged in 3 or 4 of the following: having an exit plan, an emergency supply kit, extra copies of important documents and an emergency contact list. 'Moderately high' or 'high' levels of precautionary measures include having 3 or 4 of the following: a wind-up or battery operated radio, a back-up generator, an alternate source of heat and additional water. 'Moderately high' or 'high' levels of fire safety measure include having all 3 of the following: a working smoke detector, a working fire extinguisher, and a working carbon monoxide detector.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

**Notes**



<sup>E</sup> use with caution

- 1 A Census Metropolitan Area (CMA) or a Census Agglomeration (CA) is formed by one or more adjacent municipalities centred on a population centre (known as the core). A CMA must have a total population of at least 100,000 of which 50,000 or more must live in the core. A CA must have a core population of at least 10,000. To be included in the CMA or CA, other adjacent municipalities must have a high degree of integration with the core as measured by commuting flows derived from census data.
- 2 The target population for the SEPR included all persons 15 years of age or older, residing in households in Canada's 10 provinces, excluding full-time residents of institutions (e.g. nursing homes, group homes, hospitals).
- 3 The SEPR covers three types of communities: Census Metropolitan Areas (CMAs), Census Agglomerations (CAs) with population greater than 50,000, and 'smaller communities' which include CAs with population 50,000 or less and those areas that fall outside of CMAs and CAs. All CMAs and CAs (with population greater than 50,000) were included in the SEPR. A sample of households were selected from smaller communities within each province to represent all households within the province in similar communities. Additional information on the SEPR and its sampling methodology can be found in the 'Survey description' section.
- 4 Throughout this fact sheet, responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.
- 5 This section focuses on personal experiences with emergencies or disasters that happened in Canada, in a community where the person was living at the time, and was significant enough to severely interrupt the individual's regular daily activities.
- 6 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% when respondents were asked about the source of information or assistance they received during or immediately following the emergency they experienced.
- 7 Emergency planning activities include: having an emergency exit plan, a household emergency supply kit, extra copies of important documents and an emergency contact list.
- 8 Precautionary measures include: having a wind-up or battery-operated radio, an alternate heat source such as a non-electric stove or heater or a wood-burning fireplace, a back-up generator and an alternative water source such as a well, tank or litres of stored water.
- 9 Unless otherwise specified, differences are statistically significant ( $p < 0.05$ ).
- 10 Percentage based only on those indicating that they or someone in their household has special medical needs.
- 11 A 'strong sense of belonging to community' is rating one's own sense of belonging to their community as a 4 or a 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "very weak" and 5 "very strong".
- 12 A proportion (22%) of respondents were not asked questions regarding neighbourhood helpfulness in the event of an emergency and as such these cases are not included in the analysis on neighbourhood helpfulness in general or in the event of an emergency.
- 13 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were equal to 12% when respondents who were asked if the neighbourhood they lived in was a place where neighbours would help each other in an emergency.
- 14 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% when respondents were asked about the number of people they could turn to for help if financial support is needed.



## Fact sheet Community of Norfolk (CA), Ontario

---

In 2014, information on the emergency preparedness of people living in the Census Agglomeration<sup>1</sup> of Norfolk was collected through the Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada (SEPR).<sup>2</sup> This fact sheet presents information on the risk awareness and level of emergency preparedness of the residents of Norfolk, which could help improve the understanding of community resilience in the event of an emergency.<sup>3,4</sup>

### Risk awareness and anticipated sources of help in an emergency or disaster

- Winter storms (including blizzards, ice storms and extreme cold) (94%), extended power outages lasting 24 hours or longer (80%) and heat waves (64%) were named by residents of Norfolk as the events most likely to occur in their community.
- Norfolk residents most frequently anticipated turning to radio news as an initial source for information in the event of a weather-related emergency or natural disaster (37%) or an industrial or transportation accident (33%<sup>E</sup>), and to television news in the event of an act of terrorism or terrorist threat (42%<sup>E</sup>) (Table 1.1).
- Residents listed hospitals, clinics, doctors or other medical professionals as the most common sources of initial information or assistance in the event of an outbreak of a serious or life-threatening disease (64%), while the police would be their first source of help in the event of rioting or civil unrest (44%<sup>E</sup>). In the event of an extended power outage, residents commonly anticipated first turning to their utility company (51%), and they would most frequently turn to local government in the event of a contamination or shortage of water or food (34%).

### Prior lifetime experience with a major emergency or disaster<sup>5</sup>

- Nearly half (48%) of Norfolk residents have faced a major emergency or disaster in Canada in a community they were living in at the time of the event, two-thirds (67%) of whom reported experiencing a severe disruption to their daily activities as a result of the event.
- The most commonly experienced major emergency or disaster was extended power outages lasting 24 hours or longer (64%). In addition, about one-quarter (27%<sup>E</sup>) of residents reported experiences with winter storms (including blizzards and ice storms) and 17%<sup>E</sup> said they had experienced tornadoes.
- The most common types of disruption to daily activities endured by residents who had experienced a major emergency or disaster included the inability to use electrical appliances (81%) or to heat or cool their home (63%). In addition, many said they had missed appointments or planned activities (59%) or school or work (53%) as a result of their experience. Fewer residents who had faced an emergency or disaster had experienced more serious disruptions: home evacuations (11%<sup>E</sup>), as well as an inability to use roads or transportation within the community (22%<sup>E</sup>) or communicate outside of the home (14%<sup>E</sup>).
- Most (91%) residents who experienced an emergency or disaster were able to resume their regular daily activities within one week of the event; just over half (53%) reported that they were able to resume activities in under two days.
- Approximately four in ten (43%) residents who had experienced an emergency or disaster received help during or immediately following the event, most commonly from a family member (57%<sup>E</sup>).
- Less than half (45%) of residents of Norfolk who experienced a major emergency or disaster in Canada in a community where they were living at the time of the event and which was significant enough to disrupt their regular

daily activities also endured a loss of property or financial impact.

## Emergency planning, precautionary and fire safety behaviours

- About three-quarters (76%) of people residing in Norfolk lived in a household that was engaged in at least two emergency planning activities,<sup>6</sup> and over half (57%) lived in a household with three or four such activities (Table 1.2). Few people (5%<sup>E</sup>) lived in a household that had not participated in any emergency planning activities.
- Over two-thirds of residents (69%) lived in a household with at least two precautionary measures<sup>7</sup> taken in case of an emergency, less than half (44%) lived in a household with three or four such measures. Less than one in ten (7%<sup>E</sup>) people lived in a household with no precautionary measures in place.
- Almost all (99.8%) residents reported living in a household with a working smoke detector, and over three-quarters (78%) reporting living in a household with a working fire extinguisher (Table 1.3). Eight in ten (81%) residents stated that they had a working carbon monoxide detector in their household. About two-thirds (65%) of the residents of Norfolk stated that they had implemented all three fire safety measures within their households.
- Significant differences were observed in the number of emergency planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by Norfolk residents when they were compared to residents of Ontario and Canada's 10 provinces more broadly. For example, Norfolk residents were more likely to have engaged in all four precautionary measures (18%) and all three fire safety measure (65%) than were residents of Ontario and Canadians in general.<sup>8</sup>
- Residents of Norfolk often differed from Ontarians and Canadians in the types of activities and measures they were involved in. For example, in terms of emergency planning activities, they were more likely to have an emergency exit plan (74%), a designated meeting place (44%), a contact plan for household members (70%) and a vehicle emergency supply kit (70%). For precautionary measures, residents of Norfolk were more likely to have a back-up generator (43%) and an alternate water source (59%), and for fire safety measures, they were more likely to have a working smoke detector (99.8%) and fire extinguisher (78%) than residents of Ontario overall and Canadians in general.

## Social networks and sense of belonging

- More than half (56%) of Norfolk's residents had a strong sense of belonging<sup>9</sup> to their community.<sup>10</sup>
- Most (92%) residents described the neighbourhood they lived in as a place where neighbours generally help each other.<sup>11</sup> Of those who did not describe their neighbourhood this way, most (88%) still described it as a place where neighbours would help each other in an emergency.<sup>12</sup>
- Many individuals had a large network of support in the event of an emergency or disaster, with more than five people to turn to for emotional support (71%), for help if physically injured (70%), as well as in case of a home evacuation (61%). However, three in ten residents had a large support network if financial help was needed (31%), and close to one in ten residents (8%<sup>E</sup>) reported that they had no one to turn to for financial help.<sup>13</sup>
- High levels of sense of belonging, as well as civic engagement and involvement in political activities, were sometimes associated with a higher level of emergency preparedness (Table 1.4).

## Data tables

Table 1.1

Most commonly anticipated sources of initial help and information, by type of emergency or disaster, residents of Norfolk, Ontario, 2014

Most common sources of initial help and information by type of emergency or disaster	percent
<b>Weather-related emergency or natural disaster</b>	
News- Radio	37
News- Television	23
News- Internet	20
<b>Extended power outages</b>	
Utility company	51

Family	16 <sup>E</sup>
News- Radio	14
<b>Outbreak of serious or life-threatening disease</b>	
Hospital, clinic, doctor or other medical professional	64
News- Radio	16 <sup>E</sup>
News- Television	13 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Industrial or transportation accident</b>	
News- Radio	33 <sup>E</sup>
Police/law enforcement	30 <sup>E</sup>
News- Internet	19 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Contamination or shortage of water or food <sup>1</sup></b>	
Local government	34
News- Radio	20 <sup>E</sup>
News- Internet	15 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Act of terrorism or terrorist threat</b>	
News- Television	42 <sup>E</sup>
Police/law enforcement	37 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Rioting or civil unrest</b>	
Police/law enforcement	44 <sup>E</sup>
News- Television	37 <sup>E</sup>
<sup>E</sup> use with caution	
<sup>1</sup> Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% when respondents were asked about their likely sources of initial help and information.	
<b>Note:</b> Respondents who perceived their community was at risk for any form of emergency or disaster were then asked where they would turn to first for information or assistance in the event of the perceived emergency or disaster. Respondents could provide more than one response. Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.	
<b>Source:</b> Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.	

**Table 1.2**  
**Number of emergency planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents, community of Norfolk, Ontario, 2014**

Number of planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents	Norfolk	Ontario	Canada
	percent		
<b>Number of emergency planning activities</b>			
None	5 <sup>E</sup>	8	8
1 activity	18	16	17
2 activities	19	25	25
3 activities	29	28	27
4 activities	28 **	21	19
<b>Number of precautionary measures</b>			
None	7 <sup>E</sup> ***	15	16
1 measure	22	28	27
2 measures	25	29	28
3 measures	26 ***	20	20
4 measures	18 ***	6	7
<b>Number of fire safety measures <sup>1</sup></b>			
None	F	F	1

1 measure	5 <sup>E**</sup>	7	14
2 measures	26 <sup>***</sup>	35	38
3 measures	65 <sup>***</sup>	53	42

<sup>E</sup> use with caution  
<sup>F</sup> too unreliable to be published

\*\* significantly different from Canada level estimate (p < 0.05)

\*\*\* significantly different from both provincial and Canada level estimates (p < 0.05)

1 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Canada'.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents. Emergency planning activities include: an emergency exit plan, an emergency supply kit, photocopies/electronic copies of important documents and a list of emergency contact numbers. Precautionary measures include: a battery-operated or wind-up radio, an alternate heat source, a back-up generator and an alternative water source. Fire safety measures include a working smoke detector, a working carbon monoxide detector and a working fire extinguisher.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

**Table 1.3**  
**Planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures residents engaged in, community of Norfolk, Ontario, 2014**

Residents whose households were involved in the following:	Norfolk	Ontario	Canada
	percent		
<b>Emergency planning activities</b>			
Emergency exit plan	74 <sup>***</sup>	63	60
Exit plan has been practised/reviewed in last 12 months <sup>1</sup>	53	47	46
Designated meeting place for household members <sup>2</sup>	44 <sup>***</sup>	30	33
Contact plan for household members <sup>2</sup>	70 <sup>***</sup>	57	55
Household emergency supply kit	53	47	47
Vehicle emergency supply kit <sup>3</sup>	70 <sup>***</sup>	62	59
Extra copies of important documents	57	56	53
List of emergency contact numbers	71	71	69
Plan for meeting special health needs <sup>4</sup>	56	61	62
<b>Precautionary measures</b>			
Wind-up or battery-operated radio	66 <sup>**</sup>	59	58
Alternate heat source	56 <sup>***</sup>	46	48
Back-up generator	43 <sup>***</sup>	20	23
Alternate water source	59 <sup>***</sup>	44	43
Other <sup>5</sup>	24	22	21
<b>Fire safety measures</b>			
Working smoke detector	100 <sup>***</sup>	99	98
Working carbon monoxide detector	81 <sup>**</sup>	80	60
Working fire extinguisher	78 <sup>***</sup>	64	66

\*\* significantly different from Canada level estimate (p < 0.05)

\*\*\* significantly different from both provincial and Canada level estimates (p < 0.05)

1 Percentage based only on those indicating that they have an emergency exit plan.

2 Excludes Canadians living in single-person households.

3 Excludes those who reported that they lived in a household that did not have a vehicle.

4 Percentage based only on those indicating that they or someone in their household has special medical needs.

5 'Other precautionary measures' include having an escape/rescue plan for pets, extra supply of fuel, checking and replenishing emergency supplies, and keeping exits clear.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

**Table 1.4**

**High or moderately high levels of emergency planning, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents, by social and political involvement, community of Norfolk, Ontario, 2014**

Social and political involvement	Percentage of residents who had high or moderately high levels of...		
	Planning activities	Precautionary measures	Fire safety measures
	percent		
<b>Engagement in political activities <sup>1</sup></b>			
Yes †	59	50	68
No	48 <sup>E</sup>	29 <sup>E *</sup>	56
<b>High level of civic engagement <sup>2</sup></b>			
Yes †	62	54	69
No	48	29 <sup>E *</sup>	58
<b>High level of social support <sup>3</sup></b>			
Yes †	66	50	70
No	51	43	61
<b>Strong sense of belonging to community <sup>4</sup></b>			
Yes †	60	43	73
No	51	45	52 <sup>*</sup>
<b>High neighbourhood trust <sup>5</sup></b>			
Yes †	57	49	70
No	53	40	59
<b>High level of self-efficacy <sup>6</sup></b>			
Yes †	58	45	65
No	54	44	64

<sup>E</sup> use with caution

\* significantly different from reference category ( $p < 0.05$ )

† reference category

- 1 Includes individuals over the age of 17 years who are eligible to vote, and who have participated in or volunteered for political parties or events in the past 12 months, including municipal, provincial, or federal elections, or expressed views on political or social issues through signing a petition, contacting news agencies or politicians, or attended a meeting involving social or community issues.
- 2 Civic engagement measures individuals over the age of 17 years who were involved in a recreational group or organization in the past 12 months, and includes engagement in political activities. A 'high level' is defined as having been involved in at least 4 activities in the past 12 months.
- 3 A 'high level of social support' is defined as having five or more people whom that individual could turn to for help in an emergency if they are physically injured, require emotional support, shelter, and/or financial assistance.
- 4 A 'strong sense of belonging to community' is rating one's own sense of belonging to their community as a 4 or a 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "very weak" and 5 "very strong".
- 5 'High neighbourhood trust' is rating one's own trust in the people in one's neighbourhood as 4 or 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "cannot be trusted at all" and 5 represents "can be trusted a lot", as well as having a response of "very likely" when asked about the likelihood of someone in their neighbourhood returning a lost wallet or purse containing two hundred dollars with the money still inside.
- 6 A 'high level of self-efficacy' is derived from having a high self-rating on a scale of 1 (poor) to 5 (excellent) for the following three categories: an ability to think clearly and solve day-to-day problems, to handle unexpected and difficult problems, and to figure out what to do if faced with an emergency situation.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents. Households with 'moderately high' or 'high' levels of emergency planning engaged in 3 or 4 of the following: having an exit plan, an emergency supply kit, extra copies of important documents and an emergency contact list. 'Moderately high' or 'high' levels of precautionary measures include having 3 or 4 of the following: a wind-up or battery operated radio, a back-up generator, an alternate source of heat and additional water. 'Moderately high' or 'high' levels of fire safety measure include having all 3 of the following: a working smoke detector, a working fire extinguisher, and a working carbon monoxide detector.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

## Notes

<sup>E</sup> use with caution

- 1 A Census Metropolitan Area (CMA) or a Census Agglomeration (CA) is formed by one or more adjacent municipalities centred on a population centre (known as the core). A CMA must have a total population of at least 100,000 of which 50,000 or more must live in the core. A CA must have a core population of at least 10,000. To be included in the CMA or CA, other adjacent municipalities must have a high degree of integration with the core as measured by commuting flows derived from census data.
- 2 The target population for the SEPR included all persons 15 years of age or older, residing in households in Canada's 10 provinces, excluding full-time residents of institutions (e.g. nursing homes, group homes, hospitals).
- 3 The SEPR covers three types of communities: Census Metropolitan Areas (CMAs), Census Agglomerations (CAs) with population greater than 50,000, and 'smaller communities' which include CAs with population 50,000 or less and those areas that fall outside of CMAs and CAs. All CMAs and CAs (with population greater than 50,000) were included in the SEPR. A sample of households were selected from smaller communities within each province to represent all households within the province in similar communities. Additional information on the SEPR and its sampling methodology can be found in the 'Survey description' section.
- 4 Throughout this fact sheet, responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.
- 5 This section focuses on personal experiences with emergencies or disasters that happened in Canada, in a community where the person was living at the time, and was significant enough to severely interrupt the individual's regular daily activities.
- 6 Emergency planning activities include: having an emergency exit plan, a household emergency supply kit, extra copies of important documents and an emergency contact list.

- 7 Precautionary measures include: having a wind-up or battery-operated radio, an alternate heat source such as a non-electric stove or heater or a wood-burning fireplace, a back-up generator and an alternative water source such as a well, tank or litres of stored water.
- 8 Unless otherwise specified, differences are statistically significant ( $p < 0.05$ ).
- 9 A 'strong sense of belonging to community' is rating one's own sense of belonging to their community as a 4 or a 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "very weak" and 5 "very strong".
- 10 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% when respondents were asked about their sense of belonging to the community.
- 11 A proportion (36%) of respondents were not asked questions regarding neighbourhood helpfulness in the event of an emergency and as such these cases are not included in the analysis on neighbourhood helpfulness in general or in the event of an emergency.
- 12 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% when respondents were asked about whether their neighbourhood is a place where neighbours would help each other if there is an emergency.
- 13 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were equal to 12% when respondents were asked about the number of people they could turn to for help if financial support is needed.





## Fact sheet Community of Guelph (CMA), Ontario

---

In 2014, information on the emergency preparedness of people living in the Census Metropolitan Area<sup>1</sup> of Guelph was collected through the Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada (SEPR).<sup>2</sup> This fact sheet presents information on the risk awareness and level of emergency preparedness of the residents of Guelph, which could help improve the understanding of community resilience in the event of an emergency.<sup>3,4</sup>

### **Risk awareness and anticipated sources of help in an emergency or disaster**

- Winter storms (including blizzards, ice storms and extreme cold) (95%), extended power outages lasting 24 hours or longer (88%) and heat waves (65%) were named by residents of Guelph as the events most likely to occur within their community.
- Guelph residents most frequently anticipated turning to news on the radio as an initial source for information in the event of a weather-related emergency or natural disaster (36%) or an industrial or transportation accident (34%), and to news on the television in the event of an act of terrorism or terrorist threat (35%) (Table 1.1).
- Residents stated that hospitals, clinics, doctors or other medical professionals were the most common sources of initial information or assistance in the event of an outbreak of a serious or life-threatening disease (54%), while police or law enforcement would be their first source of help in the event of rioting or civil unrest (37%). In the event of an extended power outage, residents most frequently stated that they would first turn to their utility company (34%), and they said they would first turn to local government in the event of a contamination or shortage of water or food (31%).

### **Prior lifetime experience with a major emergency or disaster<sup>5</sup>**

- Half (51%) of Guelph residents have faced a major emergency or disaster in Canada in a community they were living in at the time of the event, two-thirds (67%) of whom reported experiencing severe disruptions to their daily activities as a result of the event.
- Extended power outages lasting 24 hours or longer (72%) were the most commonly experienced emergencies or disasters by residents of Guelph. In addition, 29% reported that they had experienced emergencies resulting from winter storms (including blizzards and ice storms).
- The most common types of disruption to daily activities endured by residents who had experienced a major emergency or disaster included the inability to use electrical appliances (83%) and to heat or cool their home (68%). In addition, many said they had missed school or work (61%) or appointments or planned activities (56%) as a result of the event. Fewer residents who had faced an emergency or disaster had experienced more severe disruptions: home evacuations (17%<sup>E</sup>), as well as an inability to use roads or transportation within the community (17%<sup>E</sup>) or communicate outside of the home (10%<sup>E</sup>).
- Most (91%) residents who experienced an emergency or disaster were able to resume their daily activities within one week of the event; nearly two-thirds (64%) resumed activities in two days or less.
- About half (52%) of residents who had experienced an emergency or disaster received help during or immediately following the event, most commonly from a family member (40%) or a neighbour (37%<sup>E</sup>).
- Approximately one in three (34%) residents of Guelph who experienced a major emergency or disaster in Canada in a community where they were living at the time of the event and which were significant enough to disrupt their regular

daily routine also endured a loss of property or financial impact.

## Emergency planning, precautionary and fire safety behaviours

- Three-quarters (74%) of people residing in Guelph lived in households that were engaged in at least two emergency planning activities,<sup>6</sup> and nearly one-half (47%) lived in households with three or four such activities (Table 1.2). Less than one in ten (7%<sup>E</sup>) people lived in a household that had not participated in any emergency planning activities.
- Half (50%) lived in a household with at least two precautionary measures<sup>7</sup> taken in case of an emergency, but less than one-quarter (22%) lived in a household with three or four such measures. About one in seven (14%) people lived in a household with no precautionary measures in place.
- Almost all (99%) residents reported living in a household with a working smoke detector, and two-thirds (66%) reported living in a household with a working fire extinguisher (Table 1.3). Over three-quarters (80%) of residents stated that they had a working carbon monoxide detector in their household. Over half (56%) of the residents of Guelph stated that they had implemented all three fire safety measures within their households.
- For the most part, the number of emergency planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents of Guelph did not differ from residents of Ontario overall or those residing in Canada's 10 provinces. Guelph residents (15%), however, were less likely than both Ontarians (21%) and Canadians (19%) to have engaged in all four emergency planning activities. Those in Guelph (56%), however, were more likely to have taken all three fire safety measures than Canadians (42%).<sup>8</sup>
- In terms of specific types of emergency planning activities and precautionary measures, residents of Guelph did not differ for the most part from residents of Ontario and Canada's 10 provinces overall. They were, however, less likely to have a household emergency supply kit (41%) or a back-up generator (14%) when compared to Ontarians (47% and 20%, respectively) and Canadians (47% and 23%, respectively).

## Social networks and sense of belonging

- More than half (58%) of Guelph's residents had a strong sense of belonging<sup>9</sup> to their community.
- Most (90%) residents described the neighbourhood they lived in as a place where neighbours generally help each other.<sup>10</sup> Of those who did not describe their neighbourhood this way, most (80%) still described it as a place where neighbours would help each other in an emergency.<sup>11</sup>
- Many individuals had a large network of support in the event of an emergency or disaster, with more than five people to turn to for emotional support (63%), for help if physically injured (63%) as well as in case of a home evacuation (60%). However, three in ten residents had a large support network if financial help was needed (30%). Few residents (6%) had no one to turn to for financial support.
- High levels of sense of belonging, self-efficacy, neighbourhood trust and social support, as well as civic engagement and involvement in political activities were not associated with a higher level of emergency preparedness (Table 1.4).

## Data tables

**Table 1.1**  
Most commonly anticipated sources of initial help and information, by type of emergency or disaster, residents of Guelph, Ontario, 2014

Most common sources of initial help and information by type of emergency or disaster	percent
<b>Weather-related emergency or natural disaster</b>	
News- Radio	36
News- Television	28
News- Internet	26
<b>Extended power outages<sup>1</sup></b>	
Utility company	34
News- Radio	23
Family	16

<b>Outbreak of serious or life-threatening disease</b>		
Hospital, clinic, doctor or other medical professional		54
News- Internet		24
News- Television		22
<b>Industrial or transportation accident</b>		
News- Radio		34
News- Television		30
News- Internet		28
<b>Contamination or shortage of water or food</b>		
Local government		31
News- Radio		19
News- Internet		17 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Act of terrorism or terrorist threat</b>		
News- Television		35
Police/law enforcement		31
News- Radio		22 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Rioting or civil unrest</b>		
Police/law enforcement		37
News- Television		30 <sup>E</sup>
News- Radio		25 <sup>E</sup>
<sup>E</sup> use with caution		
1 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% when respondents were asked about their likely sources of initial help and information.		
<b>Note:</b> Respondents who perceived their community was at risk for any form of emergency or disaster were then asked where they would turn to first for information or assistance in the event of the perceived emergency or disaster. Respondents could provide more than one response. Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.		
<b>Source:</b> Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.		

**Table 1.2**  
**Number of emergency planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents, community of Guelph, Ontario, 2014**

Number of planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents	Guelph	Ontario	Canada
	percent		
<b>Number of emergency planning activities</b>			
None	7 <sup>E</sup>	8	8
1 activity	17	16	17
2 activities	27	25	25
3 activities	32	28	27
4 activities	15 <sup>***</sup>	21	19
<b>Number of precautionary measures</b>			
None	14	15	16
1 measure	34 <sup>***</sup>	28	27
2 measures	28	29	28
3 measures	17	20	20
4 measures	5 <sup>E</sup>	6	7
<b>Number of fire safety measures <sup>1</sup></b>			
None	F	F	1

1 measure	8 **	7	14
2 measures	32 **	35	38
3 measures	56 **	53	42

<sup>E</sup> use with caution  
<sup>F</sup> too unreliable to be published

\*\* significantly different from Canada level estimate (p < 0.05)

\*\*\* significantly different from both provincial and Canada level estimates (p < 0.05)

1 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Canada'.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents. Emergency planning activities include: an emergency exit plan, an emergency supply kit, photocopies/electronic copies of important documents and a list of emergency contact numbers. Precautionary measures include: a battery-operated or wind-up radio, an alternative heat source, a back-up generator and an alternative water source. Fire safety measures include a working smoke detector, a working carbon monoxide detector and a working fire extinguisher.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

**Table 1.3**  
**Planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures residents engaged in, community of Guelph, Ontario, 2014**

Residents whose households were involved in the following:	Guelph	Ontario	Canada
	percent		
<b>Emergency planning activities</b>			
Emergency exit plan	65	63	60
Exit plan has been practised/reviewed in last 12 months <sup>1</sup>	43	47	46
Designated meeting place for household members <sup>2</sup>	30	30	33
Contact plan for household members <sup>2</sup>	55	57	55
Household emergency supply kit	41 ***	47	47
Vehicle emergency supply kit <sup>3</sup>	63	62	59
Extra copies of important documents	51	56	53
List of emergency contact numbers	73	71	69
Plan for meeting special health needs <sup>4</sup>	52	61	62
<b>Precautionary measures</b>			
Wind-up or battery-operated radio	61	59	58
Alternate heat source	47	46	48
Back-up generator	14 ***	20	23
Alternate water source	43	44	43
Other <sup>5</sup>	20	22	21
<b>Fire safety measures</b>			
Working smoke detector	99 **	99	98
Working carbon monoxide detector	80 **	80	60
Working fire extinguisher	66	64	66

\*\* significantly different from Canada level estimate (p < 0.05)

\*\*\* significantly different from both provincial and Canada level estimates (p < 0.05)

1 Percentage based only on those indicating that they have an emergency exit plan.

2 Excludes Canadians living in single-person households.

3 Excludes those who reported that they lived in a household that did not have a vehicle.

4 Percentage based only on those indicating that they or someone in their household has special medical needs.

5 'Other precautionary measures' include having an escape/rescue plan for pets, extra supply of fuel, checking and replenishing emergency supplies, and keeping exits clear.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

**Table 1.4**  
**High or moderately high levels of emergency planning, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents, by social and political involvement, community of Guelph, Ontario, 2014**

Social and political involvement	Percentage of residents who had high or moderately high levels of...		
	Planning activities	Precautionary measures	Fire safety measures
	percent		
<b>Engagement in political activities <sup>1</sup></b>			
Yes †	48	24	59
No <sup>7</sup>	35 <sup>E</sup>	20 <sup>E</sup>	50 <sup>E</sup>
<b>High level of civic engagement <sup>2</sup></b>			
Yes †	48	25	57
No	42	21 <sup>E</sup>	58
<b>High level of social support <sup>3</sup></b>			
Yes †	50	20 <sup>E</sup>	63
No	46	24	53
<b>Strong sense of belonging to community <sup>4</sup></b>			
Yes †	49	23	55
No	45	22	58
<b>High neighbourhood trust <sup>5</sup></b>			
Yes †	50	25	58
No	45	21	55
<b>High level of self-efficacy <sup>6</sup></b>			
Yes †	44	26	58
No <sup>7</sup>	51	20 <sup>E</sup>	55

<sup>E</sup> use with caution

† reference category

- 1 Includes individuals over the age of 17 years who are eligible to vote, and who have participated in or volunteered for political parties or events in the past 12 months, including municipal, provincial, or federal elections, or expressed views on political or social issues through signing a petition, contacting news agencies or politicians, or attended a meeting involving social or community issues.
- 2 Civic engagement measures individuals over the age of 17 years who were involved in a recreational group or organization in the past 12 months, and includes engagement in political activities. A 'high level' is defined as having been involved in at least 4 activities in the past 12 months.
- 3 A 'high level of social support' is defined as having five or more people whom that individual could turn to for help in an emergency if they are physically injured, require emotional support, shelter, and/or financial assistance.
- 4 A 'strong sense of belonging to community' is rating one's own sense of belonging to their community as a 4 or a 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "very weak" and 5 "very strong".
- 5 'High neighbourhood trust' is rating one's own trust in the people in one's neighbourhood as 4 or 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "cannot be trusted at all" and 5 represents "can be trusted a lot", as well as having a response of "very likely" when asked about the likelihood of someone in their neighbourhood returning a lost wallet or purse containing two hundred dollars with the money still inside.
- 6 A 'high level of self-efficacy' is derived from having a high self-rating on a scale of 1 (poor) to 5 (excellent) for the following three categories: an ability to think clearly and solve day-to-day problems, to handle unexpected and difficult problems, and to figure out what to do if faced with an emergency situation.
- 7 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Fire safety measures'.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents. Households with 'moderately high' or 'high' levels of emergency planning engaged in 3 or 4 of the following: having an exit plan, an emergency supply kit, extra copies of important documents and an emergency contact list. 'Moderately high' or 'high' levels of precautionary measures include having 3 or 4 of the following: a wind-up or battery operated radio, a back-up generator, an alternate source of heat and additional water. 'Moderately high' or 'high' levels of fire safety measure include having all 3 of the following: a working smoke detector, a working fire extinguisher, and a working carbon monoxide detector.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

## Notes

<sup>E</sup> use with caution

- 1 A Census Metropolitan Area (CMA) or a Census Agglomeration (CA) is formed by one or more adjacent municipalities centred on a population centre (known as the core). A CMA must have a total population of at least 100,000 of which 50,000 or more must live in the core. A CA must have a core population of at least 10,000. To be included in the CMA or CA, other adjacent municipalities must have a high degree of integration with the core as measured by commuting flows derived from census data.
- 2 The target population for the SEPR included all persons 15 years of age or older, residing in households in Canada's 10 provinces, excluding full-time residents of institutions (e.g. nursing homes, group homes, hospitals).
- 3 The SEPR covers three types of communities: Census Metropolitan Areas (CMAs), Census Agglomerations (CAs) with population greater than 50,000, and 'smaller communities' which include CAs with population 50,000 or less and those areas that fall outside of CMAs and CAs. All CMAs and CAs (with population greater than 50,000) were included in the SEPR. A sample of households were selected from smaller communities within each province to represent all households within the province in similar communities. Additional information on the SEPR and its sampling methodology can be found in the 'Survey description' section.
- 4 Throughout this fact sheet, responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.
- 5 This section focuses on personal experiences with emergencies or disasters that happened in Canada, in a community where the person was living at the time, and was significant enough to severely interrupt the individual's regular daily activities.
- 6 Emergency planning activities include: having an emergency exit plan, a household emergency supply kit, extra copies of important documents and an emergency contact list.

- 7 Precautionary measures include: having a wind-up or battery-operated radio, an alternate heat source such as a non-electric stove or heater or a wood-burning fireplace, a back-up generator and an alternative water source such as a well, tank or litres of stored water.
- 8 Unless otherwise specified, differences are statistically significant ( $p < 0.05$ ).
- 9 A 'strong sense of belonging to community' is rating one's own sense of belonging to their community as a 4 or a 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "very weak" and 5 "very strong".
- 10 A proportion (10%) of respondents were not asked questions regarding neighbourhood helpfulness in the event of an emergency and as such these cases are not included in the analysis on neighbourhood helpfulness in general or in the event of an emergency.
- 11 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were 13% when respondents were asked if the neighbourhood they lived in was a place where neighbours would help each other in an emergency.



## Fact sheet Community of London (CMA), Ontario

---

In 2014, information on the emergency preparedness of people living in the Census Metropolitan Area<sup>1</sup> of London was collected through the Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada (SEPR).<sup>2</sup> This fact sheet presents information on the risk awareness and level of emergency preparedness of the residents of London, which could help improve the understanding of community resilience in the event of an emergency.<sup>3,4</sup>

### Risk awareness and anticipated sources of help in an emergency or disaster

- Winter storms (including blizzards, ice storms and extreme cold) (95%), extended power outages lasting 24 hours or longer (77%) and heat waves (66%) were named by residents of London as the most likely events to occur within their community.
- Residents most commonly anticipated turning to television news as an initial source for help and information if they were faced with a weather-related emergency or natural disaster (34%), and to radio news in the event of an industrial or transportation accident (36%) (Table 1.1).
- Police or law enforcement was most frequently anticipated as the first source for help or information in a situation of rioting or civil unrest (39%<sup>E</sup>) or in the event of an act of terrorism or terrorist threat (34%). Residents also stated (55%) that hospitals, clinics, doctors and other medical professionals were the most common sources of initial help and information in the event of an outbreak of a serious or life-threatening disease. In the event of a contamination or shortage of water or food, they most frequently said they would seek help from local government (28%), and in the event of an extended power outage, residents would commonly first turn to their utility company (39%).

### Prior lifetime experience with a major emergency or disaster<sup>5</sup>

- About four in ten (42%) London residents have faced a major emergency or disaster in Canada in a community they were living in at the time of the event, almost three-quarters (73%) of whom reported experiencing severe disruptions to their daily activities as a result of the event.
- Extended power outages lasting 24 hours or longer (61%) and winter storms which include blizzards and ice storms (33%) were the most commonly experienced emergencies or disasters by residents of London.
- The most common types of disruption to daily activities endured by residents who had experienced a major emergency or disaster included the inability to use electrical appliances (72%) or to heat or cool their home (56%), as well as missing school or work (63%). More severe disruptions included home evacuations, experienced by 9%<sup>E</sup> of people faced with an emergency, as well as an inability to use roads or transportation within the community (33%) or communicate outside of the home (13%<sup>E</sup>).
- Most (95%) residents who experienced an emergency or disaster were able to resume their daily activities within one week of the event: 28% within 24 hours, 42% in one to two days and 22%<sup>E</sup> in three to five days.
- Almost half (46%) of residents who had experienced an emergency or disaster received help during or immediately following the event, most commonly from a neighbour (42%<sup>E</sup>) or family member (22%<sup>E</sup>).
- Less than one in five (17%<sup>E</sup>) residents of London who experienced a major emergency or disaster in Canada in a community where they were living at the time of the event and which was significant enough to disrupt their regular daily routine also endured a loss of property or financial impact.



## Emergency planning, precautionary and fire safety behaviours

- About three-quarters (76%) of residents in London lived in households that were engaged in at least two emergency planning activities,<sup>6</sup> almost half (47%) lived in households with three or four such activities (Table 1.2). Few (5%<sup>E</sup>) people lived in a household that had not participated in any emergency planning activities.
- About half (52%) lived in a household with at least two precautionary measures<sup>7</sup> taken in case of an emergency, with about one in five (19%) living in a household with three or four such measures. About one in six (16%<sup>E</sup>) people lived in a household with no precautionary measures in place.
- Almost all (99.7%) residents reported living in a household with a working smoke detector, and about three-quarters (77%) reported living in a household with a working carbon monoxide detector (Table 1.3). Nearly two-thirds (64%) stated that they had a working fire extinguisher in their household. Just over half (53%) of the residents of London stated that they had implemented all three fire safety measures within their households.
- Generally, the emergency planning, fire safety and precautionary measures of residents of London did not significantly differ from residents of Ontario or Canada's 10 provinces overall. Residents (5%<sup>E</sup>) were, however, significantly less likely to have taken no emergency planning activities than residents of Ontario (8%) or Canada's 10 provinces (8%) overall. In addition, London residents (53%) were significantly more likely than Canadians (42%) to have implemented all three fire safety measures.<sup>8</sup>
- In terms of the types of activities and measures residents engaged in, the proportion of London residents who had an emergency exit plan (72%) or a working smoke detector (99.7%) within their households was significantly higher than for Ontarians or Canadians overall, while the proportion of those who had a household emergency supply kit (38%) or an alternate water source (37%) was lower.

## Social networks and sense of belonging

- More than half (55%) of London's residents had a strong sense of belonging<sup>9</sup> to their community.
- Most (90%) residents described the neighbourhood they lived in as a place where neighbours generally help each other.<sup>10</sup> Of those who did not describe their neighbourhood this way, most (90%) still described it as a place where neighbours would help each other in an emergency.<sup>11</sup>
- Many individuals had a large network of support in the event of an emergency or disaster, with more than five people to turn to for emotional support (67%), for help if physically injured (65%) as well as in case of a home evacuation (58%). However, fewer residents had a large support network if financial help was needed (26%), and 8%<sup>E</sup> reported that they had no one to turn to for financial help.<sup>12</sup>
- High levels of self-efficacy, social support, as well as civic engagement and involvement in political activities were sometimes associated with a higher level of emergency preparedness (Table 1.4).

## Data tables

Table 1.1

Most commonly anticipated sources of initial help and information, by type of emergency or disaster, residents of London, Ontario, 2014

Most common sources of initial help and information by type of emergency or disaster	percent
<b>Weather-related emergency or natural disaster</b>	
News- Television	34
News- Radio	31
News- Internet	25
<b>Extended power outages<sup>1</sup></b>	
Utility company	39
News- Radio	22
Family	14 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Outbreak of serious or life-threatening disease</b>	
Hospital, clinic, doctor or other medical professional	55

News- Internet	24
News- Television	24
<b>Industrial or transportation accident</b>	
News- Radio	36
News- Television	29
News- Internet	21
<b>Contamination or shortage of water or food</b>	
Local government	28
News- Radio	27
News- Television	24
<b>Act of terrorism or terrorist threat</b>	
Police/law enforcement	34
News- Radio	29 <sup>E</sup>
News- Television	28
<b>Rioting or civil unrest</b>	
Police/law enforcement	39 <sup>E</sup>
News- Radio	31 <sup>E</sup>
News- Internet	30 <sup>E</sup>
<sup>E</sup> use with caution	
1 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% when respondents were asked about their likely sources of initial help and information.	
<b>Note:</b> Respondents who perceived their community was at risk for any form of emergency or disaster were then asked where they would turn to first for information or assistance in the event of the perceived emergency or disaster. Respondents could provide more than one response. Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.	
<b>Source:</b> Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.	

**Table 1.2**  
**Number of emergency planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents, community of London, Ontario, 2014**

Number of planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents	London	Ontario	Canada
	percent		
<b>Number of emergency planning activities</b>			
None	5 <sup>E</sup> ***	8	8
1 activity	17	16	17
2 activities	29	25	25
3 activities	29	28	27
4 activities	18	21	19
<b>Number of precautionary measures</b>			
None	16 <sup>E</sup>	15	16
1 measure	30	28	27
2 measures	33	29	28
3 measures	13 ***	20	20
4 measures	6 <sup>E</sup>	6	7
<b>Number of fire safety measures <sup>1</sup></b>			
None	F	F	1
1 measure	11 <sup>E</sup> *	7	14
2 measures	32	35	38

3 measures	53 **	53	42
<p><sup>E</sup> use with caution  <sup>F</sup> too unreliable to be published</p> <p>* significantly different from provincial level estimate (p &lt; 0.05)</p> <p>** significantly different from Canada level estimate (p &lt; 0.05)</p> <p>*** significantly different from both provincial and Canada level estimates (p &lt; 0.05)</p> <p>1 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Canada'.</p> <p><b>Note:</b> Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents. Emergency planning activities include: an emergency exit plan, an emergency supply kit, photocopies/electronic copies of important documents and a list of emergency contact numbers. Precautionary measures include: a battery-operated or wind-up radio, an alternative heat source, a back-up generator and an alternative water source. Fire safety measures include a working smoke detector, a working carbon monoxide detector and a working fire extinguisher.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.</p>			

**Table 1.3**  
**Planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures residents engaged in, community of London, Ontario, 2014**

Residents whose households were involved in the following:	London	Ontario	Canada
	percent		
<b>Emergency planning activities</b>			
Emergency exit plan	72 ***	63	60
Exit plan has been practised/reviewed in last 12 months <sup>1</sup>	43	47	46
Designated meeting place for household members <sup>2</sup>	37	30	33
Contact plan for household members <sup>2</sup>	56	57	55
Household emergency supply kit	38 ***	47	47
Vehicle emergency supply kit <sup>3</sup>	66	62	59
Extra copies of important documents	57	56	53
List of emergency contact numbers	71	71	69
Plan for meeting special health needs <sup>4</sup>	62	61	62
<b>Precautionary measures</b>			
Wind-up or battery-operated radio	58	59	58
Alternate heat source	48	46	48
Back-up generator	17 **	20	23
Alternate water source	37 ***	44	43
Other <sup>5</sup>	23	22	21
<b>Fire safety measures</b>			
Working smoke detector	100 ***	99	98
Working carbon monoxide detector	77 **	80	60
Working fire extinguisher	64	64	66

\*\* significantly different from Canada level estimate (p < 0.05)

\*\*\* significantly different from both provincial and Canada level estimates (p < 0.05)

1 Percentage based only on those indicating that they have an emergency exit plan.

2 Excludes Canadians living in single-person households.

3 Excludes those who reported that they lived in a household that did not have a vehicle.

4 Percentage based only on those indicating that they or someone in their household has special medical needs.

5 'Other precautionary measures' include having an escape/rescue plan for pets, extra supply of fuel, checking and replenishing emergency supplies, and keeping exits clear.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

**Table 1.4**

**High or moderately high levels of emergency planning, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents, by social and political involvement, community of London, Ontario, 2014**

Social and political involvement	Percentage of residents who had high or moderately high levels of...		
	Planning activities	Precautionary measures	Fire safety measures
	percent		
<b>Engagement in political activities <sup>1</sup></b>			
Yes †	48	21	59
No <sup>7 8</sup>	42 <sup>E</sup>	19 <sup>E</sup>	37 <sup>E *</sup>
<b>High level of civic engagement <sup>2</sup></b>			
Yes †	49	24	61
No <sup>7 8</sup>	41	15 <sup>E</sup>	40 <sup>*</sup>
<b>High level of social support <sup>3</sup></b>			
Yes †	60	36 <sup>E</sup>	68
No	43 <sup>*</sup>	13 <sup>*</sup>	50 <sup>*</sup>
<b>Strong sense of belonging to community <sup>4</sup></b>			
Yes †	52	21	60
No	40	17 <sup>E</sup>	48
<b>High neighbourhood trust <sup>5</sup></b>			
Yes †	53	24 <sup>E</sup>	55
No	43	16 <sup>E</sup>	54
<b>High level of self-efficacy <sup>6</sup></b>			
Yes †	57	22	53
No	38 <sup>*</sup>	17 <sup>E</sup>	55

<sup>E</sup> use with caution

\* significantly different from reference category ( $p < 0.05$ )

† reference category

- 1 Includes individuals over the age of 17 years who are eligible to vote, and who have participated in or volunteered for political parties or events in the past 12 months, including municipal, provincial, or federal elections, or expressed views on political or social issues through signing a petition, contacting news agencies or politicians, or attended a meeting involving social or community issues.
- 2 Civic engagement measures individuals over the age of 17 years who were involved in a recreational group or organization in the past 12 months, and includes engagement in political activities. A 'high level' is defined as having been involved in at least 4 activities in the past 12 months.
- 3 A 'high level of social support' is defined as having five or more people whom that individual could turn to for help in an emergency if they are physically injured, require emotional support, shelter, and/or financial assistance.
- 4 A 'strong sense of belonging to community' is rating one's own sense of belonging to their community as a 4 or a 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "very weak" and 5 "very strong".
- 5 'High neighbourhood trust' is rating one's own trust in the people in one's neighbourhood as 4 or 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "cannot be trusted at all" and 5 represents "can be trusted a lot", as well as having a response of "very likely" when asked about the likelihood of someone in their neighbourhood returning a lost wallet or purse containing two hundred dollars with the money still inside.
- 6 A 'high level of self-efficacy' is derived from having a high self-rating on a scale of 1 (poor) to 5 (excellent) for the following three categories: an ability to think clearly and solve day-to-day problems, to handle unexpected and difficult problems, and to figure out what to do if faced with an emergency situation.
- 7 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Precautionary measures'.
- 8 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Fire safety measures'.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents. Households with 'moderately high' or 'high' levels of emergency planning engaged in 3 or 4 of the following: having an exit plan, an emergency supply kit, extra copies of important documents and an emergency contact list. 'Moderately high' or 'high' levels of precautionary measures include having 3 or 4 of the following: a wind-up or battery operated radio, a back-up generator, an alternate source of heat and additional water. 'Moderately high' or 'high' levels of fire safety measure include having all 3 of the following: a working smoke detector, a working fire extinguisher, and a working carbon monoxide detector.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

## Notes

<sup>E</sup> use with caution

- 1 A Census Metropolitan Area (CMA) or a Census Agglomeration (CA) is formed by one or more adjacent municipalities centred on a population centre (known as the core). A CMA must have a total population of at least 100,000 of which 50,000 or more must live in the core. A CA must have a core population of at least 10,000. To be included in the CMA or CA, other adjacent municipalities must have a high degree of integration with the core as measured by commuting flows derived from census data.
- 2 The target population for the SEPR included all persons 15 years of age or older, residing in households in Canada's 10 provinces, excluding full-time residents of institutions (e.g. nursing homes, group homes, hospitals).
- 3 The SEPR covers three types of communities: Census Metropolitan Areas (CMAs), Census Agglomerations (CAs) with population greater than 50,000, and 'smaller communities' which include CAs with population 50,000 or less and those areas that fall outside of CMAs and CAs. All CMAs and CAs (with population greater than 50,000) were included in the SEPR. A sample of households were selected from smaller communities within each province to represent all households within the province in similar communities. Additional information on the SEPR and its sampling methodology can be found in the 'Survey description' section.
- 4 Throughout this fact sheet, responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.
- 5 This section focuses on personal experiences with emergencies or disasters that happened in Canada, in a community where the person was living at the time, and was significant enough to severely interrupt the individual's regular daily activities.

- 6 Emergency planning activities include: having an emergency exit plan, a household emergency supply kit, extra copies of important documents and an emergency contact list.
- 7 Precautionary measures include: having a wind-up or battery-operated radio, an alternate heat source such as a non-electric stove or heater or a wood-burning fireplace, a back-up generator and an alternative water source such as a well, tank or litres of stored water.
- 8 Unless otherwise specified, differences are statistically significant ( $p < 0.05$ ).
- 9 A 'strong sense of belonging to community' is rating one's own sense of belonging to their community as a 4 or a 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "very weak" and 5 "very strong".
- 10 A proportion (22%) of respondents were not asked questions regarding neighbourhood helpfulness in the event of an emergency and as such these cases are not included in the analysis on neighbourhood helpfulness in general or in the event of an emergency.
- 11 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% when respondents were asked about whether their neighbourhood is a place where neighbours would help each other if there is an emergency.
- 12 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% when respondents were asked about the number of people they could turn to for help if financial support is needed.



## Fact sheet Community of Chatham–Kent (CA), Ontario

---

In 2014, information on the emergency preparedness of people living in the Census Agglomeration<sup>1</sup> of Chatham–Kent was collected through the Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada (SEPR).<sup>2</sup> This fact sheet presents information on the risk awareness and level of emergency preparedness of the residents of Chatham–Kent, which could help improve the understanding of community resilience in the event of an emergency.<sup>3,4</sup>

### Risk awareness and anticipated sources of help in an emergency or disaster

- Winter storms (including blizzards, ice storms and extreme cold) (89%), extended power outages lasting 24 hours or longer (73%) and heat waves (60%) were named by residents of Chatham–Kent as the events most likely to occur within their community.
- Residents most commonly anticipated turning to news on the radio as an initial source for help and information if they were faced with an industrial or transportation accident (44%), an act of terrorism or terrorist threat (43%<sup>E</sup>), a weather-related emergency or natural disaster (41%), or in the event of a contamination or shortage of water or food (31%) (Table 1.1).
- Residents listed hospitals, clinics, doctors or other medical professionals as the most common sources of initial help and information in the event of an outbreak of a serious or life-threatening disease (57%). In the event of an extended power outage, residents would commonly first turn to their utility company (38%). In the event of rioting or civil unrest, the police were most commonly listed as the first source of help and information (41%<sup>E</sup>).

### Prior lifetime experience with a major emergency or disaster<sup>5</sup>

- Close to half (46%) of Chatham–Kent residents has faced a major emergency or disaster in Canada in a community they were living in at the time of the event, seven in ten (70%) of whom reported experiencing severe disruptions to their daily activities as a result of the event.
- Extended power outages lasting 24 hours or longer (69%) were the most commonly experienced emergency or disaster by residents of Chatham–Kent, followed by winter storms (including blizzards and ice storms) (18%<sup>E</sup>).
- The most common types of disruption to daily activities endured by residents who had experienced a major emergency or disaster included the inability to use electrical appliances (66%) or to heat or cool their homes (60%), as well as missing work or school (61%). More severe disruptions were home evacuations (14%<sup>E</sup>), as well as an inability to communicate outside of the home (25%<sup>E</sup>) or use roads or transportation within the community (19%<sup>E</sup>).
- Most (93%) residents who experienced an emergency or disaster were able to resume their daily activities within one week of the event: 37% within 24 hours, and another 37% in one to two days.
- About four in ten (42%) residents who had experienced an emergency or disaster received help during or immediately following the event, most commonly from a family member (49%<sup>E</sup>) or neighbour (36%<sup>E</sup>).
- About one in five (19%<sup>E</sup>) residents of Chatham–Kent who experienced a major emergency or disaster in Canada in a community where they were living at the time of the event and which were significant enough to disrupt their regular daily routine also endured a loss of property or financial impact.

### Emergency planning, precautionary and fire safety behaviours

- Over two-thirds (69%) of people residing in Chatham–Kent lived in households that were engaged in at least two emergency planning activities,<sup>6</sup> while 46% lived in households with three or four such activities (Table 1.2). Few (7%<sup>E</sup>) people lived in a household that had not participated in any emergency planning activities.
- Over half (58%) lived in a household with at least two precautionary measures<sup>7</sup> taken in case of an emergency, and three in ten (29%) lived in a household with three or four such measures. One in ten (10%<sup>E</sup>) people lived in a household with no precautionary measures in place.
- Almost all (99%) residents reported living in a household with a working smoke detector, and about three-quarters (77%) reported living in a household with a working carbon monoxide detector (Table 1.3). Seven in ten (70%) residents stated that they had a working fire extinguisher in their household. Over half (56%) of the residents of Chatham–Kent stated that they had implemented all three fire safety measures within their households, a higher rate compared to residents of Canada's 10 provinces overall (42%).<sup>8</sup>
- Generally, the number of emergency planning, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents of Chatham–Kent did not significantly differ from Ontarians or Canadians overall. Residents were, however, significantly more likely to have certain activities and measures in place. In particular, they were more likely to have a back-up generator (30%) or alternate water source (52%) than Ontarians (20% and 44%, respectively) and Canadians (23% and 43%, respectively) more broadly. Residents in Chatham–Kent were also more likely to have a contact plan for household members (66%) and a vehicle emergency supply kit (71%) than Ontarians (57% and 62%, respectively) and Canadians (55% and 59%, respectively).

## Social networks and sense of belonging

- Two-thirds (67%) of Chatham–Kent's residents had a strong sense of belonging<sup>9</sup> to their community.
- Most (90%) residents described the neighbourhood they lived in as a place where neighbours generally help each other.<sup>10</sup> Of those who did not describe their neighbourhood this way, most (91%) still described it as a place where neighbours would help each other in an emergency.<sup>11</sup>
- Many individuals had a large network of support in the event of an emergency or disaster, with more than five people to turn to for help if physically injured (68%), in the event of a home evacuation (66%) and for emotional support (63%). About three in ten residents had a large support network if financial help was needed (28%). However, 5% reported that they had no one to turn to for financial help.<sup>12</sup>
- High levels of sense of belonging, self-efficacy and neighbourhood trust, as well as civic engagement and involvement in political activities, were sometimes associated with a higher level of emergency preparedness (Table 1.4).

## Data tables

**Table 1.1**

**Most commonly anticipated sources of initial help and information, by type of emergency or disaster, residents of Chatham–Kent, Ontario, 2014**

Most common sources of initial help and information by type of emergency or disaster	percent
<b>Weather-related emergency or natural disaster</b>	
News- Radio	41
News- Television	23
News- Internet	22
<b>Extended power outages</b>	
Utility company	38
News- Radio	27
Family	16 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Outbreak of serious or life-threatening disease</b>	
Hospital, clinic, doctor or other medical professional	57
News- Radio	23 <sup>E</sup>
News- Internet	21 <sup>E</sup>



<b>Industrial or transportation accident</b>	
News- Radio	44
Police/law enforcement	25 <sup>E</sup>
News- Internet	19 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Contamination or shortage of water or food <sup>1</sup></b>	
News- Radio	31
News- Internet	20 <sup>E</sup>
News- Television	17 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Act of terrorism or terrorist threat</b>	
News- Radio	43 <sup>E</sup>
News- Television	36 <sup>E</sup>
Police/law enforcement	27 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Rioting or civil unrest</b>	
Police/law enforcement	41 <sup>E</sup>
<sup>E</sup> use with caution	
1 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% when respondents were asked about their likely sources of initial help and information.	
<b>Note:</b> Respondents who perceived their community was at risk for any form of emergency or disaster were then asked where they would turn to first for information or assistance in the event of the perceived emergency or disaster. Respondents could provide more than one response. Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.	
<b>Source:</b> Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.	

**Table 1.2**  
**Number of emergency planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents, community of Chatham–Kent, Ontario, 2014**

Number of planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents	Chatham–Kent	Ontario	Canada
	percent		
<b>Number of emergency planning activities</b>			
None	7 <sup>E</sup>	8	8
1 activity	21	16	17
2 activities	23	25	25
3 activities	28	28	27
4 activities	18	21	19
<b>Number of precautionary measures <sup>1</sup></b>			
None	10 <sup>E</sup> ***	15	16
1 measure	26	28	27
2 measures	29	29	28
3 measures	20	20	20
4 measures	9 <sup>E</sup>	6	7
<b>Number of fire safety measures <sup>2</sup></b>			
None	F	F	1
1 measure	7 <sup>E</sup> **	7	14
2 measures	33	35	38
3 measures	56 **	53	42

E use with caution  
 F too unreliable to be published

\*\* significantly different from Canada level estimate (p < 0.05)

\*\*\* significantly different from both provincial and Canada level estimates (p < 0.05)

1 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Chatham-Kent'.

2 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Canada'.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents. Emergency planning activities include: an emergency exit plan, an emergency supply kit, photocopies/electronic copies of important documents and a list of emergency contact numbers. Precautionary measures include: a battery-operated or wind-up radio, an alternative heat source, a back-up generator and an alternative water source. Fire safety measures include a working smoke detector, a working carbon monoxide detector and a working fire extinguisher.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

**Table 1.3**  
**Planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures residents engaged in, community of Chatham-Kent, Ontario, 2014**

Residents whose households were involved in the following:	Chatham-Kent	Ontario	Canada
	percent		
<b>Emergency planning activities</b>			
Emergency exit plan	67	63	60
Exit plan has been practised/reviewed in last 12 months <sup>1</sup>	52	47	46
Designated meeting place for household members <sup>2</sup>	35	30	33
Contact plan for household members <sup>2</sup>	66 ***	57	55
Household emergency supply kit	43	47	47
Vehicle emergency supply kit <sup>3</sup>	71 ***	62	59
Extra copies of important documents	47 *	56	53
List of emergency contact numbers	69	71	69
Plan for meeting special health needs <sup>4</sup>	64	61	62
<b>Precautionary measures</b>			
Wind-up or battery-operated radio	61	59	58
Alternate heat source	42	46	48
Back-up generator	30 ***	20	23
Alternate water source	52 ***	44	43
Other <sup>5</sup>	21	22	21
<b>Fire safety measures</b>			
Working smoke detector	99 **	99	98
Working carbon monoxide detector	77 **	80	60
Working fire extinguisher	70	64	66

\* significantly different from provincial level estimate (p < 0.05)

\*\* significantly different from Canada level estimate (p < 0.05)

\*\*\* significantly different from both provincial and Canada level estimates (p < 0.05)

1 Percentage based only on those indicating that they have an emergency exit plan.

2 Excludes Canadians living in single-person households.

3 Excludes those who reported that they lived in a household that did not have a vehicle.

4 Percentage based only on those indicating that they or someone in their household has special medical needs.

5 'Other precautionary measures' include having an escape/rescue plan for pets, extra supply of fuel, checking and replenishing emergency supplies, and keeping exits clear.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

**Table 1.4**

**High or moderately high levels of emergency planning, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents, by social and political involvement, community of Chatham–Kent, Ontario, 2014**

Social and political involvement	Percentage of residents who had high or moderately high levels of...		
	Planning activities	Precautionary measures	Fire safety measures
	percent		
<b>Engagement in political activities <sup>1</sup></b>			
Yes †	54	30	60
No	24 <sup>E *</sup>	34 <sup>E</sup>	50 <sup>E</sup>
<b>High level of civic engagement <sup>2</sup></b>			
Yes †	56	28	62
No	35 <sup>E *</sup>	34 <sup>E</sup>	52
<b>High level of social support <sup>3</sup></b>			
Yes †	56	30 <sup>E</sup>	55
No <sup>7</sup>	42	28	56
<b>Strong sense of belonging to community <sup>4</sup></b>			
Yes <sup>7 †</sup>	48	29	62
No <sup>8</sup>	44	28 <sup>E</sup>	44 <sup>*</sup>
<b>High neighbourhood trust <sup>5</sup></b>			
Yes †	50	35	61
No <sup>7</sup>	42	22 <sup>E *</sup>	50
<b>High level of self-efficacy <sup>6</sup></b>			
Yes †	50	35	61
No <sup>8 9</sup>	41	21 <sup>E *</sup>	50

<sup>E</sup> use with caution

\* significantly different from reference category ( $p < 0.05$ )

† reference category

- 1 Includes individuals over the age of 17 years who are eligible to vote, and who have participated in or volunteered for political parties or events in the past 12 months, including municipal, provincial, or federal elections, or expressed views on political or social issues through signing a petition, contacting news agencies or politicians, or attended a meeting involving social or community issues.
- 2 Civic engagement measures individuals over the age of 17 years who were involved in a recreational group or organization in the past 12 months, and includes engagement in political activities. A 'high level' is defined as having been involved in at least 4 activities in the past 12 months.
- 3 A 'high level of social support' is defined as having five or more people whom that individual could turn to for help in an emergency if they are physically injured, require emotional support, shelter, and/or financial assistance.
- 4 A 'strong sense of belonging to community' is rating one's own sense of belonging to their community as a 4 or a 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "very weak" and 5 "very strong".
- 5 'High neighbourhood trust' is rating one's own trust in the people in one's neighbourhood as 4 or 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "cannot be trusted at all" and 5 represents "can be trusted a lot", as well as having a response of "very likely" when asked about the likelihood of someone in their neighbourhood returning a lost wallet or purse containing two hundred dollars with the money still inside.
- 6 A 'high level of self-efficacy' is derived from having a high self-rating on a scale of 1 (poor) to 5 (excellent) for the following three categories: an ability to think clearly and solve day-to-day problems, to handle unexpected and difficult problems, and to figure out what to do if faced with an emergency situation.
- 7 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Precautionary measures'.
- 8 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Fire safety measures'.
- 9 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were equal to 13% for 'Precautionary measures'.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents. Households with 'moderately high' or 'high' levels of emergency planning engaged in 3 or 4 of the following: having an exit plan, an emergency supply kit, extra copies of important documents and an emergency contact list. 'Moderately high' or 'high' levels of precautionary measures include having 3 or 4 of the following: a wind-up or battery operated radio, a back-up generator, an alternate source of heat and additional water. 'Moderately high' or 'high' levels of fire safety measure include having all 3 of the following: a working smoke detector, a working fire extinguisher, and a working carbon monoxide detector.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

## Notes

<sup>E</sup> use with caution

- 1 A Census Metropolitan Area (CMA) or a Census Agglomeration (CA) is formed by one or more adjacent municipalities centred on a population centre (known as the core). A CMA must have a total population of at least 100,000 of which 50,000 or more must live in the core. A CA must have a core population of at least 10,000. To be included in the CMA or CA, other adjacent municipalities must have a high degree of integration with the core as measured by commuting flows derived from census data.
- 2 The target population for the SEPR included all persons 15 years of age or older, residing in households in Canada's 10 provinces, excluding full-time residents of institutions (e.g., nursing homes, group homes, hospitals).
- 3 The SEPR covers three types of communities: Census Metropolitan Areas (CMAs), Census Agglomerations (CAs) with population greater than 50,000, and 'smaller communities' which include CAs with population 50,000 or less and those areas that fall outside of CMAs and CAs. All CMAs and CAs (with population greater than 50,000) were included in the SEPR. A sample of households were selected from smaller communities within each province to represent all households within the province in similar communities. Additional information on the SEPR and its sampling methodology can be found in the 'Survey description' section.
- 4 Throughout this fact sheet, responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.
- 5 This section focuses on personal experiences with emergencies or disasters that happened in Canada, in a community where the person was living at the time, and was significant enough to severely interrupt the individual's regular daily activities.

- 6 Emergency planning activities include: having an emergency exit plan, a household emergency supply kit, extra copies of important documents and an emergency contact list.
- 7 Precautionary measures include: having a wind-up or battery-operated radio, an alternate heat source such as a non-electric stove or heater or a wood-burning fireplace, a back-up generator and an alternative water source such as a well, tank or litres of stored water.
- 8 Unless otherwise specified, differences are statistically significant ( $p < 0.05$ ).
- 9 A 'strong sense of belonging to community' is rating one's own sense of belonging to their community as a 4 or a 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "very weak" and 5 "very strong".
- 10 A proportion (5%) of respondents were not asked questions regarding neighbourhood helpfulness in the event of an emergency and as such these cases are not included in the analysis on neighbourhood helpfulness in general or in the event of an emergency.
- 11 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% when respondents were asked about whether their neighbourhood is a place where neighbours would help each other if there is an emergency.
- 12 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% when respondents were asked about the number of people they could turn to for help if financial support is needed.



## Fact sheet Community of Windsor (CMA), Ontario

---

In 2014, information on the emergency preparedness of people living in the Census Metropolitan Area<sup>1</sup> of Windsor was collected through the Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada (SEPR).<sup>2</sup> This fact sheet presents information on the risk awareness and level of emergency preparedness of the residents of Windsor, which could help improve the understanding of community resilience in the event of an emergency.<sup>3,4</sup>

### **Risk awareness and anticipated sources of help in an emergency or disaster**

- Winter storms (including blizzards, ice storms and extreme cold) (86%), extended power outages lasting 24 hours or longer (71%) and heat waves (65%) were named by residents of Windsor as the events most likely to occur in their community.
- For almost all types of emergencies or disasters, Windsor residents most commonly anticipated turning to news on the radio as an initial source of assistance and information (Table 1.1). More specifically, radio news was listed as the first source of help if faced with a weather-related emergency or natural disaster (39%), an industrial or transportation accident (39%), an act of terrorism or terrorist threat (39%), a contamination or shortage of water or food (33%), rioting or civil unrest (33%<sup>E</sup>), or an extended power outage (30%).
- In the event of an outbreak of a serious or life-threatening disease, residents frequently stated that hospitals, clinics, doctors or other medical professionals were the most commonly anticipated sources of initial assistance and information (42%).

### **Prior lifetime experience with a major emergency or disaster<sup>5</sup>**

- About four in ten (42%) Windsor residents have experienced a major emergency or disaster in Canada in a community where they were living at the time. For most (79%), this emergency or disaster was significant enough to have resulted in severe disruptions to their daily activities.
- Extended power outages lasting 24 hours or longer (80%) were the most commonly experienced emergency or disaster by residents of Windsor, followed by winter storms (20%<sup>E</sup>) (including blizzards and ice storms).
- The most common types of disruption to daily activities by residents who experienced emergencies or disasters included an inability to heat or cool their home (79%), as well as an inability to use electrical appliances (78%). More severe disruptions were experienced less frequently, including an inability to use roads or transportation within the community (19%<sup>E</sup>), being unable to communicate outside the home (15%<sup>E</sup>) and home evacuations (10%<sup>E</sup>).
- Approximately nine in ten (93%) residents who experienced an emergency or disaster were able to resume their daily activities within one week of the event, with close to two-thirds (64%) in two days or less.
- About half (48%) of residents who had experienced an emergency or disaster received help during or immediately following the event, most commonly from neighbours (39%<sup>E</sup>) and family (32%<sup>E</sup>).
- Approximately three in ten (28%) residents of Windsor who experienced a major emergency or disaster in Canada in a community where they were living at the time of the event and which was severe enough to disrupt their regular daily activities also endured a loss of property or some kind of a financial impact.

### **Emergency planning, precautionary and fire safety behaviours**

- Approximately three-quarters (74%) of Windsor residents lived in a household that engaged in at least two emergency planning activities,<sup>6</sup> with just over half (53%) living in a household with three or four such activities (Table 1.2). Close to one in ten (8%<sup>E</sup>) people in Windsor lived in a household that had not participated in any emergency planning activities.
- Over half (58%) of Windsor residents lived in a household with at least two precautionary measures<sup>7</sup> taken in case of an emergency, with about one-quarter (23%) living in a household with three or four such measures. Inversely, over one in ten residents (14%) lived in a household with no precautionary measures in place.
- The majority (99%) of residents reported living in a household with a working smoke detector, while just over two-thirds (68%) reported living in a household with a working fire extinguisher (Table 1.3). Eight in ten (80%) stated that they had a working carbon monoxide detector in their household. Over half (58%) of Windsor residents stated that they had implemented all three fire safety measures within their households.
- The number of emergency planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by Windsor residents did not significantly differ from residents of Ontario as a whole. When compared with residents of Canada's 10 provinces, however, Windsor residents were less likely to have all four precautionary measures in place than Canadians in general (4%<sup>E</sup> versus 7%), however, they were more likely to have implemented all three fire safety measures (58% versus 42%).<sup>8</sup>
- There were few differences among the types of activities and measures set in place by residents of Windsor when compared with residents of Ontario and Canada in general. When significant differences did exist, a higher proportion of Windsor residents had implemented the selected activity or measure. For instance, Windsor residents were more likely to report having a designated meeting place for household members than residents of Ontario overall (39% versus 30%), and they were more likely than Canadians to report having a contact plan for household members (62% versus 55%).

## Social networks and sense of belonging

- Over half (59%) of Windsor residents had a strong sense of belonging<sup>9</sup> to their community.<sup>10</sup>
- Most (88%) residents described the neighbourhood they lived in as a place where neighbours generally help each other.<sup>11</sup> Of those who did not describe their neighbourhood this way, the majority (68%) still described it as a place where neighbours would at least help each other in an emergency.<sup>12</sup>
- Approximately two-thirds of residents had a strong network of support in the event of an emergency or disaster, with more than five people to turn to for emotional support (68%), for help if physically injured (62%), as well as in the event of a home evacuation (61%). Just under three in ten (28%) residents had a large support network if financial help was needed, and 13% reported that they had no one to turn to for financial help.<sup>13</sup>
- High levels of self-efficacy, sense of belonging and social support, as well as engagement in civic and political activities, were sometimes associated with a higher level of emergency preparedness (Table 1.4).

## Data tables

**Table 1.1**  
Most commonly anticipated sources of initial help and information, by type of emergency or disaster, residents of Windsor, Ontario, 2014

Most common sources of initial help and information by type of emergency or disaster	percent
<b>Weather-related emergency or natural disaster</b>	
News- Radio	39
News- Television	28
News- Internet	25
<b>Extended power outages</b>	
News- Radio	30
Utility company	28
Family	19 <sup>E</sup>

<b>Outbreak of serious or life-threatening disease</b>		
Hospital, clinic, doctor or other medical professional		42
News- Radio		30
News- Television		28
<b>Industrial or transportation accident</b>		
News- Radio		39
News- Television		29
News- Internet		22
<b>Contamination or shortage of water or food</b>		
News- Radio		33
News- Television		24
News- Internet		22 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Act of terrorism or terrorist threat</b>		
News- Radio		39
News- Television		37
News- Internet		23
<b>Rioting or civil unrest</b>		
News- Radio		33 <sup>E</sup>
News- Television		32 <sup>E</sup>
News- Internet		26 <sup>E</sup>
<sup>E</sup> use with caution		
<b>Note:</b> Respondents who perceived their community was at risk for any form of emergency or disaster were then asked where they would turn to first for information or assistance in the event of the perceived emergency or disaster. Respondents could provide more than one response. Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.		
<b>Source:</b> Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.		

**Table 1.2**  
**Number of emergency planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents, community of Windsor, Ontario, 2014**

Number of planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents	Windsor	Ontario	Canada
	percent		
<b>Number of emergency planning activities</b>			
None	8 <sup>E</sup>	8	8
1 activity	14	16	17
2 activities	21	25	25
3 activities	29	28	27
4 activities	24	21	19
<b>Number of precautionary measures</b>			
None	14	15	16
1 measure	26	28	27
2 measures	35 **	29	28
3 measures	19	20	20
4 measures	4 <sup>E</sup> **	6	7
<b>Number of fire safety measures <sup>1</sup></b>			
None	F	F	1
1 measure	8 <sup>E</sup> **	7	14
2 measures	32 **	35	38



3 measures	58 **	53	42
<p><sup>E</sup> use with caution  <sup>F</sup> too unreliable to be published</p> <p>** significantly different from Canada level estimate (p &lt; 0.05)</p> <p>1 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Canada'.</p> <p><b>Note:</b> Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents. Emergency planning activities include: an emergency exit plan, an emergency supply kit, photocopies/electronic copies of important documents and a list of emergency contact numbers. Precautionary measures include: a battery-operated or wind-up radio, an alternative heat source, a back-up generator and an alternative water source. Fire safety measures include a working smoke detector, a working carbon monoxide detector and a working fire extinguisher.  <b>Source:</b> Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.</p>			

**Table 1.3**  
**Planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures residents engaged in, community of Windsor, Ontario, 2014**

Residents whose households were involved in the following:	Windsor	Ontario	Canada
	percent		
<b>Emergency planning activities</b>			
Emergency exit plan	66	63	60
Exit plan has been practised/reviewed in last 12 months <sup>1</sup>	47	47	46
Designated meeting place for household members <sup>2</sup>	39 *	30	33
Contact plan for household members <sup>2</sup>	62 **	57	55
Household emergency supply kit	44	47	47
Vehicle emergency supply kit <sup>3</sup>	59	62	59
Extra copies of important documents	61 **	56	53
List of emergency contact numbers	73	71	69
Plan for meeting special health needs <sup>4</sup>	58	61	62
<b>Precautionary measures</b>			
Wind-up or battery-operated radio	62	59	58
Alternate heat source	44	46	48
Back-up generator	19	20	23
Alternate water source	47	44	43
Other <sup>5</sup>	18	22	21
<b>Fire safety measures</b>			
Working smoke detector	99 **	99	98
Working carbon monoxide detector	80 **	80	60
Working fire extinguisher	68	64	66
<p>* significantly different from provincial level estimate (p &lt; 0.05)</p> <p>** significantly different from Canada level estimate (p &lt; 0.05)</p> <p>1 Percentage based only on those indicating that they have an emergency exit plan.</p> <p>2 Excludes Canadians living in single-person households.</p> <p>3 Excludes those who reported that they lived in a household that did not have a vehicle.</p> <p>4 Percentage based only on those indicating that they or someone in their household has special medical needs.</p> <p>5 'Other precautionary measures' include having an escape/rescue plan for pets, extra supply of fuel, checking and replenishing emergency supplies, and keeping exits clear.</p> <p><b>Note:</b> Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.  <b>Source:</b> Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.</p>			

**Table 1.4**

**High or moderately high levels of emergency planning, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents, by social and political involvement, community of Windsor, Ontario, 2014**

Social and political involvement	Percentage of residents who had high or moderately high levels of...		
	Planning activities	Precautionary measures	Fire safety measures
	percent		
<b>Engagement in political activities <sup>1</sup></b>			
Yes †	53	27	64
No	56	F	43 *
<b>High level of civic engagement <sup>2</sup></b>			
Yes †	56	27	68
No	52	18 <sup>E</sup>	44 *
<b>High level of social support <sup>3</sup></b>			
Yes †	60	26 <sup>E</sup>	69
No	51	24	54 *
<b>Strong sense of belonging to community <sup>4</sup></b>			
Yes †	60	28	59
No	43 *	18 <sup>E</sup>	57
<b>High neighbourhood trust <sup>5</sup></b>			
Yes †	54	31	65
No	54	20 <sup>E</sup>	54
<b>High level of self-efficacy <sup>6</sup></b>			
Yes †	61	28	63
No	45 *	20 <sup>E</sup>	53

<sup>E</sup> use with caution

F too unreliable to be published

\* significantly different from reference category ( $p < 0.05$ )

† reference category

1 Includes individuals over the age of 17 years who are eligible to vote, and who have participated in or volunteered for political parties or events in the past 12 months, including municipal, provincial, or federal elections, or expressed views on political or social issues through signing a petition, contacting news agencies or politicians, or attended a meeting involving social or community issues.

2 Civic engagement measures individuals over the age of 17 years who were involved in a recreational group or organization in the past 12 months, and includes engagement in political activities. A 'high level' is defined as having been involved in at least 4 activities in the past 12 months.

3 A 'high level of social support' is defined as having five or more people whom that individual could turn to for help in an emergency if they are physically injured, require emotional support, shelter, and/or financial assistance.

4 A 'strong sense of belonging to community' is rating one's own sense of belonging to their community as a 4 or a 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "very weak" and 5 "very strong".

5 'High neighbourhood trust' is rating one's own trust in the people in one's neighbourhood as 4 or 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "cannot be trusted at all" and 5 represents "can be trusted a lot", as well as having a response of "very likely" when asked about the likelihood of someone in their neighbourhood returning a lost wallet or purse containing two hundred dollars with the money still inside.

6 A 'high level of self-efficacy' is derived from having a high self-rating on a scale of 1 (poor) to 5 (excellent) for the following three categories: an ability to think clearly and solve day-to-day problems, to handle unexpected and difficult problems, and to figure out what to do if faced with an emergency situation.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents. Households with 'moderately high' or 'high' levels of emergency planning engaged in 3 or 4 of the following: having an exit plan, an emergency supply kit, extra copies of important documents and an emergency contact list. 'Moderately high' or 'high' levels of precautionary measures include having 3 or 4 of the following: a wind-up or battery operated radio, a back-up generator, an alternate source of heat and additional water. 'Moderately high' or 'high' levels of fire safety measure include having all 3 of the following: a working smoke detector, a working fire extinguisher, and a working carbon monoxide detector.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

## Notes

<sup>E</sup> use with caution

- 1 A Census Metropolitan Area (CMA) or a Census Agglomeration (CA) is formed by one or more adjacent municipalities centred on a population centre (known as the core). A CMA must have a total population of at least 100,000 of which 50,000 or more must live in the core. A CA must have a core population of at least 10,000. To be included in the CMA or CA, other adjacent municipalities must have a high degree of integration with the core as measured by commuting flows derived from census data.
- 2 The target population for the SEPR included all persons 15 years of age or older, residing in households in Canada's 10 provinces, excluding full-time residents of institutions (e.g. nursing homes, group homes, hospitals).
- 3 The SEPR covers three types of communities: Census Metropolitan Areas (CMAs), Census Agglomerations (CAs) with population greater than 50,000, and 'smaller communities' which include CAs with population 50,000 or less and those areas that fall outside of CMAs and CAs. All CMAs and CAs (with population greater than 50,000) were included in the SEPR. A sample of households were selected from smaller communities within each province to represent all households within the province in similar communities. Additional information on the SEPR and its sampling methodology can be found in the 'Survey description' section.
- 4 Throughout this fact sheet, responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.
- 5 This section focuses on personal experiences with emergencies or disasters that happened in Canada, in a community where the person was living at the time, and was significant enough to severely interrupt the individual's regular daily activities.
- 6 Emergency planning activities include: having an emergency exit plan, a household emergency supply kit, extra copies of important documents and an emergency contact list.
- 7 Precautionary measures include: having a wind-up or battery-operated radio, an alternate heat source such as a non-electric stove or heater or a wood-burning fireplace, a back-up generator and an alternative water source such as a well, tank or litres of stored water.
- 8 Unless otherwise specified, differences are statistically significant ( $p < 0.05$ ).
- 9 A 'strong sense of belonging to community' is rating one's own sense of belonging to their community as a 4 or a 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "very weak" and 5 "very strong".
- 10 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% when respondents were asked about their sense of belonging to their community.
- 11 A proportion (18%) of respondents were not asked questions regarding neighbourhood helpfulness in the event of an emergency and as such these cases are not included in the analysis on neighbourhood helpfulness in general or in the event of an emergency.
- 12 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were equal to 12% when respondents were asked about whether their neighbourhood is a place where neighbours would help each other if there is an emergency.
- 13 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% when respondents were asked about the number of people they could turn to for help if financial support is needed.



## Fact sheet Community of Sarnia (CA), Ontario

---

In 2014, information on the emergency preparedness of people living in the Census Agglomeration<sup>1</sup> of Sarnia was collected through the Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada (SEPR).<sup>2</sup> This fact sheet presents information on the risk awareness and level of emergency preparedness of the residents of Sarnia, which could help improve the understanding of community resilience in the event of an emergency.<sup>3,4</sup>

### **Risk awareness and anticipated sources of help in an emergency or disaster**

- Winter storms (including blizzards, ice storms and extreme cold) (92%), industrial or transportation accidents (92%) and extended power outages lasting 24 hours or longer (79%) were named by residents of Sarnia as the events most likely to occur in their community.
- Residents most commonly anticipated turning to news on the radio as an initial source for help and information if they were faced with a weather-related emergency or natural disaster (57%), an act of terrorism or terrorist threat (54%), or an industrial or transportation accident (53%). Residents also reported that they would first turn to news on the radio in the event of rioting or civil unrest (46%<sup>E</sup>), a contamination or shortage of water or food (44%), or an extended power outage (38%) (Table 1.1).
- The majority of residents (54%) most commonly anticipated turning to a hospital, clinic, doctor or other medical professional in the event of an outbreak of a serious or life-threatening disease.

### **Prior lifetime experience with a major emergency or disaster<sup>5</sup>**

- Half (50%) of Sarnia residents have faced a major emergency or disaster in Canada in a community they were living in at the time of the event, seven in ten (69%) of whom reported experiencing severe disruptions to their daily activities as a result of the event.
- Extended power outages lasting 24 hours or longer (52%) were the most commonly experienced emergency or disaster by residents of Sarnia. Past experience with winter storms (including blizzards and ice storms) (31%<sup>E</sup>) and industrial or transportation accidents (12%<sup>E</sup>) were less common.
- The most common types of disruption to daily activities endured by residents who had experienced major emergencies or disasters included an inability to use electrical appliances (64%), missing school or work (53%), and an inability to heat or cool the home (51%). A more severe, but less frequent, disruption experienced included an inability to use roads or transportation within the community (27%<sup>E</sup>).
- Approximately nine in ten (88%) residents who experienced an emergency or disaster were able to resume their daily activities within one week of the event; seven in ten (71%) within two days or less.
- About four in ten (42%) residents who had experienced an emergency or disaster received help during or immediately following the event, most commonly from neighbours (25%<sup>E</sup>) or family (23%<sup>E</sup>).
- Over one-quarter (28%<sup>E</sup>) of residents of Sarnia who experienced a major emergency or disaster in Canada in a community where they were living at the time of the event and which was significant enough to disrupt their regular daily routine also endured a loss of property or financial impact.

### **Emergency planning, precautionary and fire safety behaviours**

- Just over three-quarters (78%) of people residing in Sarnia lived in a household that was engaged in at least two emergency planning activities,<sup>6</sup> with approximately one-half (52%) living in a household with three or four such activities (Table 1.2). A small proportion (5%<sup>E</sup>) of people lived in a household that had not participated in any emergency planning activities.
- Over half (56%) lived in a household with at least two precautionary measures<sup>7</sup> taken in case of an emergency, but less than one-quarter (23%) lived in a household with three or four such measures. Close to one in ten (9%<sup>E</sup>) people lived in a household with no precautionary measures in place.
- The majority (99%) of residents reported living in a household with a working smoke detector, and seven in ten (70%) reported living in a household with a working fire extinguisher (Table 1.3). Over three-quarters (77%) of residents stated that they had a working carbon monoxide detector in their household. More than half (56%) of Sarnia residents stated that they had implemented all three fire safety measures within their household.
- For the most part, the number of emergency planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents of Sarnia did not significantly differ from residents of Ontario. When compared to those residing in Canada's 10 provinces, however, residents of Sarnia were significantly more likely to have engaged in all four emergency planning activities (25% versus 19%) and implemented all three fire safety measures (56% versus 42%).<sup>8</sup>
- When differences existed in the types of activities and measures set in place by residents of Sarnia compared to Ontarians and Canadians in general, it was often due to Sarnia residents being significantly more likely to have engaged in selected activities or measures. For instance, residents of Sarnia were more likely to have an emergency exit plan, a vehicle emergency supply kit, as well as a wind-up or battery-operated radio than those in Ontario and Canada. The exception, however, was that Sarnia residents were less likely to have an alternate water source than Ontarians and Canadians.

## Social networks and sense of belonging

- Nearly six in ten (59%) of Sarnia's residents had a strong sense of belonging<sup>9</sup> to their community.
- Most (86%) residents described the neighbourhood they lived in as a place where neighbours generally help each other.<sup>10</sup> Of those who did not describe their neighbourhood this way, most (87%) still described it as a place where neighbours would help each other in an emergency.
- Many individuals had a large network of support in the event of an emergency or disaster, with more than five people to turn to for help if physically injured (66%), for emotional support (64%) and in the event of a home evacuation (59%). About one-third of residents had a large support network if financial help was needed (32%). However, 14% reported that they had no one to turn to for financial help.
- High levels of sense of belonging, self-efficacy, social support and neighbourhood trust were sometimes associated with a higher level of emergency preparedness (Table 1.4).

## Data tables

Table 1.1

Most commonly anticipated sources of initial help and information, by type of emergency or disaster, residents of Sarnia, Ontario, 2014

Most common sources of initial help and information by type of emergency or disaster	percent
<b>Weather-related emergency or natural disaster</b>	
News- Radio	57
News- Television	21
News- Internet	17
<b>Extended power outages<sup>1</sup></b>	
News- Radio	38
Utility company	28
Family	12 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Outbreak of serious or life-threatening disease</b>	

Hospital, clinic, doctor or other medical professional	54
News- Radio	34
News- Television	19 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Industrial or transportation accident</b>	
News- Radio	53
News- Television	16
Police/law enforcement	15
<b>Contamination or shortage of water or food <sup>1</sup></b>	
News- Radio	44
Local government	15 <sup>E</sup>
News- Internet	15 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Act of terrorism or terrorist threat</b>	
News- Radio	54
Police/law enforcement	26
News- Television	22
<b>Rioting or civil unrest</b>	
News- Radio	46 <sup>E</sup>
Police/law enforcement	26 <sup>E</sup>
News- Television	18 <sup>E</sup>
<sup>E</sup> use with caution	
1 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% when respondents were asked about their likely sources of initial help and information.	
<b>Note:</b> Respondents who perceived their community was at risk for any form of emergency or disaster were then asked where they would turn to first for information or assistance in the event of the perceived emergency or disaster. Respondents could provide more than one response. Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.	
<b>Source:</b> Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.	

**Table 1.2**  
**Number of emergency planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents, community of Sarnia, Ontario, 2014**

Number of planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents	Sarnia	Ontario	Canada
	percent		
<b>Number of emergency planning activities</b>			
None	5 <sup>E</sup> **	8	8
1 activity	14	16	17
2 activities	26	25	25
3 activities	27	28	27
4 activities	25 **	21	19
<b>Number of precautionary measures</b>			
None	9 <sup>E</sup> ***	15	16
1 measure	31	28	27
2 measures	33	29	28
3 measures	17	20	20
4 measures	6 <sup>E</sup>	6	7
<b>Number of fire safety measures <sup>1</sup></b>			
None	F	F	1
1 measure	7 <sup>E</sup> **	7	14

2 measures	34	35	38
3 measures	56 **	53	42
<p>E use with caution  F too unreliable to be published</p> <p>** significantly different from Canada level estimate (p &lt; 0.05)</p> <p>*** significantly different from both provincial and Canada level estimates (p &lt; 0.05)</p> <p>1 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Canada'.</p> <p><b>Note:</b> Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents. Emergency planning activities include: an emergency exit plan, an emergency supply kit, photocopies/electronic copies of important documents and a list of emergency contact numbers. Precautionary measures include: a battery-operated or wind-up radio, an alternative heat source, a back-up generator and an alternative water source. Fire safety measures include a working smoke detector, a working carbon monoxide detector and a working fire extinguisher.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.</p>			

**Table 1.3**  
**Planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures residents engaged in, community of Sarnia, Ontario, 2014**

Residents whose households were involved in the following:	Sarnia	Ontario	Canada
	percent		
<b>Emergency planning activities</b>			
Emergency exit plan	70 ***	63	60
Exit plan has been practised/reviewed in last 12 months <sup>1</sup>	45	47	46
Designated meeting place for household members <sup>2</sup>	37	30	33
Contact plan for household members <sup>2</sup>	60	57	55
Household emergency supply kit	47	47	47
Vehicle emergency supply kit <sup>3</sup>	69 ***	62	59
Extra copies of important documents	59 **	56	53
List of emergency contact numbers	73	71	69
Plan for meeting special health needs <sup>4</sup>	67	61	62
<b>Precautionary measures</b>			
Wind-up or battery-operated radio	71 ***	59	58
Alternate heat source	45	46	48
Back-up generator	24	20	23
Alternate water source	37 ***	44	43
Other <sup>5</sup>	25	22	21
<b>Fire safety measures</b>			
Working smoke detector	99	99	98
Working carbon monoxide detector	77 **	80	60
Working fire extinguisher	70	64	66

\*\* significantly different from Canada level estimate (p < 0.05)

\*\*\* significantly different from both provincial and Canada level estimates (p < 0.05)

1 Percentage based only on those indicating that they have an emergency exit plan.

2 Excludes Canadians living in single-person households.

3 Excludes those who reported that they lived in a household that did not have a vehicle.

4 Percentage based only on those indicating that they or someone in their household has special medical needs.

5 'Other precautionary measures' include having an escape/rescue plan for pets, extra supply of fuel, checking and replenishing emergency supplies, and keeping exits clear.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

**Table 1.4**  
**High or moderately high levels of emergency planning, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents, by social and political involvement, community of Sarnia, Ontario, 2014**

Social and political involvement	Percentage of residents who had high or moderately high levels of...		
	Planning activities	Precautionary measures	Fire safety measures
	percent		
<b>Engagement in political activities <sup>1</sup></b>			
Yes †	54	24	59
No	45 <sup>E</sup>	24 <sup>E</sup>	55
<b>High level of civic engagement <sup>2</sup></b>			
Yes †	55	27	63
No	48	19 <sup>E</sup>	52
<b>High level of social support <sup>3</sup></b>			
Yes <sup>7 8</sup> †	66	25 <sup>E</sup>	62
No	48 *	23	53
<b>Strong sense of belonging to community <sup>4</sup></b>			
Yes †	59	28	59
No <sup>7 8</sup>	44 *	16 <sup>E</sup> *	50
<b>High neighbourhood trust <sup>5</sup></b>			
Yes †	56	35	61
No	52	14 <sup>E</sup> *	51
<b>High level of self-efficacy <sup>6</sup></b>			
Yes †	58	29	63
No <sup>7</sup>	48	16 <sup>E</sup> *	48 *



<sup>E</sup> use with caution

\* significantly different from reference category ( $p < 0.05$ )

† reference category

- 1 Includes individuals over the age of 17 years who are eligible to vote, and who have participated in or volunteered for political parties or events in the past 12 months, including municipal, provincial, or federal elections, or expressed views on political or social issues through signing a petition, contacting news agencies or politicians, or attended a meeting involving social or community issues.
- 2 Civic engagement measures individuals over the age of 17 years who were involved in a recreational group or organization in the past 12 months, and includes engagement in political activities. A 'high level' is defined as having been involved in at least 4 activities in the past 12 months.
- 3 A 'high level of social support' is defined as having five or more people whom that individual could turn to for help in an emergency if they are physically injured, require emotional support, shelter, and/or financial assistance.
- 4 A 'strong sense of belonging to community' is rating one's own sense of belonging to their community as a 4 or a 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "very weak" and 5 "very strong".
- 5 'High neighbourhood trust' is rating one's own trust in the people in one's neighbourhood as 4 or 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "cannot be trusted at all" and 5 represents "can be trusted a lot", as well as having a response of "very likely" when asked about the likelihood of someone in their neighbourhood returning a lost wallet or purse containing two hundred dollars with the money still inside.
- 6 A 'high level of self-efficacy' is derived from having a high self-rating on a scale of 1 (poor) to 5 (excellent) for the following three categories: an ability to think clearly and solve day-to-day problems, to handle unexpected and difficult problems, and to figure out what to do if faced with an emergency situation.
- 7 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Precautionary measures'.
- 8 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Fire safety measures'.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents. Households with 'moderately high' or 'high' levels of emergency planning engaged in 3 or 4 of the following: having an exit plan, an emergency supply kit, extra copies of important documents and an emergency contact list. 'Moderately high' or 'high' levels of precautionary measures include having 3 or 4 of the following: a wind-up or battery operated radio, a back-up generator, an alternate source of heat and additional water. 'Moderately high' or 'high' levels of fire safety measure include having all 3 of the following: a working smoke detector, a working fire extinguisher, and a working carbon monoxide detector.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

## Notes

<sup>E</sup> use with caution

- 1 A Census Metropolitan Area (CMA) or a Census Agglomeration (CA) is formed by one or more adjacent municipalities centred on a population centre (known as the core). A CMA must have a total population of at least 100,000 of which 50,000 or more must live in the core. A CA must have a core population of at least 10,000. To be included in the CMA or CA, other adjacent municipalities must have a high degree of integration with the core as measured by commuting flows derived from census data.
- 2 The target population for the SEPR included all persons 15 years of age or older, residing in households in Canada's 10 provinces, excluding full-time residents of institutions (e.g., nursing homes, group homes, hospitals).
- 3 The SEPR covers three types of communities: Census Metropolitan Areas (CMAs), Census Agglomerations (CAs) with population greater than 50,000, and 'smaller communities' which include CAs with population 50,000 or less and those areas that fall outside of CMAs and CAs. All CMAs and CAs (with population greater than 50,000) were included in the SEPR. A sample of households were selected from smaller communities within each province to represent all households within the province in similar communities. Additional information on the SEPR and its sampling methodology can be found in the 'Survey description' section.
- 4 Throughout this fact sheet, responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.
- 5 This section focuses on personal experiences with emergencies or disasters that happened in Canada, in a community where the person was living at the time, and was significant enough to severely interrupt the individual's regular daily activities.

- 6 Emergency planning activities include: having an emergency exit plan, a household emergency supply kit, extra copies of important documents and an emergency contact list.
- 7 Precautionary measures include: having a wind-up or battery-operated radio, an alternate heat source such as a non-electric stove or heater or a wood-burning fireplace, a back-up generator and an alternative water source such as a well, tank or litres of stored water.
- 8 Unless otherwise specified, differences are statistically significant ( $p < 0.05$ ).
- 9 A 'strong sense of belonging to community' is rating one's own sense of belonging to their community as a 4 or a 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "very weak" and 5 "very strong".
- 10 A proportion (17%) of respondents were not asked questions regarding neighbourhood helpfulness in the event of an emergency and as such these cases are not included in the analysis on neighbourhood helpfulness in general or in the event of an emergency.



## Fact sheet Community of Barrie (CMA), Ontario

---

In 2014, information on the emergency preparedness of people living in the Census Metropolitan Area<sup>1</sup> of Barrie was collected through the Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada (SEPR).<sup>2</sup> This fact sheet presents information on the risk awareness and level of emergency preparedness of the residents of Barrie, which could help improve the understanding of community resilience in the event of an emergency.<sup>3,4</sup>

### **Risk awareness and anticipated sources of help in an emergency or disaster**

- Winter storms (including blizzards, ice storms and extreme cold) (96%), extended power outages lasting 24 hours or longer (85%) and tornadoes (69%) were named by residents of Barrie as the most likely events to occur within their community.
- Residents most commonly anticipated turning to news on the radio as an initial source for help and information if they were faced with a weather-related emergency or natural disaster (36%) or an industrial or transportation accident (29%) (Table 1.1). News on the television was most frequently listed as the first place to turn to for information or assistance in the event of an act of terrorism or terrorist threat (32%<sup>E</sup>).
- Residents also stated (48%) that hospitals, clinics, doctors and other medical professionals were the most commonly anticipated sources of initial help and information in the event of an outbreak of a serious or life-threatening disease. Other results were split: residents anticipated turning to police or law enforcement in the event of rioting or civil unrest (36%<sup>E</sup>), to their utility company during an extended power outage (35%), and to local government in the event of a contamination or shortage of water or food (31%).

### **Prior lifetime experience with a major emergency or disaster<sup>5</sup>**

- About half (53%) of Barrie residents have faced a major emergency or disaster in Canada in a community they were living in at the time of the event, approximately six in ten (63%) of whom reported experiencing severe disruptions to their daily activities as a result of the event.
- Extended power outages lasting 24 hours or longer (64%) were the most commonly experienced emergency or disaster by residents of Barrie, followed by tornadoes (23%) and winter storms (including blizzards and ice storms) (11%<sup>E</sup>).
- The most common types of disruption to daily activities endured by residents who had experienced a major emergency or disaster included an inability to use electrical appliances (81%), an inability to heat or cool the home (74%), and missing school or work (64%). More severe, but less frequent, disruptions experienced were an inability to communicate outside of the home (17%<sup>E</sup>) or use roads or transportation in the community (13%<sup>E</sup>), as well as home evacuation (15%<sup>E</sup>).
- Approximately nine in ten (88%) residents who experienced an emergency or disaster were able to resume their daily activities within one week of the event, with more than six in ten (63%) residents resuming their activities in two days or less.
- Nearly half (45%) of residents who had experienced an emergency or disaster received help during or immediately following the event, most commonly from neighbours (42%) and family (42%).

- Over one-third (36%) of residents of Barrie who experienced a major emergency or disaster in Canada in a community where they were living at the time of the event and which was significant enough to disrupt their regular daily routine also endured a loss of property or financial impact.

## Emergency planning, precautionary and fire safety behaviours

- Four out of five (81%) people residing in Barrie lived in households that were engaged in at least two emergency planning activities,<sup>6</sup> and over half (56%) lived in households with three or four such activities (Table 1.2). Less than one in ten (7%<sup>E</sup>) people lived in a household that had not participated in any emergency planning activities.
- Close to two-thirds (63%) lived in a household with at least two precautionary measures<sup>7</sup> taken in case of an emergency, with one-third (34%) living in a household with three or four such measures. More than one in ten (13%<sup>E</sup>) people lived in a household with no precautionary measures in place.
- The majority (99.8%) of residents reported living in a household with a working smoke detector, and three-quarters (75%) reported living in a household with a working fire extinguisher (Table 1.3). More than four in five (85%) residents stated that they had a working carbon monoxide detector in their household. Approximately two-thirds (64%) of the residents of Barrie stated that they had implemented all three fire safety measures within their households.
- There were some differences in the number of emergency planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures put in place by residents of Barrie when compared to residents of Ontario and Canada's 10 provinces overall. For example, the proportion of Barrie residents who had three emergency planning activities (36%) and three precautionary measures (26%) in place was significantly higher than Ontarians (28% and 20%, respectively) and Canadians in general (27% and 20%, respectively). In addition, the proportion of residents in Barrie who had all three fire safety measures in place (64%) was significantly higher compared to Ontario (53%) and Canada more broadly (42%).<sup>8</sup>
- There were some differences in the types of activities and measures put in place by residents of Barrie when compared to Ontario and Canada in general. For example, the proportion of Barrie residents who had a working smoke detector (99.8%), a working fire extinguisher (75%), an emergency exit plan (71%) and an alternate water source (53%) was significantly higher compared to Ontarians and Canadians in general. In addition, the proportion of residents in Barrie that had a working carbon monoxide detector (85%), a vehicle emergency supply kit (66%), a wind-up or battery-operated radio (64%) and extra copies of important documents (61%) were significantly higher than that of Canadians.

## Social networks and sense of belonging

- More than half (52%) of Barrie's residents had a strong sense of belonging<sup>9</sup> to their community.
- Most (90%) residents described the neighbourhood they lived in as a place where neighbours generally help each other.<sup>10</sup> Of those who did not describe their neighbourhood this way, most (86%) still described it as a place where neighbours would help each other in an emergency.<sup>11</sup>
- Many individuals had a large network of support in the event of an emergency or disaster, with more than five people to turn to for emotional support (70%), for help if physically injured (69%) as well as in case of a home evacuation (59%). About one-third of residents had a large support network if financial help was needed (32%). However, 9% reported that they had no one to turn to for financial help.<sup>12</sup>
- High levels of sense of belonging, self-efficacy and social support, as well involvement in political activities, were sometimes associated with a higher level of emergency preparedness (Table 1.4).

## Data tables

Table 1.1

Most commonly anticipated sources of initial help and information, by type of emergency or disaster, residents of Barrie, Ontario, 2014

Most common sources of initial help and information by type of emergency or disaster	percent
<b>Weather-related emergency or natural disaster</b>	
News- Radio	36

News- Television	31
News- Internet	25
<b>Extended power outages</b>	
Utility company	35
News- Radio	26
Family	12 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Outbreak of serious or life-threatening disease</b>	
Hospital, clinic, doctor or other medical professional	48
News- Radio	21
News- Internet	20
<b>Industrial or transportation accident</b>	
News- Radio	29
News- Television	27
News- Internet	26 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Contamination or shortage of water or food</b>	
Local government	31
News- Radio	22
News- Television	15 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Act of terrorism or terrorist threat</b>	
News- Television	32 <sup>E</sup>
News- Radio	29 <sup>E</sup>
Police/law enforcement	26 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Rioting or civil unrest</b>	
Police/law enforcement	36 <sup>E</sup>
News- Radio	28 <sup>E</sup>
News- Television	28 <sup>E</sup>
<sup>E</sup> use with caution	
<b>Note:</b> Respondents who perceived their community was at risk for any form of emergency or disaster were then asked where they would turn to first for information or assistance in the event of the perceived emergency or disaster. Respondents could provide more than one response. Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.	
<b>Source:</b> Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.	

**Table 1.2**  
**Number of emergency planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents, community of Barrie, Ontario, 2014**

Number of planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents	Barrie	Ontario	Canada
	percent		
<b>Number of emergency planning activities</b>			
None	7 <sup>E</sup>	8	8
1 activity	10 <sup>***</sup>	16	17
2 activities	25	25	25
3 activities	36 <sup>***</sup>	28	27
4 activities	20	21	19
<b>Number of precautionary measures</b>			
None	13 <sup>E</sup>	15	16
1 measure	23	28	27
2 measures	29	29	28

3 measures	26 ***	20	20
4 measures	8 <sup>E</sup>	6	7
<b>Number of fire safety measures <sup>1</sup></b>			
None	F	F	1
1 measure	4 <sup>E</sup> ***	7	14
2 measures	29 **	35	38
3 measures	64 ***	53	42
<sup>E</sup> use with caution F too unreliable to be published ** significantly different from Canada level estimate (p < 0.05) *** significantly different from both provincial and Canada level estimates (p < 0.05) 1 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Canada'. <b>Note:</b> Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents. Emergency planning activities include: an emergency exit plan, an emergency supply kit, photocopies/electronic copies of important documents and a list of emergency contact numbers. Precautionary measures include: a battery-operated or wind-up radio, an alternative heat source, a back-up generator and an alternative water source. Fire safety measures include a working smoke detector, a working carbon monoxide detector and a working fire extinguisher. <b>Source:</b> Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.			

**Table 1.3**  
**Planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures residents engaged in, community of Barrie, Ontario, 2014**

Residents whose households were involved in the following:	Barrie	Ontario	Canada
	percent		
<b>Emergency planning activities</b>			
Emergency exit plan	71 ***	63	60
Exit plan has been practised/reviewed in last 12 months <sup>1</sup>	48	47	46
Designated meeting place for household members <sup>2</sup>	36	30	33
Contact plan for household members <sup>2</sup>	56	57	55
Household emergency supply kit	47	47	47
Vehicle emergency supply kit <sup>3</sup>	66 **	62	59
Extra copies of important documents	61 **	56	53
List of emergency contact numbers	72	71	69
Plan for meeting special health needs <sup>4</sup>	69	61	62
<b>Precautionary measures</b>			
Wind-up or battery-operated radio	64 **	59	58
Alternate heat source	50	46	48
Back-up generator	23	20	23
Alternate water source	53 ***	44	43
Other <sup>5</sup>	21	22	21
<b>Fire safety measures</b>			
Working smoke detector	100 ***	99	98
Working carbon monoxide detector	85 **	80	60
Working fire extinguisher	75 ***	64	66

\*\* significantly different from Canada level estimate (p < 0.05)

\*\*\* significantly different from both provincial and Canada level estimates (p < 0.05)

1 Percentage based only on those indicating that they have an emergency exit plan.

2 Excludes Canadians living in single-person households.

3 Excludes those who reported that they lived in a household that did not have a vehicle.

4 Percentage based only on those indicating that they or someone in their household has special medical needs.

5 'Other precautionary measures' include having an escape/rescue plan for pets, extra supply of fuel, checking and replenishing emergency supplies, and keeping exits clear.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

**Table 1.4**

**High or moderately high levels of emergency planning, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents, by social and political involvement, community of Barrie, Ontario, 2014**

Social and political involvement	Percentage of residents who had high or moderately high levels of...		
	Planning activities	Precautionary measures	Fire safety measures
	percent		
<b>Engagement in political activities <sup>1</sup></b>			
Yes †	58	39	66
No	53 <sup>E</sup>	22 <sup>E *</sup>	57
<b>High level of civic engagement <sup>2</sup></b>			
Yes †	61	38	65
No	51	33	64
<b>High level of social support <sup>3</sup></b>			
Yes †	62	43	73
No	55	30 *	61
<b>Strong sense of belonging to community <sup>4</sup></b>			
Yes †	64	36	60
No	47 *	30	70
<b>High neighbourhood trust <sup>5</sup></b>			
Yes †	62	33	66
No	53	34	64
<b>High level of self-efficacy <sup>6</sup></b>			
Yes †	64	33	60
No	46 *	34	71 *

<sup>E</sup> use with caution

\* significantly different from reference category ( $p < 0.05$ )

† reference category

- 1 Includes individuals over the age of 17 years who are eligible to vote, and who have participated in or volunteered for political parties or events in the past 12 months, including municipal, provincial, or federal elections, or expressed views on political or social issues through signing a petition, contacting news agencies or politicians, or attended a meeting involving social or community issues.
- 2 Civic engagement measures individuals over the age of 17 years who were involved in a recreational group or organization in the past 12 months, and includes engagement in political activities. A 'high level' is defined as having been involved in at least 4 activities in the past 12 months.
- 3 A 'high level of social support' is defined as having five or more people whom that individual could turn to for help in an emergency if they are physically injured, require emotional support, shelter, and/or financial assistance.
- 4 A 'strong sense of belonging to community' is rating one's own sense of belonging to their community as a 4 or a 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "very weak" and 5 "very strong".
- 5 'High neighbourhood trust' is rating one's own trust in the people in one's neighbourhood as 4 or 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "cannot be trusted at all" and 5 represents "can be trusted a lot", as well as having a response of "very likely" when asked about the likelihood of someone in their neighbourhood returning a lost wallet or purse containing two hundred dollars with the money still inside.
- 6 A 'high level of self-efficacy' is derived from having a high self-rating on a scale of 1 (poor) to 5 (excellent) for the following three categories: an ability to think clearly and solve day-to-day problems, to handle unexpected and difficult problems, and to figure out what to do if faced with an emergency situation.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents. Households with 'moderately high' or 'high' levels of emergency planning engaged in 3 or 4 of the following: having an exit plan, an emergency supply kit, extra copies of important documents and an emergency contact list. 'Moderately high' or 'high' levels of precautionary measures include having 3 or 4 of the following: a wind-up or battery operated radio, a back-up generator, an alternate source of heat and additional water. 'Moderately high' or 'high' levels of fire safety measure include having all 3 of the following: a working smoke detector, a working fire extinguisher, and a working carbon monoxide detector.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

## Notes

<sup>E</sup> use with caution

- 1 A Census Metropolitan Area (CMA) or a Census Agglomeration (CA) is formed by one or more adjacent municipalities centred on a population centre (known as the core). A CMA must have a total population of at least 100,000 of which 50,000 or more must live in the core. A CA must have a core population of at least 10,000. To be included in the CMA or CA, other adjacent municipalities must have a high degree of integration with the core as measured by commuting flows derived from census data.
- 2 The target population for the SEPR included all persons 15 years of age or older, residing in households in Canada's 10 provinces, excluding full-time residents of institutions (e.g. nursing homes, group homes, hospitals).
- 3 The SEPR covers three types of communities: Census Metropolitan Areas (CMAs), Census Agglomerations (CAs) with population greater than 50,000, and 'smaller communities' which include CAs with population 50,000 or less and those areas that fall outside of CMAs and CAs. All CMAs and CAs (with population greater than 50,000) were included in the SEPR. A sample of households were selected from smaller communities within each province to represent all households within the province in similar communities. Additional information on the SEPR and its sampling methodology can be found in the 'Survey description' section.
- 4 Throughout this fact sheet, responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.
- 5 This section focuses on personal experiences with emergencies or disasters that happened in Canada, in a community where the person was living at the time, and was significant enough to severely interrupt the individual's regular daily activities.
- 6 Emergency planning activities include: having an emergency exit plan, a household emergency supply kit, extra copies of important documents and an emergency contact list.



- 7 Precautionary measures include: having a wind-up or battery-operated radio, an alternate heat source such as a non-electric stove or heater or a wood-burning fireplace, a back-up generator and an alternative water source such as a well, tank or litres of stored water.
- 8 Unless otherwise specified, differences are statistically significant ( $p < 0.05$ ).
- 9 A 'strong sense of belonging to community' is rating one's own sense of belonging to their community as a 4 or a 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "very weak" and 5 "very strong".
- 10 A proportion (23%) of respondents were not asked questions regarding neighbourhood helpfulness in the event of an emergency and as such these cases are not included in the analysis on neighbourhood helpfulness in general or in the event of an emergency.
- 11 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% when respondents were asked about whether their neighbourhood is a place where neighbours would help each other if there is an emergency.
- 12 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% when respondents were asked about the number of people they could turn to for help if financial support is needed.



## Fact sheet

### Community of North Bay (CA), Ontario

---

In 2014, information on the emergency preparedness of people living in the Census Agglomeration<sup>1</sup> of North Bay was collected through the Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada (SEPR).<sup>2</sup> This fact sheet presents information on the risk awareness and level of emergency preparedness of the residents of North Bay, which could help improve the understanding of community resilience in the event of an emergency.<sup>3,4</sup>

#### **Risk awareness and anticipated sources of help in an emergency or disaster**

- Winter storms (including blizzards, ice storms and extreme cold) (97%), extended power outages lasting 24 hours or longer (80%), industrial or transportation accidents (71%) and wildfires (70%) were named by North Bay residents as the events most likely to occur within their community.
- Residents reported most often that they would anticipate first turning to hospitals, clinics, doctors and other medical professionals for help and information in the event of an outbreak of a serious or life-threatening disease (67%). In the event of an extended power outage, residents anticipated first turning to their utility company (47%), while an act of terrorism or terrorist threat, as well as rioting or civil unrest, would lead them to first turn to police and law enforcement (36% and 33%<sup>E</sup>, respectively) (Table 1.1). In the event of a contamination or shortage of water or food, residents most commonly anticipated first turning to their local government (29%).
- Residents also reported that they would anticipate turning to news on the radio as an initial source for information or assistance if they were faced with a weather-related emergency or natural disaster (35%) or an industrial or transportation accident (26%).

#### **Prior lifetime experience with a major emergency or disaster<sup>5</sup>**

- Half (51%) of North Bay residents have faced a major emergency or disaster in Canada in a community they were living in at the time of the event, and two-thirds (66%) of those reported experiencing severe disruptions to their daily activities as a result of the event.
- Extended power outages lasting 24 hours or longer (65%) were the most commonly experienced emergency or disaster experienced by residents of North Bay, followed by winter storms (including blizzards and ice storms) (21%<sup>E</sup>) and tornadoes (13%<sup>E</sup>).
- The most common types of disruption to daily activities endured by residents who had experienced a major emergency or disaster were an inability to use electrical appliances (77%) or heat or cool their home (68%). More than half (56%) of residents reported missing an appointment or a planned activity and 53% had to boil drinking water or use bottled water for drinking. More severe disruptions experienced were an inability to use roads or transportation within the community (21%<sup>E</sup>) or communicate outside of the home (18%<sup>E</sup>), as well as having to evacuate the home (11%<sup>E</sup>).
- The majority (87%) of residents who experienced an emergency or disaster were able to resume their daily activities within one week of the event, and half (51%) of residents were able to resume their activities in under two days.
- More than half (58%) of residents who had experienced an emergency or disaster received help during or immediately following the event, and help was received most often from family (33%<sup>E</sup>), neighbours (29%<sup>E</sup>) or friends (18%<sup>E</sup>).

- Nearly one-third (31%) of residents of North Bay who experienced a major emergency or disaster in Canada in a community where they were living at the time of the event and which was significant enough to disrupt their regular daily routine also endured a loss of property or financial impact.

## Emergency planning, precautionary and fire safety behaviours

- Four out of five (80%) North Bay residents lived in a household that was engaged in at least two emergency planning activities,<sup>6</sup> and over half (56%) lived in a household with three or four such activities (Table 1.2). A small proportion (6%<sup>E</sup>) of people lived in a household that had not participated in any emergency planning activities.
- Nearly two-thirds (64%) lived in a household with at least two precautionary measures<sup>7</sup> taken in case of an emergency, and one-third (32%) lived in a household with three or four such measures. One in ten (11%<sup>E</sup>) people lived in a household with no precautionary measures in place.
- The majority (99.9%) of residents reported living in a household with a working smoke detector, and nine in ten (90%) reported living in a household with a working carbon monoxide detector (Table 1.3). Two-thirds (67%) of residents stated that they had a working fire extinguisher in their household.
- In regards to the number of emergency planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures put in place, there were some significant differences between residents of North Bay and those in Ontario and Canada's 10 provinces more broadly. One-quarter (26%) of North Bay residents reported that they had implemented all four emergency planning activities, compared to 19% of Canadians. The proportion (14%<sup>E</sup>) of North Bay residents who had all four precautionary measures in place was double that of Ontario and Canada (6% and 7%, respectively). Additionally, 62% of North Bay residents reported that they had taken all three fire safety measures, compared to 53% of Ontarians and 42% of Canadians.<sup>8</sup>
- When considering the types of activities and measures set in place, residents of North Bay were often more prepared than residents of Ontario and Canada. For example, the proportion of North Bay residents who had an emergency exit plan (73%), a wind-up or battery-operated radio (70%), a back-up generator (32%) and an alternate water source (54%) was significantly higher than both Ontario and Canada. In addition, the proportion of North Bay residents with a working smoke detector (99.9%) or a working carbon monoxide detector (90%) was significantly higher than both Ontario and Canada.

## Social networks and sense of belonging

- Just over half (54%) of North Bay's residents had a strong sense of belonging<sup>9</sup> to their community.
- Most (85%) residents described the neighbourhood they lived in as a place where neighbours generally help each other.<sup>10</sup> Of those who did not describe their neighbourhood this way, most (88%) still described it as a place where neighbours would help each other in an emergency.<sup>11</sup>
- In the event of an emergency or disaster, most individuals had a large network of support with more than five people to turn to in the event of an emergency or disaster: 71% for emotional support, 63% for help if physically injured and 60% in the event of a home evacuation. Three in ten residents had a large support network if financial help was needed (29%). However, 9% reported that they had no one to turn to for financial help.
- High levels of sense of belonging and neighbourhood trust, as well as civic engagement, were sometimes associated with a higher level of emergency preparedness (Table 1.4).

## Data tables

**Table 1.1**  
Most commonly anticipated sources of initial help and information, by type of emergency or disaster, residents of North Bay, Ontario, 2014

Most common sources of initial help and information by type of emergency or disaster	percent
<b>Weather-related emergency or natural disaster<sup>1</sup></b>	
News- Radio	35
News- Television	19
News- Internet	18

<b>Extended power outages</b>		
Utility company		47
News- Radio		21
Family		14 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Outbreak of serious or life-threatening disease</b>		
Hospital, clinic, doctor or other medical professional		67
News- Radio		20 <sup>E</sup>
News- Television		19 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Industrial or transportation accident</b>		
News- Radio		26
News- Television		22
News- Internet		20
<b>Contamination or shortage of water or food</b>		
Local government		29
News- Radio		26 <sup>E</sup>
News- Television		20 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Act of terrorism or terrorist threat</b>		
Police/law enforcement		36
News- Radio		25 <sup>E</sup>
News- Television		16 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Rioting or civil unrest</b>		
Police/law enforcement		33 <sup>E</sup>
<sup>E</sup> use with caution		
1 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% when respondents were asked about their likely sources of initial help and information.		
<b>Note:</b> Respondents who perceived their community was at risk for any form of emergency or disaster were then asked where they would turn to first for information or assistance in the event of the perceived emergency or disaster. Respondents could provide more than one response. Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.		
<b>Source:</b> Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.		

**Table 1.2**  
**Number of emergency planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents, community of North Bay, Ontario, 2014**

Number of planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents	North Bay	Ontario	Canada
	percent		
<b>Number of emergency planning activities</b>			
None	6 <sup>E</sup>	8	8
1 activity	13 <sup>E</sup>	16	17
2 activities	24	25	25
3 activities	30	28	27
4 activities	26 <sup>**</sup>	21	19
<b>Number of precautionary measures</b>			
None	11 <sup>E **</sup>	15	16
1 measure	22	28	27
2 measures	32	29	28
3 measures	18	20	20
4 measures	14 <sup>E ***</sup>	6	7

Number of fire safety measures <sup>1</sup>			
None	F	F	1
1 measure	4 <sup>E***</sup>	7	14
2 measures	32	35	38
3 measures	62 <sup>***</sup>	53	42

<sup>E</sup> use with caution  
<sup>F</sup> too unreliable to be published

\*\* significantly different from Canada level estimate (p < 0.05)

\*\*\* significantly different from both provincial and Canada level estimates (p < 0.05)

<sup>1</sup> Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Canada'.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents. Emergency planning activities include: an emergency exit plan, an emergency supply kit, photocopies/electronic copies of important documents and a list of emergency contact numbers. Precautionary measures include: a battery-operated or wind-up radio, an alternative heat source, a back-up generator and an alternative water source. Fire safety measures include a working smoke detector, a working carbon monoxide detector and a working fire extinguisher.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

**Table 1.3**  
**Planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures residents engaged in, community of North Bay, Ontario, 2014**

Residents whose households were involved in the following:	North Bay	Ontario	Canada
	percent		
<b>Emergency planning activities</b>			
Emergency exit plan	73 <sup>***</sup>	63	60
Exit plan has been practised/reviewed in last 12 months <sup>1</sup>	54 <sup>**</sup>	47	46
Designated meeting place for household members <sup>2</sup>	38	30	33
Contact plan for household members <sup>2</sup>	56	57	55
Household emergency supply kit	54 <sup>*</sup>	47	47
Vehicle emergency supply kit <sup>3</sup>	71 <sup>**</sup>	62	59
Extra copies of important documents	53	56	53
List of emergency contact numbers	75	71	69
Plan for meeting special health needs <sup>4</sup>	69	61	62
<b>Precautionary measures</b>			
Wind-up or battery-operated radio	70 <sup>***</sup>	59	58
Alternate heat source	44	46	48
Back-up generator	32 <sup>***</sup>	20	23
Alternate water source	54 <sup>***</sup>	44	43
Other <sup>5</sup>	20	22	21
<b>Fire safety measures</b>			
Working smoke detector	100 <sup>***</sup>	99	98
Working carbon monoxide detector	90 <sup>***</sup>	80	60
Working fire extinguisher	67	64	66

\* significantly different from provincial level estimate (p < 0.05)

\*\* significantly different from Canada level estimate (p < 0.05)

\*\*\* significantly different from both provincial and Canada level estimates (p < 0.05)

1 Percentage based only on those indicating that they have an emergency exit plan.

2 Excludes Canadians living in single-person households.

3 Excludes those who reported that they lived in a household that did not have a vehicle.

4 Percentage based only on those indicating that they or someone in their household has special medical needs.

5 'Other precautionary measures' include having an escape/rescue plan for pets, extra supply of fuel, checking and replenishing emergency supplies, and keeping exits clear.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

**Table 1.4**

**High or moderately high levels of emergency planning, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents, by social and political involvement, community of North Bay, Ontario, 2014**

Social and political involvement	Percentage of residents who had high or moderately high levels of...		
	Planning activities	Precautionary measures	Fire safety measures
	percent		
<b>Engagement in political activities <sup>1</sup></b>			
Yes <sup>†</sup>	56	36	63
No <sup>7</sup>	44 <sup>E</sup>	F	57
<b>High level of civic engagement <sup>2</sup></b>			
Yes <sup>†</sup>	59	40	64
No	44	17 <sup>E *</sup>	58
<b>High level of social support <sup>3</sup></b>			
Yes <sup>†</sup>	61	42	63
No	53	29	60
<b>Strong sense of belonging to community <sup>4</sup></b>			
Yes <sup>†</sup>	63	36	61
No	47 <sup>*</sup>	28 <sup>E</sup>	61
<b>High neighbourhood trust <sup>5</sup></b>			
Yes <sup>†</sup>	66	38	68
No	46 <sup>*</sup>	27	55
<b>High level of self-efficacy <sup>6</sup></b>			
Yes <sup>†</sup>	58	35	62
No	53	28 <sup>E</sup>	59

<sup>E</sup> use with caution

F too unreliable to be published

\* significantly different from reference category ( $p < 0.05$ )

† reference category

1 Includes individuals over the age of 17 years who are eligible to vote, and who have participated in or volunteered for political parties or events in the past 12 months, including municipal, provincial, or federal elections, or expressed views on political or social issues through signing a petition, contacting news agencies or politicians, or attended a meeting involving social or community issues.

2 Civic engagement measures individuals over the age of 17 years who were involved in a recreational group or organization in the past 12 months, and includes engagement in political activities. A 'high level' is defined as having been involved in at least 4 activities in the past 12 months.

3 A 'high level of social support' is defined as having five or more people whom that individual could turn to for help in an emergency if they are physically injured, require emotional support, shelter, and/or financial assistance.

4 A 'strong sense of belonging to community' is rating one's own sense of belonging to their community as a 4 or a 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "very weak" and 5 "very strong".

5 'High neighbourhood trust' is rating one's own trust in the people in one's neighbourhood as 4 or 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "cannot be trusted at all" and 5 represents "can be trusted a lot", as well as having a response of "very likely" when asked about the likelihood of someone in their neighbourhood returning a lost wallet or purse containing two hundred dollars with the money still inside.

6 A 'high level of self-efficacy' is derived from having a high self-rating on a scale of 1 (poor) to 5 (excellent) for the following three categories: an ability to think clearly and solve day-to-day problems, to handle unexpected and difficult problems, and to figure out what to do if faced with an emergency situation.

7 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Fire safety activities'.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents. Households with 'moderately high' or 'high' levels of emergency planning engaged in 3 or 4 of the following: having an exit plan, an emergency supply kit, extra copies of important documents and an emergency contact list. 'Moderately high' or 'high' levels of precautionary measures include having 3 or 4 of the following: a wind-up or battery operated radio, a back-up generator, an alternate source of heat and additional water. 'Moderately high' or 'high' levels of fire safety measure include having all 3 of the following: a working smoke detector, a working fire extinguisher, and a working carbon monoxide detector.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

## Notes

<sup>E</sup> use with caution

1 A Census Metropolitan Area (CMA) or a Census Agglomeration (CA) is formed by one or more adjacent municipalities centred on a population centre (known as the core). A CMA must have a total population of at least 100,000 of which 50,000 or more must live in the core. A CA must have a core population of at least 10,000. To be included in the CMA or CA, other adjacent municipalities must have a high degree of integration with the core as measured by commuting flows derived from census data.

2 The target population for the SEPR included all persons 15 years of age or older, residing in households in Canada's 10 provinces, excluding full-time residents of institutions (e.g. nursing homes, group homes, hospitals).

3 The SEPR covers three types of communities: Census Metropolitan Areas (CMAs), Census Agglomerations (CAs) with population greater than 50,000, and 'smaller communities' which include CAs with population 50,000 or less and those areas that fall outside of CMAs and CAs. All CMAs and CAs (with population greater than 50,000) were included in the SEPR. A sample of households were selected from smaller communities within each province to represent all households within the province in similar communities. Additional information on the SEPR and its sampling methodology can be found in the 'Survey description' section.

4 Throughout this fact sheet, responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.

5 This section focuses on personal experiences with emergencies or disasters that happened in Canada, in a community where the person was living at the time, and was significant enough to severely interrupt the individual's regular daily activities.

- 6 Emergency planning activities include: having an emergency exit plan, a household emergency supply kit, extra copies of important documents and an emergency contact list.
- 7 Precautionary measures include: having a wind-up or battery-operated radio, an alternate heat source such as a non-electric stove or heater or a wood-burning fireplace, a back-up generator and an alternative water source such as a well, tank or litres of stored water.
- 8 Unless otherwise specified, differences are statistically significant ( $p < 0.05$ ).
- 9 A 'strong sense of belonging to community' is rating one's own sense of belonging to their community as a 4 or a 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "very weak" and 5 "very strong".
- 10 A proportion (9%) of respondents were not asked questions regarding neighbourhood helpfulness in the event of an emergency and as such these cases are not included in the analysis on neighbourhood helpfulness in general or in the event of an emergency.
- 11 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% when respondents were asked about whether their neighbourhood is a place where neighbours would help each other if there is an emergency.





## Fact sheet

# Community of Greater Sudbury (CMA), Ontario

---

In 2014, information on the emergency preparedness of people living in the Census Metropolitan Area<sup>1</sup> of Greater Sudbury was collected through the Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada (SEPR).<sup>2</sup> This fact sheet presents information on the risk awareness and level of emergency preparedness of the residents of Greater Sudbury, which could help improve the understanding of community resilience in the event of an emergency.<sup>3,4</sup>

### **Risk awareness and anticipated sources of help in an emergency or disaster**

- Winter storms (including blizzards, ice storms and extreme cold) (91%), extended power outages lasting 24 hours or longer (77%), wildfires (73%) and industrial or transportation accidents (72%) were named by residents of Greater Sudbury as the most likely events to occur within their community.
- Residents most commonly anticipated turning to news on the radio as an initial source for help and information if they were faced with a weather-related emergency or natural disaster (38%) or an industrial or transportation accident (31%) (Table 1.1).
- Residents also stated (61%) that hospitals, clinics, doctors or other medical professionals were the most commonly anticipated sources of initial help and information in the event of an outbreak of a serious or life-threatening disease, and police or law enforcement during rioting of civil unrest (39%) or an act of terrorism or terrorist threat (34%). In the event of a contamination or shortage of water or food, they most commonly said they would initially seek help from local government (33%), and in the event of an extended power outage, residents frequently anticipated first turning to their utility company (47%).

### **Prior lifetime experience with a major emergency or disaster<sup>5</sup>**

- Nearly half (45%) of Greater Sudbury residents have faced a major emergency or disaster in Canada in a community they were living in at the time of the event, seven in ten (71%) of whom reported experiencing severe disruptions to their daily activities as a result of the event.
- Extended power outages lasting 24 hours or longer (70%) were the most commonly experienced emergencies or disasters by residents of Greater Sudbury, followed by winter storms (including blizzards and ice storms) (11%<sup>E</sup>) and tornadoes (8%<sup>E</sup>).
- The most common types of disruption to daily activities endured by residents who had experienced major emergencies or disasters were an inability to use electrical appliances (75%) and an inability to heat or cool their home (72%). Half of residents who had experienced a major emergency or disaster reported having to miss school or work (49%), or having to boil water for drinking or drink bottled water (49%). More severe disruptions experienced were an inability to use roads or transportation in the community (15%<sup>E</sup>) or communicate outside of the home (15%<sup>E</sup>), as well as home evacuation (13%<sup>E</sup>).
- Most (86%) residents who experienced an emergency or disaster were able to resume their daily activities within one week of the event; six in ten (61%) were able to resume their daily activities in two days or less.
- More than four in ten (43%) residents who had experienced an emergency or disaster received help during or immediately following the event, most commonly from family (35%<sup>E</sup>) or neighbours (25%<sup>E</sup>).

- One in three (34%) residents of Greater Sudbury who experienced a major emergency or disaster in Canada in a community where they were living at the time of the event and which was significant enough to disrupt their regular daily routine also endured a loss of property or financial impact. Enduring some sort of long-term emotional or psychological impact was less common (7%<sup>E</sup>).

## Emergency planning, precautionary and fire safety behaviours

- Three out of four (75%) people residing in Greater Sudbury lived in a household that was engaged in at least two emergency planning activities,<sup>6</sup> with half (50%) living in a household with three or four such activities (Table 1.2). Nearly one in ten (9%<sup>E</sup>) people lived in a household that had not participated in any emergency planning activities.
- Over half (58%) lived in a household with at least two precautionary measures<sup>7</sup> taken in case of an emergency, and one-third (33%) lived in a household with three or four such measures. More than one in ten (14%) people lived in a household with no precautionary measures in place.
- The majority (99.6%) of residents reported living in a household with a working smoke detector, and three-quarters (74%) reported living in a household with a working fire extinguisher (Table 1.3). Most (85%) residents stated that they had a working carbon monoxide detector in their household. Overall, two-thirds (65%) of the residents of Greater Sudbury stated that they had implemented all three fire safety measures within their households.
- The number of emergency planning activities and precautionary measures that residents of Greater Sudbury engaged in did not often differ from residents of Ontario or residents of Canada's 10 provinces. However, those in Greater Sudbury were significantly more likely to have implemented all four precautionary measures (12%), as well as all three fire safety measures (65%) than those in Ontario (6% and 53%, respectively) and Canada (7% and 42%, respectively).<sup>8</sup>
- There were significant differences in the types of activities and measures set in place by residents of Greater Sudbury when compared to the rest of Ontario and Canada more broadly, with those in Greater Sudbury often being more prepared. For example, the proportion of Greater Sudbury residents who had an emergency exit plan (73%) and a designated meeting place for household members (40%) was significantly higher compared to Ontarians and Canadians. In addition, residents of Greater Sudbury more often reported having a wind-up or battery-operated radio (66%), a back-up generator (33%) and a working fire extinguisher (74%) compared to Ontarians and Canadians.

## Social networks and sense of belonging

- Six in ten (60%) residents of Greater Sudbury had a strong sense of belonging<sup>9</sup> to their community.
- Most (90%) residents described the neighbourhood they lived in as a place where neighbours generally help each other.<sup>10</sup> Of those who did not describe their neighbourhood this way, most (87%) still described it as a place where neighbours would help each other in an emergency.<sup>11</sup>
- Many individuals had a large network of support in the event of an emergency or disaster, with more than five people to turn to for emotional support (69%), for help if physically injured (67%) as well as in case of a home evacuation (61%). Three in ten residents had such a large support network if financial help was needed (31%). However, 6%<sup>E</sup> reported that they had no one to turn to for financial help.
- High levels of sense of belonging, self-efficacy and social support, as well as civic engagement and involvement in political activities, were often associated with a higher level of emergency preparedness (Table 1.4).

## Data tables

Table 1.1

Most commonly anticipated sources of initial help and information, by type of emergency or disaster, residents of Greater Sudbury, Ontario, 2014

Most common sources of initial help and information by type of emergency or disaster	percent
<b>Weather-related emergency or natural disaster</b>	
News- Radio	38
News- Television	23
News- Internet	17

<b>Extended power outages</b>		
Utility company		47
News- Radio		21
Family		12 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Outbreak of serious or life-threatening disease</b>		
Hospital, clinic, doctor or other medical professional		61
News- Radio		20
News- Television		19
<b>Industrial or transportation accident</b>		
News- Radio		31
News- Television		22
Police/law enforcement		18
<b>Contamination or shortage of water or food <sup>1</sup></b>		
Local government		33
News- Radio		19
News- Television		15 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Act of terrorism or terrorist threat <sup>1</sup></b>		
Police/law enforcement		34
News- Television		32
News- Radio		26 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Rioting or civil unrest</b>		
Police/law enforcement		39
News- Television		23 <sup>E</sup>
News- Radio		22 <sup>E</sup>
<sup>E</sup> use with caution		
1 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% when respondents were asked about their likely sources of initial help and information.		
<b>Note:</b> Respondents who perceived their community was at risk for any form of emergency or disaster were then asked where they would turn to first for information or assistance in the event of the perceived emergency or disaster. Respondents could provide more than one response. Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.		
<b>Source:</b> Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.		

**Table 1.2**  
**Number of emergency planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents, community of Greater Sudbury, Ontario, 2014**

Number of planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents	Greater Sudbury	Ontario	Canada
	percent		
<b>Number of emergency planning activities</b>			
None	9 <sup>E</sup>	8	8
1 activity	14	16	17
2 activities	25	25	25
3 activities	29	28	27
4 activities	21	21	19
<b>Number of precautionary measures</b>			
None	14	15	16
1 measure	25	28	27
2 measures	25	29	28

3 measures	21	20	20
4 measures	12 <sup>***</sup>	6	7
<b>Number of fire safety measures<sup>1</sup></b>			
None	F	F	1
1 measure	5 <sup>E**</sup>	7	14
2 measures	27 <sup>***</sup>	35	38
3 measures	65 <sup>***</sup>	53	42
<p><sup>E</sup> use with caution  <sup>F</sup> too unreliable to be published  ** significantly different from Canada level estimate (p &lt; 0.05)  *** significantly different from both provincial and Canada level estimates (p &lt; 0.05)  1 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Canada'.</p> <p><b>Note:</b> Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents. Emergency planning activities include: an emergency exit plan, an emergency supply kit, photocopies/electronic copies of important documents and a list of emergency contact numbers. Precautionary measures include: a battery-operated or wind-up radio, an alternative heat source, a back-up generator and an alternative water source. Fire safety measures include a working smoke detector, a working carbon monoxide detector and a working fire extinguisher.  <b>Source:</b> Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.</p>			

**Table 1.3**  
**Planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures residents engaged in, community of Greater Sudbury, Ontario, 2014**

Residents whose households were involved in the following:	Greater Sudbury	Ontario	Canada
	percent		
<b>Emergency planning activities</b>			
Emergency exit plan	73 <sup>***</sup>	63	60
Exit plan has been practised/reviewed in last 12 months <sup>1</sup>	50	47	46
Designated meeting place for household members <sup>2</sup>	40 <sup>***</sup>	30	33
Contact plan for household members <sup>2</sup>	59	57	55
Household emergency supply kit	50	47	47
Vehicle emergency supply kit <sup>3</sup>	70 <sup>**</sup>	62	59
Extra copies of important documents	53	56	53
List of emergency contact numbers	60 <sup>***</sup>	71	69
Plan for meeting special health needs <sup>4</sup>	68	61	62
<b>Precautionary measures</b>			
Wind-up or battery-operated radio	66 <sup>***</sup>	59	58
Alternate heat source	44	46	48
Back-up generator	33 <sup>***</sup>	20	23
Alternate water source	44	44	43
Other <sup>5</sup>	22	22	21
<b>Fire safety measures</b>			
Working smoke detector	100 <sup>***</sup>	99	98
Working carbon monoxide detector	85 <sup>***</sup>	80	60
Working fire extinguisher	74 <sup>***</sup>	64	66

\*\* significantly different from Canada level estimate (p < 0.05)

\*\*\* significantly different from both provincial and Canada level estimates (p < 0.05)

1 Percentage based only on those indicating that they have an emergency exit plan.

2 Excludes Canadians living in single-person households.

3 Excludes those who reported that they lived in a household that did not have a vehicle.

4 Percentage based only on those indicating that they or someone in their household has special medical needs.

5 'Other precautionary measures' include having an escape/rescue plan for pets, extra supply of fuel, checking and replenishing emergency supplies, and keeping exits clear.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

**Table 1.4**

**High or moderately high levels of emergency planning, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents, by social and political involvement, community of Greater Sudbury, Ontario, 2014**

Social and political involvement	Percentage of residents who had high or moderately high levels of...		
	Planning activities	Precautionary measures	Fire safety measures
	percent		
<b>Engagement in political activities <sup>1</sup></b>			
Yes <sup>†</sup>	52	33	64
No <sup>7</sup>	36 <sup>E *</sup>	29 <sup>E</sup>	66
<b>High level of civic engagement <sup>2</sup></b>			
Yes <sup>†</sup>	56	35	69
No	37 <sup>*</sup>	27	57 <sup>*</sup>
<b>High level of social support <sup>3</sup></b>			
Yes <sup>†</sup>	53	34	75
No	48	32	62 <sup>*</sup>
<b>Strong sense of belonging to community <sup>4</sup></b>			
Yes <sup>†</sup>	56	35	70
No	40 <sup>*</sup>	31	58 <sup>*</sup>
<b>High neighbourhood trust <sup>5</sup></b>			
Yes <sup>†</sup>	54	38	70
No	47	30	63
<b>High level of self-efficacy <sup>6</sup></b>			
Yes <sup>†</sup>	59	38	71
No	38 <sup>*</sup>	28	58 <sup>*</sup>

<sup>E</sup> use with caution

\* significantly different from reference category ( $p < 0.05$ )

† reference category

- 1 Includes individuals over the age of 17 years who are eligible to vote, and who have participated in or volunteered for political parties or events in the past 12 months, including municipal, provincial, or federal elections, or expressed views on political or social issues through signing a petition, contacting news agencies or politicians, or attended a meeting involving social or community issues.
- 2 Civic engagement measures individuals over the age of 17 years who were involved in a recreational group or organization in the past 12 months, and includes engagement in political activities. A 'high level' is defined as having been involved in at least 4 activities in the past 12 months.
- 3 A 'high level of social support' is defined as having five or more people whom that individual could turn to for help in an emergency if they are physically injured, require emotional support, shelter, and/or financial assistance.
- 4 A 'strong sense of belonging to community' is rating one's own sense of belonging to their community as a 4 or a 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "very weak" and 5 "very strong".
- 5 'High neighbourhood trust' is rating one's own trust in the people in one's neighbourhood as 4 or 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "cannot be trusted at all" and 5 represents "can be trusted a lot", as well as having a response of "very likely" when asked about the likelihood of someone in their neighbourhood returning a lost wallet or purse containing two hundred dollars with the money still inside.
- 6 A 'high level of self-efficacy' is derived from having a high self-rating on a scale of 1 (poor) to 5 (excellent) for the following three categories: an ability to think clearly and solve day-to-day problems, to handle unexpected and difficult problems, and to figure out what to do if faced with an emergency situation.
- 7 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Precautionary measures'.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents. Households with 'moderately high' or 'high' levels of emergency planning engaged in 3 or 4 of the following: having an exit plan, an emergency supply kit, extra copies of important documents and an emergency contact list. 'Moderately high' or 'high' levels of precautionary measures include having 3 or 4 of the following: a wind-up or battery operated radio, a back-up generator, an alternate source of heat and additional water. 'Moderately high' or 'high' levels of fire safety measure include having all 3 of the following: a working smoke detector, a working fire extinguisher, and a working carbon monoxide detector.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

## Notes

<sup>E</sup> use with caution

- 1 A Census Metropolitan Area (CMA) or a Census Agglomeration (CA) is formed by one or more adjacent municipalities centred on a population centre (known as the core). A CMA must have a total population of at least 100,000 of which 50,000 or more must live in the core. A CA must have a core population of at least 10,000. To be included in the CMA or CA, other adjacent municipalities must have a high degree of integration with the core as measured by commuting flows derived from census data.
- 2 The target population for the SEPR included all persons 15 years of age or older, residing in households in Canada's 10 provinces, excluding full-time residents of institutions (e.g. nursing homes, group homes, hospitals).
- 3 The SEPR covers three types of communities: Census Metropolitan Areas (CMAs), Census Agglomerations (CAs) with population greater than 50,000, and 'smaller communities' which include CAs with population 50,000 or less and those areas that fall outside of CMAs and CAs. All CMAs and CAs (with population greater than 50,000) were included in the SEPR. A sample of households were selected from smaller communities within each province to represent all households within the province in similar communities. Additional information on the SEPR and its sampling methodology can be found in the 'Survey description' section.
- 4 Throughout this fact sheet, responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.
- 5 This section focuses on personal experiences with emergencies or disasters that happened in Canada, in a community where the person was living at the time, and was significant enough to severely interrupt the individual's regular daily activities.

- 6 Emergency planning activities include: having an emergency exit plan, a household emergency supply kit, extra copies of important documents and an emergency contact list.
- 7 Precautionary measures include: having a wind-up or battery-operated radio, an alternate heat source such as a non-electric stove or heater or a wood-burning fireplace, a back-up generator and an alternative water source such as a well, tank or litres of stored water.
- 8 Unless otherwise specified, differences are statistically significant ( $p < 0.05$ ).
- 9 A 'strong sense of belonging to community' is rating one's own sense of belonging to their community as a 4 or a 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "very weak" and 5 "very strong".
- 10 A proportion (17%) of respondents were not asked questions regarding neighbourhood helpfulness in the event of an emergency and as such these cases are not included in the analysis on neighbourhood helpfulness in general or in the event of an emergency.
- 11 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% when respondents were asked about whether their neighbourhood is a place where neighbours would help each other if there is an emergency.



## Fact sheet Community of Sault Ste. Marie (CA), Ontario

---

In 2014, information on the emergency preparedness of people living in the Census Agglomeration<sup>1</sup> of Sault Ste. Marie was collected through the Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada (SEPR).<sup>2</sup> This fact sheet presents information on the risk awareness and level of emergency preparedness of the residents of Sault Ste. Marie, which could help improve the understanding of community resilience in the event of an emergency.<sup>3,4</sup>

### **Risk awareness and anticipated sources of help in an emergency or disaster**

- Winter storms (including blizzards, ice storms and extreme cold) (96%) were named by residents of Sault Ste. Marie as the event most likely to occur in their community, followed by extended power outages lasting 24 hours or longer (77%), industrial or transportation accidents (66%), floods (64%) and wildfires (61%).
- In the event of a weather-related emergency or natural disaster, residents most commonly named news on the radio (28%), television (26%) or Internet (26%) as the sources of help and information they would turn to first (Table 1.1). News on the radio (27%) or television (27%) were named as the sources of initial help and information in the event of an industrial or transportation accident. Residents commonly anticipated turning to news on the Internet (23%<sup>E</sup>) or television (22%<sup>E</sup>) for help and information in the event of a contamination or shortage of water or food.
- Residents most commonly listed their utility company (46%) as an initial source of help and information if faced with an extended power outage, and hospitals, clinics, doctors or other medical professionals (60%) in the event of an outbreak of a serious or life-threatening disease. Police and law enforcement were most commonly named by residents of Sault Ste. Marie as the sources of initial information and assistance in the event of rioting or civil unrest (46%<sup>E</sup>) or an act of terrorism or terrorist threat (37%).

### **Prior lifetime experience with a major emergency or disaster<sup>5</sup>**

- Four in ten (39%) people living in the community of Sault Ste. Marie have personally experienced a major emergency or disaster in Canada in a community where they were living at the time. For two-thirds of these individuals (65%), the emergency or disaster was significant enough to have resulted in severe disruptions to their daily activities.
- Extended power outages lasting 24 hours or longer were the most commonly experienced emergencies or disasters faced by residents (68%), followed by floods (17%<sup>E</sup>) and winter storms (including blizzards and ice storms) (14%<sup>E</sup>).
- The majority (72%) of people in Sault Ste. Marie who have endured a major emergency or disaster were unable to use electrical appliances as a result, making it the most common type of disruption to daily activities. Other common disruptions experienced by residents included an inability to heat or cool their home (64%), a need to miss work or school (53%) or an appointment or a planned activity (51%), as well as an inability to store perishable foods at home (50%). A more severe, but less frequent, disruption experienced was an inability to use roads or transportation within the community (21%<sup>E</sup>).
- The majority (91%) of residents were able to resume their daily activities within five days of the event: 50% within 24 hours, 26% within one to two days and 15% within three to five days.
- Less than half (45%) of residents received help either during or immediately following the emergency or disaster. For those who received help, it most commonly came from neighbours (28%<sup>E</sup>).



- About one in four (24%<sup>E</sup>) people in Sault Ste. Marie who experienced a major emergency or disaster endured a loss of property or some other type of financial impact.

## Emergency planning, precautionary and fire safety behaviours

- Seven in ten (71%) people in Sault Ste. Marie lived in households that were engaged in at least two emergency planning activities,<sup>6</sup> and half (49%) lived in households with three or four such activities (Table 1.2). Less than one in ten (8%<sup>E</sup>) people lived in a household that had not participated in any emergency planning activities.
- Three out of five (59%) residents lived in a household with at least two precautionary measures<sup>7</sup> taken in case of an emergency, with approximately one-quarter (27%) living in a household with three or four such measures. About one in ten (12%<sup>E</sup>) people lived in a household with no precautionary measures in place.
- Most (99%) residents reported living in a household with a working smoke detector (Table 1.3). Four out of five (80%) reported living in a household with a working carbon monoxide detector, and seven in ten (70%) stated that they had a working fire extinguisher. Nearly three out of five (58%) residents stated that they had implemented all three fire safety measures within their households.
- The number of emergency planning activities and precautionary measures taken by residents of Sault Ste. Marie did not differ significantly from Ontario residents or Canadians in the 10 provinces. Residents of Sault Ste. Marie, however, were more likely than Canadians to have implemented all three fire safety measures (58% versus 42%).<sup>8</sup>
- A couple of differences were observed between residents of Sault Ste. Marie and Ontarians and Canadians in terms of the types of emergency planning activities they were involved in. Specifically, residents of Sault Ste. Marie (62%) were less likely than both Ontario residents (71%) and Canadians (69%) to have a list of emergency contact numbers, but those in Sault Ste. Marie were more likely to have an emergency exit plan (71%, 63% and 60%, respectively). In addition, residents of Sault Ste. Marie were also significantly more likely to have a working carbon monoxide detector in their home (80%) than Canadians in general (60%).

## Social networks and sense of belonging

- Approximately half (52%) of Sault Ste. Marie's residents had a strong sense of belonging<sup>9</sup> to their community.<sup>10</sup>
- Most (84%) residents described their neighbourhood as a place where neighbours generally help each other.<sup>11</sup> Of those who did not describe their neighbourhood this way, the majority (80%) still described it as a place where neighbours would help each other in an emergency.<sup>12</sup>
- Nearly two-thirds of residents had a large network of support in the event of an emergency or disaster, with more than five people to turn to for help if physically injured (64%), for emotional support (63%) or in the event of a home evacuation (60%). However, one-quarter of residents had a large network of people to turn to for financial help (26%), and one in ten (10%<sup>E</sup>) reported that they had no one to turn to for financial help.<sup>13</sup>
- Generally, the level of emergency preparedness of residents of Sault Ste. Marie was not impacted by their social networks, sense of belonging or social and political involvement (Table 1.4).

## Data tables

Table 1.1

Most commonly anticipated sources of initial help and information, by type of emergency or disaster, residents of Sault Ste. Marie, Ontario, 2014

Most common sources of initial help and information by type of emergency or disaster	percent
<b>Weather-related emergency or natural disaster</b>	
News- Radio	28
News- Television	26
News- Internet	26
<b>Extended power outages</b>	
Utility company	46
News- Radio	22

News- Internet	11 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Outbreak of serious or life-threatening disease</b>	
Hospital, clinic, doctor or other medical professional	60
News- Internet	21 <sup>E</sup>
News- Television	19 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Industrial or transportation accident <sup>1</sup></b>	
News- Television	27
News- Radio	27
News- Internet	26
<b>Contamination or shortage of water or food <sup>1</sup></b>	
News- Internet	23 <sup>E</sup>
News- Television	22 <sup>E</sup>
Local government	20 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Act of terrorism or terrorist threat</b>	
Police/law enforcement	37
News- Television	29 <sup>E</sup>
News- Internet	28 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Rioting or civil unrest</b>	
Police/law enforcement	46 <sup>E</sup>
News- Television	28 <sup>E</sup>
News- Internet	24 <sup>E</sup>
<sup>E</sup> use with caution	
1 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% when respondents were asked about their likely sources of initial help and information.	
<b>Note:</b> Respondents who perceived their community was at risk for any form of emergency or disaster were then asked where they would turn to first for information or assistance in the event of the perceived emergency or disaster. Respondents could provide more than one response. Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.	
<b>Source:</b> Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.	

**Table 1.2**  
**Number of emergency planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents, community of Sault Ste. Marie, Ontario, 2014**

Number of planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents	Sault Ste. Marie	Ontario	Canada
	percent		
<b>Number of emergency planning activities</b>			
None	8 <sup>E</sup>	8	8
1 activity	20	16	17
2 activities	22	25	25
3 activities	31	28	27
4 activities	18	21	19
<b>Number of precautionary measures</b>			
None	12 <sup>E</sup>	15	16
1 measure	29	28	27
2 measures	32	29	28
3 measures	20	20	20
4 measures	7 <sup>E</sup>	6	7
<b>Number of fire safety measures <sup>1</sup></b>			

None	F	F	1
1 measure	8 <sup>E**</sup>	7	14
2 measures	31 **	35	38
3 measures	58 **	53	42

<sup>E</sup> use with caution  
F too unreliable to be published  
\*\* significantly different from Canada level estimate (p < 0.05)

1 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Canada'.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents. Emergency planning activities include: an emergency exit plan, an emergency supply kit, photocopies/electronic copies of important documents and a list of emergency contact numbers. Precautionary measures include: a battery-operated or wind-up radio, an alternative heat source, a back-up generator and an alternative water source. Fire safety measures include a working smoke detector, a working carbon monoxide detector and a working fire extinguisher.  
**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

**Table 1.3**  
**Planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures residents engaged in, community of Sault Ste. Marie, Ontario, 2014**

Residents whose households were involved in the following:	Sault Ste. Marie	Ontario	Canada
	percent		
<b>Emergency planning activities</b>			
Emergency exit plan	71 ***	63	60
Exit plan has been practised/reviewed in last 12 months <sup>1</sup>	45	47	46
Designated meeting place for household members <sup>2</sup>	41 *	30	33
Contact plan for household members <sup>2</sup>	55	57	55
Household emergency supply kit	49	47	47
Vehicle emergency supply kit <sup>3</sup>	64	62	59
Extra copies of important documents	50	56	53
List of emergency contact numbers	62 ***	71	69
Plan for meeting special health needs <sup>4</sup>	63	61	62
<b>Precautionary measures</b>			
Wind-up or battery-operated radio	64	59	58
Alternate heat source	47	46	48
Back-up generator	26	20	23
Alternate water source	43	44	43
Other <sup>5</sup>	19	22	21
<b>Fire safety measures</b>			
Working smoke detector	99	99	98
Working carbon monoxide detector	80 **	80	60
Working fire extinguisher	70	64	66

\* significantly different from provincial level estimate (p < 0.05)

\*\* significantly different from Canada level estimate (p < 0.05)

\*\*\* significantly different from both provincial and Canada level estimates (p < 0.05)

1 Percentage based only on those indicating that they have an emergency exit plan.

2 Excludes Canadians living in single-person households.

3 Excludes those who reported that they lived in a household that did not have a vehicle.

4 Percentage based only on those indicating that they or someone in their household has special medical needs.

5 'Other precautionary measures' include having an escape/rescue plan for pets, extra supply of fuel, checking and replenishing emergency supplies, and keeping exits clear.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

**Table 1.4**  
**High or moderately high levels of emergency planning, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents, by social and political involvement, community of Sault Ste. Marie, Ontario, 2014**

Social and political involvement	Percentage of residents who had high or moderately high levels of...		
	Planning activities	Precautionary measures	Fire safety measures
	percent		
<b>Engagement in political activities <sup>1</sup></b>			
Yes †	48	30	63
No	47 <sup>E</sup>	22 <sup>E</sup>	45 <sup>E</sup>
<b>High level of civic engagement <sup>2</sup></b>			
Yes †	47	28	62
No	49	27 <sup>E</sup>	56
<b>High level of social support <sup>3</sup></b>			
Yes †	50	33 <sup>E</sup>	66
No	49	27	55
<b>Strong sense of belonging to community <sup>4</sup></b>			
Yes †	53	28	63
No	48	29 <sup>E</sup>	57
<b>High neighbourhood trust <sup>5</sup></b>			
Yes †	50	35	66
No	48	23 <sup>E</sup>	56
<b>High level of self-efficacy <sup>6</sup></b>			
Yes †	56	30	61
No	38 †	23 <sup>E</sup>	58

<sup>E</sup> use with caution

\* significantly different from reference category ( $p < 0.05$ )

† reference category

- 1 Includes individuals over the age of 17 years who are eligible to vote, and who have participated in or volunteered for political parties or events in the past 12 months, including municipal, provincial, or federal elections, or expressed views on political or social issues through signing a petition, contacting news agencies or politicians, or attended a meeting involving social or community issues.
- 2 Civic engagement measures individuals over the age of 17 years who were involved in a recreational group or organization in the past 12 months, and includes engagement in political activities. A 'high level' is defined as having been involved in at least 4 activities in the past 12 months.
- 3 A 'high level of social support' is defined as having five or more people whom that individual could turn to for help in an emergency if they are physically injured, require emotional support, shelter, and/or financial assistance.
- 4 A 'strong sense of belonging to community' is rating one's own sense of belonging to their community as a 4 or a 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "very weak" and 5 "very strong".
- 5 'High neighbourhood trust' is rating one's own trust in the people in one's neighbourhood as 4 or 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "cannot be trusted at all" and 5 represents "can be trusted a lot", as well as having a response of "very likely" when asked about the likelihood of someone in their neighbourhood returning a lost wallet or purse containing two hundred dollars with the money still inside.
- 6 A 'high level of self-efficacy' is derived from having a high self-rating on a scale of 1 (poor) to 5 (excellent) for the following three categories: an ability to think clearly and solve day-to-day problems, to handle unexpected and difficult problems, and to figure out what to do if faced with an emergency situation.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents. Households with 'moderately high' or 'high' levels of emergency planning engaged in 3 or 4 of the following: having an exit plan, an emergency supply kit, extra copies of important documents and an emergency contact list. 'Moderately high' or 'high' levels of precautionary measures include having 3 or 4 of the following: a wind-up or battery operated radio, a back-up generator, an alternate source of heat and additional water. 'Moderately high' or 'high' levels of fire safety measure include having all 3 of the following: a working smoke detector, a working fire extinguisher, and a working carbon monoxide detector.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

## Notes

<sup>E</sup> use with caution

- 1 A Census Metropolitan Area (CMA) or a Census Agglomeration (CA) is formed by one or more adjacent municipalities centred on a population centre (known as the core). A CMA must have a total population of at least 100,000 of which 50,000 or more must live in the core. A CA must have a core population of at least 10,000. To be included in the CMA or CA, other adjacent municipalities must have a high degree of integration with the core as measured by commuting flows derived from census data.
- 2 The target population for the SEPR included all persons 15 years of age or older, residing in households in Canada's 10 provinces, excluding full-time residents of institutions (e.g. nursing homes, group homes, hospitals).
- 3 The SEPR covers three types of communities: Census Metropolitan Areas (CMAs), Census Agglomerations (CAs) with population greater than 50,000, and 'smaller communities' which include CAs with population 50,000 or less and those areas that fall outside of CMAs and CAs. All CMAs and CAs (with population greater than 50,000) were included in the SEPR. A sample of households were selected from smaller communities within each province to represent all households within the province in similar communities. Additional information on the SEPR and its sampling methodology can be found in the 'Survey description' section.
- 4 Throughout this fact sheet, responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.
- 5 This section focuses on personal experiences with emergencies or disasters that happened in Canada, in a community where the person was living at the time, and was significant enough to severely interrupt the individual's regular daily activities.
- 6 Emergency planning activities include: having an emergency exit plan, a household emergency supply kit, extra copies of important documents and an emergency contact list.

- 7 Precautionary measures include: having a wind-up or battery-operated radio, an alternate heat source such as a non-electric stove or heater or a wood-burning fireplace, a back-up generator and an alternative water source such as a well, tank or litres of stored water.
- 8 Unless otherwise specified, differences are statistically significant ( $p < 0.05$ ).
- 9 A 'strong sense of belonging to community' is rating one's own sense of belonging to their community as a 4 or a 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "very weak" and 5 "very strong".
- 10 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% when respondents were asked about their sense of belonging to their neighbourhood.
- 11 A proportion (12%) of respondents were not asked questions regarding neighbourhood helpfulness in the event of an emergency and as such these cases are not included in the analysis on neighbourhood helpfulness in general or in the event of an emergency.
- 12 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were equal to 12% when respondents were asked about whether their neighbourhood is a place where neighbours would help each other if there is an emergency.
- 13 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% when respondents were asked about the number of people they could turn to for help if financial support is needed.



## Fact sheet Community of Thunder Bay (CMA), Ontario

---

In 2014, information on the emergency preparedness of people living in the Census Metropolitan Area<sup>1</sup> of Thunder Bay was collected through the Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada (SEPR).<sup>2</sup> This fact sheet presents information on the risk awareness and level of emergency preparedness of the residents of Thunder Bay, which could help improve the understanding of community resilience in the event of an emergency.<sup>3,4</sup>

### **Risk awareness and anticipated sources of help in an emergency or disaster**

- Most residents of Thunder Bay anticipated winter storms (including blizzards, ice storms and extreme cold) (93%) as an event likely to occur in their community, followed by wildfires or forest fires (80%), industrial or transportation accidents (75%), extended power outages lasting 24 hours or longer (74%), and floods (70%).
- In the event of a weather-related emergency or natural disaster (39%), an industrial or transportation accident (38%), or an act of terrorism or a terrorist threat (34%), news on the radio was most frequently named by residents as the source of information or assistance they would turn to first (Table 1.1). News on the television was most commonly anticipated as the source of information residents would turn to first if faced with rioting or civil unrest (33%).
- In the event of a contamination or shortage of water or food, residents commonly anticipated turning to news on the television or to their local government (both 25%). Residents in Thunder Bay most frequently anticipated first turning to their utility company in the event of an extended power outage (46%), and to hospitals, clinics, doctors or other medical professionals if faced with an outbreak of a serious or life-threatening disease (54%).

### **Prior lifetime experience with a major emergency or disaster<sup>5</sup>**

- More than one-third (38%) of people living in the community of Thunder Bay have experienced a major emergency or disaster in Canada in a community where they were living at the time. For nearly two-thirds (62%) of these individuals, the emergency or disaster was significant enough to have resulted in severe disruptions to their daily activities.
- Nearly half (46%) of residents who were affected by a major emergency or disaster experienced floods. Winter storms (including blizzards and ice storms) (24%<sup>E</sup>) and power outages lasting 24 hours or longer (9%<sup>E</sup>) followed as the next most commonly experienced events.
- Missing work or school (56%) and planned activities or appointments (50%) were the most common disruptions to daily activities experienced by residents, followed by an inability to use roads or transportation within the community (34%), and a need to boil drinking water or drink bottled water (32%). Nearly one-quarter of those who experienced an emergency or disaster had to evacuate their home (22%<sup>E</sup>).
- The majority (73%) of residents who were affected by a major emergency or disaster were able to resume their daily activities within one week of the event; close to half (46%) were able to resume their daily activities in two days or less.
- Two out of three (65%) residents received help from others either during or immediately following the emergency or disaster. Family (20%<sup>E</sup>), local government (19%<sup>E</sup>) and neighbours (18%<sup>E</sup>) were the most common sources of assistance.
- Nearly four in ten (37%) residents of Thunder Bay who were affected by a major emergency or disaster experienced a loss of property or financial impact,<sup>6</sup> and one in ten (10%<sup>E</sup>) experienced long-term emotional or psychological consequences.

## Emergency planning, precautionary and fire safety behaviours

- Nearly three-quarters (72%) of residents of Thunder Bay lived in households that were engaged in at least two emergency planning activities,<sup>7</sup> and close to half (47%) lived in households with three or four such activities (Table 1.2). Less than one in ten (8%<sup>E</sup>) had no emergency planning activities in place.
- More than half (56%) of residents lived in a household with at least two precautionary measures<sup>8</sup> taken in case of an emergency, and about one-third (35%) lived in a household with three or four such measures. About one in seven (15%) had no precautionary measures set in place within their home.
- Almost all (99.6%) residents reported living in a household with a working smoke detector, and three-quarters (74%) reported living in a household with a working fire extinguisher (Table 1.3). Seven in ten (69%) stated that they had a working carbon monoxide detector. More than half (55%) of residents stated that they had all three fire safety measures taken within their household.
- The number of fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents of Thunder Bay often differed significantly from Ontario residents and Canadians in the 10 provinces. Residents of Thunder Bay were more likely than those in Ontario and Canada in general to have all four precautionary measures in place (11%, 6% and 7%, respectively). Thunder Bay residents were also more likely than Canadians to have all three fire safety measures in place (55% and 42%, respectively).<sup>9</sup>
- A few differences were found between residents of Thunder Bay, Ontario and Canada in terms of the types of activities and measures people were involved in. For example, Thunder Bay residents were more likely than both Ontario residents and Canadians in general to have an emergency exit plan (74%, 63% and 60%, respectively), a back-up generator (32%, 20% and 23%, respectively) and a working fire extinguisher (74%, 64% and 66%, respectively). Residents of Thunder Bay were less likely than Ontarians to have extra copies of important documents (49% versus 56%) or a list of emergency contact numbers (65% versus 71%). Although the proportion of Thunder Bay residents with a working carbon monoxide detector (69%) was lower than that of Ontario (80%), it was higher than that of Canadians (60%).

## Social networks and sense of belonging

- More than half (56%) of residents of Thunder Bay had a strong sense of belonging<sup>10</sup> to their community.
- The majority (86%) of residents believed their neighbourhood is a place where neighbours help each other.<sup>11</sup> Of those who described their neighbourhood as a place where neighbours generally do not help each other, most (80%) still believed it is a place where neighbours would help each other in an emergency.<sup>12</sup>
- In the event of an emergency or disaster, more than half of residents had large networks of support with more than five people to turn to for emotional support (69%), for help if physically injured (63%) and in the event of a home evacuation (56%). About one in four had a large network for financial support in the event of an emergency (24%), and one in ten (11%) reported that they had no one to turn to for financial help.<sup>13</sup>
- For the most part, involvement in social or political activities did not have significant impacts on the level of emergency preparedness of the residents of Thunder Bay (Table 1.4).

## Data tables

Table 1.1

Most commonly anticipated sources of initial help and information, by type of emergency or disaster, residents of Thunder Bay, Ontario, 2014

Most common sources of initial help and information by type of emergency or disaster	percent
<b>Weather-related emergency or natural disaster</b>	
News- Radio	39
News- Television	29
News- Internet	19
<b>Extended power outages</b>	
Utility company	46



News- Radio	20
Family	12 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Outbreak of serious or life-threatening disease</b>	
Hospital, clinic, doctor or other medical professional	54
News- Radio	22
News- Television	21
<b>Industrial or transportation accident</b>	
News- Radio	38
News- Television	27
News- Internet	15
<b>Contamination or shortage of water or food <sup>1</sup></b>	
News- Television	25
Local government	25
News- Radio	23
<b>Act of terrorism or terrorist threat</b>	
News- Radio	34
Police/law enforcement	33
News- Television	32
<b>Rioting or civil unrest</b>	
News- Television	33
Police/law enforcement	32
News- Radio	32
<sup>E</sup> use with caution	
1 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% when respondents were asked about their likely sources of initial help and information.	
<b>Note:</b> Respondents who perceived their community was at risk for any form of emergency or disaster were then asked where they would turn to first for information or assistance in the event of the perceived emergency or disaster. Respondents could provide more than one response. Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.	
<b>Source:</b> Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.	

**Table 1.2**  
**Number of emergency planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents, community of Thunder Bay, Ontario, 2014**

Number of planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents	Thunder Bay	Ontario	Canada
	percent		
<b>Number of emergency planning activities</b>			
None	8 <sup>E</sup>	8	8
1 activity	18	16	17
2 activities	25	25	25
3 activities	30	28	27
4 activities	17	21	19
<b>Number of precautionary measures</b>			
None	15	15	16
1 measure	27	28	27
2 measures	21 <sup>***</sup>	29	28
3 measures	24 <sup>**</sup>	20	20
4 measures	11 <sup>***</sup>	6	7

Number of fire safety measures <sup>1</sup>			
None		F	F
1 measure	10 ***	7	14
2 measures	32 **	35	38
3 measures	55 **	53	42

<sup>E</sup> use with caution  
<sup>F</sup> too unreliable to be published

\*\* significantly different from Canada level estimate (p < 0.05)

\*\*\* significantly different from both provincial and Canada level estimates (p < 0.05)

1 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Canada'.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents. Emergency planning activities include: an emergency exit plan, an emergency supply kit, photocopies/electronic copies of important documents and a list of emergency contact numbers. Precautionary measures include: a battery-operated or wind-up radio, an alternative heat source, a back-up generator and an alternative water source. Fire safety measures include a working smoke detector, a working carbon monoxide detector and a working fire extinguisher.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

**Table 1.3**  
**Planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures residents engaged in, community of Thunder Bay, Ontario, 2014**

Residents whose households were involved in the following:	Thunder Bay	Ontario	Canada
	percent		
<b>Emergency planning activities</b>			
Emergency exit plan	74 ***	63	60
Exit plan has been practised/reviewed in last 12 months <sup>1</sup>	46	47	46
Designated meeting place for household members <sup>2</sup>	39 *	30	33
Contact plan for household members <sup>2</sup>	53	57	55
Household emergency supply kit	43	47	47
Vehicle emergency supply kit <sup>3</sup>	63	62	59
Extra copies of important documents	49 *	56	53
List of emergency contact numbers	65 *	71	69
Plan for meeting special health needs <sup>4</sup>	56	61	62
<b>Precautionary measures</b>			
Wind-up or battery-operated radio	62	59	58
Alternate heat source	47	46	48
Back-up generator	32 ***	20	23
Alternate water source	47	44	43
Other <sup>5</sup>	22	22	21
<b>Fire safety measures</b>			
Working smoke detector	100 ***	99	98
Working carbon monoxide detector	69 ***	80	60
Working fire extinguisher	74 ***	64	66

\* significantly different from provincial level estimate (p < 0.05)

\*\*\* significantly different from both provincial and Canada level estimates (p < 0.05)

1 Percentage based only on those indicating that they have an emergency exit plan.

2 Excludes Canadians living in single-person households.

3 Excludes those who reported that they lived in a household that did not have a vehicle.

4 Percentage based only on those indicating that they or someone in their household has special medical needs.

5 'Other precautionary measures' include having an escape/rescue plan for pets, extra supply of fuel, checking and replenishing emergency supplies, and keeping exits clear.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

**Table 1.4**

**High or moderately high levels of emergency planning, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents, by social and political involvement, community of Thunder Bay, Ontario, 2014**

Social and political involvement	Percentage of residents who had high or moderately high levels of...		
	Planning activities	Precautionary measures	Fire safety measures
	percent		
<b>Engagement in political activities <sup>1</sup></b>			
Yes †	48	37	57
No	44	31 <sup>E</sup>	55
<b>High level of civic engagement <sup>2</sup></b>			
Yes †	47	40	59
No	47	28 *	52
<b>High level of social support <sup>3</sup></b>			
Yes †	53	41	58
No	47	35	54
<b>Strong sense of belonging to community <sup>4</sup></b>			
Yes †	49	38	55
No	48	34	58
<b>High neighbourhood trust <sup>5</sup></b>			
Yes †	56	52	62
No <sup>7</sup>	42 *	25 *	50 *
<b>High level of self-efficacy <sup>6</sup></b>			
Yes †	50	40	55
No <sup>7</sup>	45	31	55

<sup>E</sup> use with caution

\* significantly different from reference category ( $p < 0.05$ )

† reference category

- 1 Includes individuals over the age of 17 years who are eligible to vote, and who have participated in or volunteered for political parties or events in the past 12 months, including municipal, provincial, or federal elections, or expressed views on political or social issues through signing a petition, contacting news agencies or politicians, or attended a meeting involving social or community issues.
- 2 Civic engagement measures individuals over the age of 17 years who were involved in a recreational group or organization in the past 12 months, and includes engagement in political activities. A 'high level' is defined as having been involved in at least 4 activities in the past 12 months.
- 3 A 'high level of social support' is defined as having five or more people whom that individual could turn to for help in an emergency if they are physically injured, require emotional support, shelter, and/or financial assistance.
- 4 A 'strong sense of belonging to community' is rating one's own sense of belonging to their community as a 4 or a 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "very weak" and 5 "very strong".
- 5 'High neighbourhood trust' is rating one's own trust in the people in one's neighbourhood as 4 or 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "cannot be trusted at all" and 5 represents "can be trusted a lot", as well as having a response of "very likely" when asked about the likelihood of someone in their neighbourhood returning a lost wallet or purse containing two hundred dollars with the money still inside.
- 6 A 'high level of self-efficacy' is derived from having a high self-rating on a scale of 1 (poor) to 5 (excellent) for the following three categories: an ability to think clearly and solve day-to-day problems, to handle unexpected and difficult problems, and to figure out what to do if faced with an emergency situation.
- 7 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Fire safety measures'.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents. Households with 'moderately high' or 'high' levels of emergency planning engaged in 3 or 4 of the following: having an exit plan, an emergency supply kit, extra copies of important documents and an emergency contact list. 'Moderately high' or 'high' levels of precautionary measures include having 3 or 4 of the following: a wind-up or battery operated radio, a back-up generator, an alternate source of heat and additional water. 'Moderately high' or 'high' levels of fire safety measure include having all 3 of the following: a working smoke detector, a working fire extinguisher, and a working carbon monoxide detector.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

## Notes

<sup>E</sup> use with caution

- 1 A Census Metropolitan Area (CMA) or a Census Agglomeration (CA) is formed by one or more adjacent municipalities centred on a population centre (known as the core). A CMA must have a total population of at least 100,000 of which 50,000 or more must live in the core. A CA must have a core population of at least 10,000. To be included in the CMA or CA, other adjacent municipalities must have a high degree of integration with the core as measured by commuting flows derived from census data.
- 2 The target population for the SEPR included all persons 15 years of age or older, residing in households in Canada's 10 provinces, excluding full-time residents of institutions (e.g., nursing homes, group homes, hospitals).
- 3 The SEPR covers three types of communities: Census Metropolitan Areas (CMAs), Census Agglomerations (CAs) with population greater than 50,000, and 'smaller communities' which include CAs with population 50,000 or less and those areas that fall outside of CMAs and CAs. All CMAs and CAs (with population greater than 50,000) were included in the SEPR. A sample of households were selected from smaller communities within each province to represent all households within the province in similar communities. Additional information on the SEPR and its sampling methodology can be found in the 'Survey description' section.
- 4 Throughout this fact sheet, responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.
- 5 This section focuses on personal experiences with emergencies or disasters that happened in Canada, in a community where the person was living at the time, and was significant enough to severely interrupt the individual's regular daily activities.

- 6 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% when respondents were asked about whether the emergency they experienced caused them to suffer loss of property or financial impacts.
- 7 Emergency planning activities include: having an emergency exit plan, a household emergency supply kit, extra copies of important documents and an emergency contact list.
- 8 Precautionary measures include: having a wind-up or battery-operated radio, an alternate heat source such as a non-electric stove or heater or a wood-burning fireplace, a back-up generator and an alternative water source such as a well, tank or litres of stored water.
- 9 Unless otherwise specified, differences are statistically significant ( $p < 0.05$ ).
- 10 A 'strong sense of belonging to community' is rating one's own sense of belonging to their community as a 4 or a 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "very weak" and 5 "very strong".
- 11 A proportion (8%) of respondents were not asked questions regarding neighbourhood helpfulness in the event of an emergency and as such these cases are not included in the analysis on neighbourhood helpfulness in general or in the event of an emergency.
- 12 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were equal to 11% when respondents were asked about whether their neighbourhood is a place where neighbours would help each other if there is an emergency.
- 13 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% when respondents were asked about the number of people they could turn to for help if financial support is needed.



## Fact sheet Smaller communities of Ontario

---

In 2014, information on the emergency preparedness of people living in 'smaller communities' of Ontario was collected through the Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada (SEPR).<sup>1 2 3</sup> This fact sheet presents information on the risk awareness and level of emergency preparedness of the residents of Ontario's smaller communities, which could help improve the understanding of community resilience in the event of an emergency.<sup>4</sup>

### **Risk awareness and anticipated sources of help in an emergency or disaster**

- People living in the smaller communities of Ontario anticipated winter storms (including blizzards, ice storms and extreme cold) (94%) as the event most likely to occur within their communities, followed by extended power outages lasting 24 hours or longer (82%) and heat waves (51%).
- Residents of these smaller communities anticipated first turning to news on the radio as an initial source of help and information in the event of a weather-related emergency or natural disaster (34%) or an industrial or transportation accident (28%) (Table 1.1).
- Police or law enforcement would most commonly be the first sources of initial help and information for residents in the event of an act of terrorism or terrorist threat (40%<sup>E</sup>) or rioting or civil unrest (38%<sup>E</sup>). In the event of a contamination or shortage of water or food, local government was the most commonly anticipated source of help and information for residents (38%). In the event of an extended power outage, residents would commonly first turn to their utility company (49%) and if faced with an outbreak of a serious or life-threatening disease, they most frequently anticipated turning to hospitals, clinics, doctors or other medical professionals first (60%).

### **Prior lifetime experience with a major emergency or disaster<sup>5</sup>**

- Close to half (48%) of residents of the smaller communities of Ontario had personally experienced a major emergency or disaster within Canada, in a community where they were living at the time. Three out of four (74%) of these people had experienced an emergency or a disaster that was significant enough to have resulted in severe disruptions to their daily activities.
- Extended power outages lasting 24 hours or longer (41%) were the most commonly experienced emergency or disaster faced by residents in smaller communities in Ontario. Winter storms including blizzards and ice storms (36%) and tornadoes (14%<sup>E</sup>) were the next most commonly experienced events.
- Missing work or school (57%), missing appointments or planned activities (53%) or an inability to use electrical appliances (52%) were the most common types of disruptions to daily activities endured by residents who were faced with major emergencies or disasters. One-third (32%) of emergency victims were unable to use roads or transportation within their community and one in five (20%<sup>E</sup>) had to evacuate their homes; about one in ten (11%<sup>E</sup>) were unable to communicate outside the home.
- Over three-quarters (78%) of the residents of Ontario's smaller communities who had experienced major emergencies or disasters were able to resume their daily activities within one week of the event: about one-quarter (26%) within 24 hours and another one-quarter (24%) within one to two days.
- Three out of five (59%) emergency or disaster victims received help either during or immediately following the event. Neighbours (36%<sup>E</sup>), family members (30%<sup>E</sup>) and friends (18%<sup>E</sup>) were the most common sources of assistance.

- Three in ten (30%) residents of Ontario's smaller communities who were affected by a major emergency or disaster which was significant enough to disrupt their regular daily routines endured a loss of property or another financial impact.

## Emergency planning, precautionary and fire safety behaviours

- Three-quarters (75%) of residents of the smaller communities of Ontario lived in households that were engaged in at least two emergency planning activities,<sup>6</sup> and over half (54%) reported living in households with three or four such activities (Table 1.2). Less than one in ten (8%<sup>E</sup>) people lived in a household that had not engaged in any emergency planning activities.
- Three out of four (74%) residents lived in a household with at least two precautionary measures<sup>7</sup> taken in the event of an emergency. Just under half (46%) lived in a household with three or four such measures. Less than one in ten (7%<sup>E</sup>) people lived in a household with no precautionary measures set in place.
- Most (99%) residents reported living in a household with a working smoke detector, and the majority reported living in a household with a working fire extinguisher (79%) or a working carbon monoxide detector (78%) (Table 1.3). Approximately three out of five (62%) residents stated that they had all three fire safety measures within their household.
- The number of emergency planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents of the smaller communities of Ontario were frequently different when compared to the province as a whole and to Canadians residing in the 10 provinces in general. For example, residents of the smaller communities of Ontario were more likely to have engaged in all four emergency planning activities (27%), all four precautionary measures (15%) and all three fire safety measures (62%) than were residents of Ontario overall (21%, 6% and 53%, respectively) and Canadians in general (19%, 7% and 42%, respectively).<sup>8</sup>
- Differences were often observed between residents of the smaller communities of Ontario and Ontarians as a whole and Canadians in general in terms of the types of activities and measures they had in place. For example, residents of the smaller communities of Ontario were more likely to have an emergency exit plan, a vehicle emergency supply kit, a wind-up or battery-operated radio, a back-up generator, as well as alternate water and heat sources, or a fire extinguisher when compared to residents of Ontario overall and Canadians in general.

## Social networks and sense of belonging

- Three in five (62%) people living in the smaller communities of Ontario had a strong sense of belonging<sup>9</sup> to their community.
- The majority (95%) of residents believed the neighbourhood they lived in is a place where neighbours generally help each other.<sup>10</sup> Of those who did not describe their neighbourhood this way, most (93%) still described it as a place where neighbours would help each other in an emergency.
- About two-thirds of residents had a large network of support in the event of an emergency or disaster, with more than five people to turn to for help if physically injured (69%), for emotional support (65%) or if they had to evacuate their home (63%). About half as many people (32%) had such a network for financial support in the event of an emergency, and one in ten (9%<sup>E</sup>) people reported that they had no one to turn to for financial help.<sup>11</sup>
- High levels of neighbourhood trust, sense of belonging, and self-efficacy, as well as engagement in civic activities were sometimes associated with a higher level of emergency preparedness (Table 1.4).

## Data tables

**Table 1.1**  
Most commonly anticipated sources of initial help and information, by type of emergency or disaster, residents of smaller communities of Ontario, 2014

Most common sources of initial help and information by type of emergency or disaster	percent
<b>Weather-related emergency or natural disaster</b>	
News- Radio	34
News- Television	19

News- Internet	18
<b>Extended power outages</b>	
Utility company	49
News- Radio	14
Family	9 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Outbreak of serious or life-threatening disease</b>	
Hospital, clinic, doctor or other medical professional	60
News- Radio	18 <sup>E</sup>
News- Internet	17 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Industrial or transportation accident</b>	
News- Radio	28
Police/law enforcement	27
News- Internet	16 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Contamination or shortage of water or food <sup>1</sup></b>	
Local government	38
News- Radio	15 <sup>E</sup>
Hospital, clinic, doctor or other medical professional	12 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Act of terrorism or terrorist threat <sup>1</sup></b>	
Police/law enforcement	40 <sup>E</sup>
News- Radio	25 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Rioting or civil unrest</b>	
Police/law enforcement	38 <sup>E</sup>
<sup>E</sup> use with caution	
1 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% when respondents were asked about their likely sources of initial help and information.	
<b>Note:</b> Respondents who perceived their community was at risk for any form of emergency or disaster were then asked where they would turn to first for information or assistance in the event of the perceived emergency or disaster. Respondents could provide more than one response. Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.	
<b>Source:</b> Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.	

**Table 1.2**  
**Number of emergency planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents, smaller communities of Ontario, 2014**

Number of planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents	Smaller communities of Ontario	Ontario	Canada
	percent		
<b>Number of emergency planning activities</b>			
None	8 <sup>E</sup>	8	8
1 activity	15	16	17
2 activities	21	25	25
3 activities	27	28	27
4 activities	27 <sup>***</sup>	21	19
<b>Number of precautionary measures</b>			
None	7 <sup>E</sup> <sup>***</sup>	15	16
1 measure	18 <sup>***</sup>	28	27
2 measures	28	29	28
3 measures	31 <sup>***</sup>	20	20
4 measures	15 <sup>***</sup>	6	7



Number of fire safety measures <sup>1</sup>			
None	F	F	1
1 measure	4 **	7	14
2 measures	32 **	35	38
3 measures	62 ***	53	42

<sup>E</sup> use with caution  
<sup>F</sup> too unreliable to be published

\*\* significantly different from Canada level estimate (p < 0.05)

\*\*\* significantly different from both provincial and Canada level estimates (p < 0.05)

<sup>1</sup> Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Canada'.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents. Emergency planning activities include: an emergency exit plan, an emergency supply kit, photocopies/electronic copies of important documents and a list of emergency contact numbers. Precautionary measures include: a battery-operated or wind-up radio, an alternative heat source, a back-up generator and an alternative water source. Fire safety measures include a working smoke detector, a working carbon monoxide detector and a working fire extinguisher.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

**Table 1.3**  
**Planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures residents engaged in, smaller communities of Ontario, 2014**

Residents whose households were involved in the following:	Smaller communities of Ontario	Ontario	Canada
	percent		
<b>Emergency planning activities</b>			
Emergency exit plan	74 ***	63	60
Exit plan has been practised/reviewed in last 12 months <sup>1</sup>	53 **	47	46
Designated meeting place for household members <sup>2</sup>	36 *	30	33
Contact plan for household members <sup>2</sup>	56	57	55
Household emergency supply kit	47	47	47
Vehicle emergency supply kit <sup>3</sup>	66 ***	62	59
Extra copies of important documents	53	56	53
List of emergency contact numbers	72	71	69
Plan for meeting special health needs <sup>4</sup>	69	61	62
<b>Precautionary measures</b>			
Wind-up or battery-operated radio	65 ***	59	58
Alternate heat source	54 ***	46	48
Back-up generator	45 ***	20	23
Alternate water source	63 ***	44	43
Other <sup>5</sup>	26 **	22	21
<b>Fire safety measures</b>			
Working smoke detector	99 **	99	98
Working carbon monoxide detector	78 **	80	60
Working fire extinguisher	79 ***	64	66

\* significantly different from provincial level estimate (p < 0.05)

\*\* significantly different from Canada level estimate (p < 0.05)

\*\*\* significantly different from both provincial and Canada level estimates (p < 0.05)

1 Percentage based only on those indicating that they have an emergency exit plan.

2 Excludes Canadians living in single-person households.

3 Excludes those who reported that they lived in a household that did not have a vehicle.

4 Percentage based only on those indicating that they or someone in their household has special medical needs.

5 'Other precautionary measures' include having an escape/rescue plan for pets, extra supply of fuel, checking and replenishing emergency supplies, and keeping exits clear.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

**Table 1.4**  
**High or moderately high levels of emergency planning, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents, by social and political involvement, smaller communities of Ontario, 2014**

Social and political involvement	Percentage of residents who had high or moderately high levels of...		
	Planning activities	Precautionary measures	Fire safety measures
	percent		
<b>Engagement in political activities <sup>1</sup></b>			
Yes †	54	51	64
No	44 <sup>E</sup>	35	51
<b>High level of civic engagement <sup>2</sup></b>			
Yes †	56	54	63
No	45	37 *	59
<b>High level of social support <sup>3</sup></b>			
Yes †	55	47	58
No	54	46	64
<b>Strong sense of belonging to community <sup>4</sup></b>			
Yes †	60	45	65
No	45 *	49	56
<b>High neighbourhood trust <sup>5</sup></b>			
Yes †	60	59	67
No	48 *	33 *	56
<b>High level of self-efficacy <sup>6</sup></b>			
Yes †	62	50	67
No	42 *	41	55

<sup>E</sup> use with caution

\* significantly different from reference category ( $p < 0.05$ )

† reference category

- 1 Includes individuals over the age of 17 years who are eligible to vote, and who have participated in or volunteered for political parties or events in the past 12 months, including municipal, provincial, or federal elections, or expressed views on political or social issues through signing a petition, contacting news agencies or politicians, or attended a meeting involving social or community issues.
- 2 Civic engagement measures individuals over the age of 17 years who were involved in a recreational group or organization in the past 12 months, and includes engagement in political activities. A 'high level' is defined as having been involved in at least 4 activities in the past 12 months.
- 3 A 'high level of social support' is defined as having five or more people whom that individual could turn to for help in an emergency if they are physically injured, require emotional support, shelter, and/or financial assistance.
- 4 A 'strong sense of belonging to community' is rating one's own sense of belonging to their community as a 4 or a 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "very weak" and 5 "very strong".
- 5 'High neighbourhood trust' is rating one's own trust in the people in one's neighbourhood as 4 or 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "cannot be trusted at all" and 5 represents "can be trusted a lot", as well as having a response of "very likely" when asked about the likelihood of someone in their neighbourhood returning a lost wallet or purse containing two hundred dollars with the money still inside.
- 6 A 'high level of self-efficacy' is derived from having a high self-rating on a scale of 1 (poor) to 5 (excellent) for the following three categories: an ability to think clearly and solve day-to-day problems, to handle unexpected and difficult problems, and to figure out what to do if faced with an emergency situation.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents. Households with 'moderately high' or 'high' levels of emergency planning engaged in 3 or 4 of the following: having an exit plan, an emergency supply kit, extra copies of important documents and an emergency contact list. 'Moderately high' or 'high' levels of precautionary measures include having 3 or 4 of the following: a wind-up or battery operated radio, a back-up generator, an alternate source of heat and additional water. 'Moderately high' or 'high' levels of fire safety measure include having all 3 of the following: a working smoke detector, a working fire extinguisher, and a working carbon monoxide detector.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

## Notes

<sup>E</sup> use with caution

- 1 The SEPR covers three types of communities: Census Metropolitan Areas (CMAs), Census Agglomerations (CAs) with population greater than 50,000, and 'smaller communities' which include CAs with population 50,000 or less and those areas that fall outside of CMAs and CAs. All CMAs and CAs (with population greater than 50,000) were included in the SEPR. A sample of households were selected from smaller communities within each province to represent all households within the province in similar communities. Additional information on the SEPR and its sampling methodology can be found in the 'Survey description' section.
- 2 A Census Metropolitan Area (CMA) or a Census Agglomeration (CA) is formed by one or more adjacent municipalities centred on a population centre (known as the core). A CMA must have a total population of at least 100,000 of which 50,000 or more must live in the core. A CA must have a core population of at least 10,000. To be included in the CMA or CA, other adjacent municipalities must have a high degree of integration with the core as measured by commuting flows derived from census data.
- 3 The target population for the SEPR included all persons 15 years of age or older, residing in households in Canada's 10 provinces, excluding full-time residents of institutions (e.g. nursing homes, group homes, hospitals).
- 4 Throughout this fact sheet, responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.
- 5 This section focuses on personal experiences with emergencies or disasters that happened in Canada, in a community where the person was living at the time, and was significant enough to severely interrupt the individual's regular daily activities.
- 6 Emergency planning activities include: having an emergency exit plan, a household emergency supply kit, extra copies of important documents and an emergency contact list.

- 7 Precautionary measures include: having a wind-up or battery-operated radio, an alternate heat source such as a non-electric stove or heater, or a wood-burning fireplace, a back-up generator and an alternative water source such as a well, tank or litres of stored water.
- 8 Unless otherwise specified, differences are statistically significant ( $p < 0.05$ ).
- 9 A 'strong sense of belonging to community' is rating one's own sense of belonging to their community as a 4 or a 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "very weak" and 5 "very strong".
- 10 A proportion (26%) of respondents were not asked questions regarding neighbourhood helpfulness in the event of an emergency and as such these cases are not included in the analysis on neighbourhood helpfulness in general or in the event of an emergency.
- 11 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% when respondents were asked about the number of people they could turn to for help if financial support is needed.



## Fact sheet Community of Winnipeg (CMA), Manitoba

---

In 2014, information on the emergency preparedness of people living in the Census Metropolitan Area<sup>1</sup> of Winnipeg was collected through the Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada (SEPR).<sup>2</sup> This fact sheet presents information on the risk awareness and level of emergency preparedness of the residents of Winnipeg, which could help improve the understanding of community resilience in the event of an emergency.<sup>3,4</sup>

### **Risk awareness and anticipated sources of help in an emergency or disaster**

- Winter storms (including blizzards, ice storms and extreme cold) (95%), floods (73%) and extended power outages lasting 24 hours or longer (68%) were named by residents of Winnipeg as the most likely events to occur within their community.
- Residents most commonly reported that they would anticipate turning to local government as an initial source for help and information if they were faced with a contamination or shortage of water or food (43%), to their utility company in the event of an extended power outage (42%) or to a hospital, clinic, doctor or other medical professional in the event of an outbreak of a serious or life-threatening disease (40%) (Table 1.1).
- Residents also anticipated turning to news on the radio if faced with an industrial or transportation accident (29%) or a weather-related emergency or natural disaster (27%). In the event of rioting or civil unrest, residents most commonly anticipated turning to police or law enforcement (25%), while news on the Internet was listed as the most commonly anticipated initial source of information in the event of an act of terrorism or terrorist threat (23%).

### **Prior lifetime experience with a major emergency or disaster<sup>5</sup>**

- Three in ten (30%) Winnipeg residents have faced a major emergency or disaster in Canada in a community they were living in at the time of the event, more than half (58%) of whom reported experiencing severe disruptions to their daily activities as a result of the event.
- Floods (46%) and winter storms which include blizzards and ice storms (28%) were the most commonly experienced emergency or disaster by residents of Winnipeg.
- The most common types of disruption to daily activities endured by residents who had experienced major emergencies or disasters included missing work or school (63%) and missing an appointment or planned activity (54%). More severe disruptions experienced were an inability to use roads or transportation in the community (48%), as well as home evacuations (30%<sup>E</sup>).
- Two-thirds (66%) of residents who experienced an emergency or disaster were able to resume their daily activities within one week of the event: 12%<sup>E</sup> within 24 hours, 26%<sup>E</sup> within one to two days, 17%<sup>E</sup> within three to five days and 11%<sup>E</sup> within six to seven days.
- Six in ten (62%) residents who had experienced an emergency or disaster received help during or immediately following the event, most commonly from a family member (38%<sup>E</sup>), a neighbour (31%<sup>E</sup>) or a friend (21%<sup>E</sup>).
- More than one-third (35%) of residents of Winnipeg who experienced a major emergency or disaster in Canada in a community where they were living at the time of the event and which was significant enough to disrupt their regular daily routine also endured a loss of property or financial impact. Long-term emotional or psychological consequences were experienced by 17%<sup>E</sup> of individuals affected by a major emergency or disaster.

## Emergency planning, precautionary and fire safety behaviours

- Two-thirds (67%) of people residing in Winnipeg lived in households that were engaged in at least two emergency planning activities,<sup>6</sup> and nearly half (44%) lived in households with three or four such activities (Table 1.2). More than one in ten (12%) people lived in a household that had not participated in any emergency planning activities.
- Four in ten (41%) lived in a household with at least two precautionary measures<sup>7</sup> taken in case of an emergency, and less than two in ten (15%) lived in a household with three or four such measures. One-quarter (24%) of people lived in a household with no precautionary measures in place.
- The vast majority (97%) of residents reported living in a household with a working smoke detector, and three in five (60%) reported living in a household with a working fire extinguisher (Table 1.3). Two out of three (66%) residents stated that they had a working carbon monoxide detector in their household. However, less than half (44%) of the residents of Winnipeg stated that they had implemented all three fire safety measures within their households.
- On the whole, the number of emergency planning activities and fire safety measures implemented by residents of Winnipeg did not typically differ from residents in Manitoba or Canada's 10 provinces in general. Differences did, however, exist when considering the number of precautionary measures taken. For instance, Winnipeg residents (2%<sup>E</sup>) were significantly less likely to have implemented all four precautionary measures compared to Manitobans (5%) and Canadians (7%) in general.<sup>8</sup>
- Differences existed in the types of activities and measures set in place by residents of Winnipeg when compared to Manitoba and Canada overall. For instance, residents in Winnipeg less commonly reported that they had participated in various types of emergency planning activities when compared to residents in Manitoba and Canadians in general. In addition, residents of Winnipeg reported less often that they had an alternate heat source (37%), an alternate water source (37%) or a back-up generator (13%) than Manitobans and Canadians. In contrast, the proportion of residents in Winnipeg with a working carbon monoxide detector (66%) was significantly higher than both Manitoba and Canada in general.

## Social networks and sense of belonging

- More than half (55%) of Winnipeg's residents had a strong sense of belonging<sup>9</sup> to their community.
- Most (87%) residents described the neighbourhood they lived in as a place where neighbours generally help each other.<sup>10</sup> Of those who did not describe their neighbourhood this way, two-thirds (66%) still described it as a place where neighbours would help each other in an emergency.<sup>11</sup>
- Many individuals had a large network of support in the event of an emergency or disaster, with more than five people to turn to for emotional support (63%), for help if physically injured (63%) as well as in case of a home evacuation (59%). About one-quarter of residents had a large support network if financial help was needed (27%). However, 10% reported that they had no one to turn to for financial help.
- High levels of sense of belonging and neighbourhood trust, as well as civic engagement, were sometimes associated with a higher level of emergency preparedness (Table 1.4).

## Data tables

Table 1.1

Most commonly anticipated sources of initial help and information, by type of emergency or disaster, residents of Winnipeg, Manitoba, 2014

Most common sources of initial help and information by type of emergency or disaster	percent
<b>Weather-related emergency or natural disaster</b>	
News- Radio	27
News- Internet	26
News- Television	26
<b>Extended power outages</b>	
Utility company	42
News- Radio	14

Family	12 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Outbreak of serious or life-threatening disease</b>	
Hospital, clinic, doctor or other medical professional	40
News- Television	21
News- Internet	18
<b>Industrial or transportation accident <sup>1</sup></b>	
News- Radio	29
News- Television	25
News- Internet	22
<b>Contamination or shortage of water or food <sup>1</sup></b>	
Local government	43
News- Television	19
News- Radio	17
<b>Act of terrorism or terrorist threat</b>	
News- Internet	23
News- Television	22
Police/law enforcement	21 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Rioting or civil unrest</b>	
Police/law enforcement	25
News- Television	23 <sup>E</sup>
News- Internet	22 <sup>E</sup>
<sup>E</sup> use with caution	
1 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% when respondents were asked about their likely sources of initial help and information.	
<b>Note:</b> Respondents who perceived their community was at risk for any form of emergency or disaster were then asked where they would turn to first for information or assistance in the event of the perceived emergency or disaster. Respondents could provide more than one response. Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.	
<b>Source:</b> Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.	

**Table 1.2**  
**Number of emergency planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents, community of Winnipeg, Manitoba, 2014**

Number of planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents	Winnipeg	Manitoba	Canada
	percent		
<b>Number of emergency planning activities</b>			
None	12 <sup>***</sup>	10	8
1 activity	19	19	17
2 activities	23	25	25
3 activities	28	27	27
4 activities	16	16	19
<b>Number of precautionary measures</b>			
None	24 <sup>***</sup>	20	16
1 measure	30 <sup>†</sup>	28	27
2 measures	26	26	28
3 measures	13 <sup>***</sup>	18	20
4 measures	2 <sup>E</sup> <sup>***</sup>	5	7
<b>Number of fire safety measures <sup>1 2</sup></b>			

None	F	F	1
1 measure	15	15	14
2 measures	34 *	37	38
3 measures	44	41	42
<p><sup>E</sup> use with caution  <sup>F</sup> too unreliable to be published</p> <p>* significantly different from provincial level estimate (p &lt; 0.05)</p> <p>*** significantly different from both provincial and Canada level estimates (p &lt; 0.05)</p> <p>1 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Canada'.</p> <p>2 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Winnipeg'.</p> <p><b>Note:</b> Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents. Emergency planning activities include: an emergency exit plan, an emergency supply kit, photocopies/electronic copies of important documents and a list of emergency contact numbers. Precautionary measures include: a battery-operated or wind-up radio, an alternative heat source, a back-up generator and an alternative water source. Fire safety measures include a working smoke detector, a working carbon monoxide detector and a working fire extinguisher.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.</p>			

**Table 1.3**  
**Planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures residents engaged in, community of Winnipeg, Manitoba, 2014**

Residents whose households were involved in the following:	Winnipeg	Manitoba	Canada
	percent		
<b>Emergency planning activities</b>			
Emergency exit plan	64	64	60
Exit plan has been practised/reviewed in last 12 months <sup>1</sup>	40 **	42	46
Designated meeting place for household members <sup>2</sup>	35 *	39	33
Contact plan for household members <sup>2</sup>	50	53	55
Household emergency supply kit	40 **	41	47
Vehicle emergency supply kit <sup>3</sup>	64 *	67	59
Extra copies of important documents	50	50	53
List of emergency contact numbers	63 **	65	69
Plan for meeting special health needs <sup>4</sup>	58	62	62
<b>Precautionary measures</b>			
Wind-up or battery-operated radio	49 **	51	58
Alternate heat source	37 ***	41	48
Back-up generator	13 ***	21	23
Alternate water source	37 ***	44	43
Other <sup>5</sup>	19	19	21
<b>Fire safety measures</b>			
Working smoke detector	97	97	98
Working carbon monoxide detector	66 ***	60	60
Working fire extinguisher	60 ***	63	66



\* significantly different from provincial level estimate (p < 0.05)

\*\* significantly different from Canada level estimate (p < 0.05)

\*\*\* significantly different from both provincial and Canada level estimates (p < 0.05)

1 Percentage based only on those indicating that they have an emergency exit plan.

2 Excludes Canadians living in single-person households.

3 Excludes those who reported that they lived in a household that did not have a vehicle.

4 Percentage based only on those indicating that they or someone in their household has special medical needs.

5 'Other precautionary measures' include having an escape/rescue plan for pets, extra supply of fuel, checking and replenishing emergency supplies, and keeping exits clear.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

**Table 1.4**

**High or moderately high levels of emergency planning, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents, by social and political involvement, community of Winnipeg, Manitoba, 2014**

Social and political involvement	Percentage of residents who had high or moderately high levels of...		
	Planning activities	Precautionary measures	Fire safety measures
	percent		
<b>Engagement in political activities <sup>1</sup></b>			
Yes †	45	18	44
No <sup>7 B</sup>	40	F	46
<b>High level of civic engagement <sup>2</sup></b>			
Yes †	46	20	45
No <sup>7 B</sup>	39	11E *	44
<b>High level of social support <sup>3</sup></b>			
Yes †	53	20E	53
No <sup>8</sup>	42	14	42
<b>Strong sense of belonging to community <sup>4</sup></b>			
Yes †	53	17	48
No <sup>8</sup>	34 *	14E	40
<b>High neighbourhood trust <sup>5</sup></b>			
Yes †	51	24	54
No <sup>8</sup>	43	13 *	40 *
<b>High level of self-efficacy <sup>6</sup></b>			
Yes †	46	18	49
No <sup>8</sup>	44	14E	40

<sup>E</sup> use with caution

F too unreliable to be published

\* significantly different from reference category ( $p < 0.05$ )

† reference category

1 Includes individuals over the age of 17 years who are eligible to vote, and who have participated in or volunteered for political parties or events in the past 12 months, including municipal, provincial, or federal elections, or expressed views on political or social issues through signing a petition, contacting news agencies or politicians, or attended a meeting involving social or community issues.

2 Civic engagement measures individuals over the age of 17 years who were involved in a recreational group or organization in the past 12 months, and includes engagement in political activities. A 'high level' is defined as having been involved in at least 4 activities in the past 12 months.

3 A 'high level of social support' is defined as having five or more people whom that individual could turn to for help in an emergency if they are physically injured, require emotional support, shelter, and/or financial assistance.

4 A 'strong sense of belonging to community' is rating one's own sense of belonging to their community as a 4 or a 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "very weak" and 5 "very strong".

5 'High neighbourhood trust' is rating one's own trust in the people in one's neighbourhood as 4 or 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "cannot be trusted at all" and 5 represents "can be trusted a lot", as well as having a response of "very likely" when asked about the likelihood of someone in their neighbourhood returning a lost wallet or purse containing two hundred dollars with the money still inside.

6 A 'high level of self-efficacy' is derived from having a high self-rating on a scale of 1 (poor) to 5 (excellent) for the following three categories: an ability to think clearly and solve day-to-day problems, to handle unexpected and difficult problems, and to figure out what to do if faced with an emergency situation.

7 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Precautionary measures'.

8 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Fire safety measures'.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents. Households with 'moderately high' or 'high' levels of emergency planning engaged in 3 or 4 of the following: having an exit plan, an emergency supply kit, extra copies of important documents and an emergency contact list. 'Moderately high' or 'high' levels of precautionary measures include having 3 or 4 of the following: a wind-up or battery operated radio, a back-up generator, an alternate source of heat and additional water. 'Moderately high' or 'high' levels of fire safety measure include having all 3 of the following: a working smoke detector, a working fire extinguisher, and a working carbon monoxide detector.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

## Notes

<sup>E</sup> use with caution

1 A Census Metropolitan Area (CMA) or a Census Agglomeration (CA) is formed by one or more adjacent municipalities centred on a population centre (known as the core). A CMA must have a total population of at least 100,000 of which 50,000 or more must live in the core. A CA must have a core population of at least 10,000. To be included in the CMA or CA, other adjacent municipalities must have a high degree of integration with the core as measured by commuting flows derived from census data.

2 The target population for the SEPR included all persons 15 years of age or older, residing in households in Canada's 10 provinces, excluding full-time residents of institutions (e.g. nursing homes, group homes, hospitals).

3 The SEPR covers three types of communities: Census Metropolitan Areas (CMAs), Census Agglomerations (CAs) with population greater than 50,000, and 'smaller communities' which include CAs with population 50,000 or less and those areas that fall outside of CMAs and CAs. All CMAs and CAs (with population greater than 50,000) were included in the SEPR. A sample of households were selected from smaller communities within each province to represent all households within the province in similar communities. Additional information on the SEPR and its sampling methodology can be found in the 'Survey description' section.

4 Throughout this fact sheet, responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.

5 This section focuses on personal experiences with emergencies or disasters that happened in Canada, in a community where the person was living at the time, and was significant enough to severely interrupt the individual's regular daily activities.

- 6 Emergency planning activities include: having an emergency exit plan, a household emergency supply kit, extra copies of important documents and an emergency contact list.
- 7 Precautionary measures include: having a wind-up or battery-operated radio, an alternate heat source such as a non-electric stove or heater or a wood-burning fireplace, a back-up generator and an alternative water source such as a well, tank or litres of stored water.
- 8 Unless otherwise specified, differences are statistically significant ( $p < 0.05$ ).
- 9 A 'strong sense of belonging to community' is rating one's own sense of belonging to their community as a 4 or a 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "very weak" and 5 "very strong".
- 10 A proportion (7%) of respondents were not asked questions regarding neighbourhood helpfulness in the event of an emergency and as such these cases are not included in the analysis on neighbourhood helpfulness in general or in the event of an emergency.
- 11 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were equal to 14% when respondents were asked about whether their neighbourhood is a place where neighbours would help each other if there is an emergency.



## Fact sheet Community of Brandon (CA), Manitoba

---

In 2014, information on the emergency preparedness of people living in the Census Agglomeration<sup>1</sup> of Brandon was collected through the Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada (SEPR).<sup>2</sup> This fact sheet presents information on the risk awareness and level of emergency preparedness of the residents of Brandon, which could help improve the understanding of community resilience in the event of an emergency.<sup>3,4</sup>

### **Risk awareness and anticipated sources of help in an emergency or disaster**

- Winter storms (including blizzards, ice storms and extreme cold) (99%), industrial or transportation accidents (75%) and floods (73%) were named by residents of Brandon as the most likely events to occur in their community.
- Residents most commonly anticipated turning to their utility company in the event of an extended power outage lasting 24 hours or longer (55%), to local government if they faced a contamination or shortage of water or food (52%), and to a hospital, clinic, doctor or other medical professional during an outbreak of a serious or life-threatening disease (48%). Residents reported that they would turn to police or law enforcement if they were faced with an act of terrorism or a terrorist threat (39%<sup>E</sup>). In addition to news on the television, police or law enforcement were also the most commonly anticipated initial sources of information or assistance if residents were faced with rioting or civil unrest (both 30%<sup>E</sup>) (Table 1.1).
- Residents anticipated turning to news on the radio as an initial source for help and information if they were faced with a weather-related emergency or natural disaster (37%) or an industrial or transportation accident (36%).

### **Prior lifetime experience with a major emergency or disaster<sup>5</sup>**

- More than four in ten (45%) Brandon residents have faced a major emergency or disaster in Canada in a community they were living in at the time of the event, nearly half (47%) of whom reported experiencing severe disruptions to their daily activities as a result of the event.
- Floods (64%) were the most commonly experienced emergencies or disasters by residents of Brandon.
- The most common types of disruption to daily activities endured by residents who had experienced major emergencies or disasters included missing work or school (50%<sup>E</sup>) and missing an appointment or planned activity (47%<sup>E</sup>). More severe disruptions experienced were an inability to use roads or transportation within the community (48%<sup>E</sup>) and home evacuation (34%<sup>E</sup>).
- More than half (57%) of residents who experienced an emergency or disaster were able to resume their daily activities within one week of the event. For 18%<sup>E</sup> of residents, it took between one to two months to resume their daily activities.
- Nearly two-thirds (64%) of residents who had experienced an emergency or disaster received help during or immediately following the event, commonly from local government (28%<sup>E</sup>).
- Three in ten (29%<sup>E</sup>) residents of Brandon who experienced a major emergency or disaster in Canada in a community where they were living at the time of the event and which was significant enough to disrupt their regular daily routine also endured a loss of property or financial impact.

### **Emergency planning, precautionary and fire safety behaviours**

- Three-quarters (73%) of people residing in Brandon lived in households that were engaged in at least two emergency planning activities,<sup>6</sup> and four in ten (43%) lived in households with three or four such activities (Table 1.2). One in ten (10%<sup>E</sup>) people lived in a household that had not participated in any emergency planning activities.
- Half (51%) lived in a household with at least two precautionary measures<sup>7</sup> taken in case of an emergency. Close to one in five (18%<sup>E</sup>) people lived in a household with no precautionary measures in place.
- The vast majority (98%) of residents reported living in a household with a working smoke detector, and six in ten (62%) reported living in a household with a working fire extinguisher (Table 1.3). More than half (56%) of residents stated that they had a working carbon monoxide detector in their household. Approximately one-third (35%) of the residents of Brandon stated that they had implemented all three fire safety measures within their households.
- The number of emergency planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents of Brandon did not significantly differ from Manitoba residents overall and residents of Canada's 10 provinces. The one exception, however, was that Brandon residents (14%<sup>E</sup>) were less likely to have participated in all four emergency planning activities compared to Canadians (19%).<sup>8</sup>
- Generally, the types of activities and measures in place by residents of Brandon did not differ significantly from residents of Manitoba and Canada. There are two exceptions: Brandon residents (70%) were more likely to have an emergency exit plan but less likely to have a list of emergency contact numbers (57%) compared to Canadian residents (60% and 69%, respectively).

## Social networks and sense of belonging

- Approximately half (48%) of Brandon's residents had a strong sense of belonging<sup>9</sup> to their community.<sup>10</sup>
- Most (84%) residents described the neighbourhood they lived in as a place where neighbours generally help each other.<sup>11</sup> Of those who did not describe their neighbourhood this way, most (92%) still described it as a place where neighbours would help each other in an emergency.
- The majority of individuals had a large network of support in the event of an emergency or disaster, with more than five people to turn to for emotional support (66%), for help if physically injured (59%) as well as in case of a home evacuation (56%). About one-quarter (27%) of residents had a large support network if financial help was needed. However, 9%<sup>E</sup> reported that they had no one to turn to for financial help.
- Higher levels of sense of belonging, neighbourhood trust and social support, as well as civic engagement and involvement in political activities, were not associated with a higher level of emergency preparedness (Table 1.4).

## Data tables

Table 1.1

Most commonly anticipated sources of initial help and information, by type of emergency or disaster, residents of Brandon, Manitoba, 2014

Most common sources of initial help and information by type of emergency or disaster	percent
<b>Weather-related emergency or natural disaster</b>	
News- Radio	37
News- Internet	25 <sup>E</sup>
News- Television	17
<b>Extended power outages<sup>1</sup></b>	
Utility company	55
News- Radio	12 <sup>E</sup>
News- Internet	11 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Outbreak of serious or life-threatening disease</b>	
Hospital, clinic, doctor or other medical professional	48
News- Radio	17 <sup>E</sup>
News- Internet	11 <sup>E</sup>

<b>Industrial or transportation accident</b>	
News- Radio	36
News- Internet	23 <sup>E</sup>
Local government	14 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Contamination or shortage of water or food</b>	
Local government	52
News- Radio	15 <sup>E</sup>
News- Internet	12 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Act of terrorism or terrorist threat <sup>1</sup></b>	
Police/law enforcement	39 <sup>F</sup>
News- Radio	18 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Rioting or civil unrest</b>	
News- Television	30 <sup>E</sup>
Police/law enforcement	30 <sup>E</sup>
News- Radio	27 <sup>E</sup>
<sup>E</sup> use with caution	
1 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% when respondents were asked about their likely sources of initial help and information.	
<b>Note:</b> Respondents who perceived their community was at risk for any form of emergency or disaster were then asked where they would turn to first for information or assistance in the event of the perceived emergency or disaster. Respondents could provide more than one response. Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.	
<b>Source:</b> Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.	

**Table 1.2**  
**Number of emergency planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents, community of Brandon, Manitoba, 2014**

Number of planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents	Brandon	Manitoba	Canada
	percent		
<b>Number of emergency planning activities</b>			
None	10 <sup>E</sup>	10	8
1 activity	15 <sup>E</sup>	19	17
2 activities	30	25	25
3 activities	29	27	27
4 activities	14 <sup>E</sup> **	16	19
<b>Number of precautionary measures</b>			
None	18 <sup>E</sup>	20	16
1 measure	24	28	27
2 measures	32	26	28
3 measures	19 <sup>E</sup>	18	20
4 measures	F	5	7
<b>Number of fire safety measures <sup>1 2</sup></b>			
None	F	F	1
1 measure	16 <sup>E</sup>	15	14
2 measures	41	37	38
3 measures	35	41	42

<sup>E</sup> use with caution  
<sup>F</sup> too unreliable to be published

\*\* significantly different from Canada level estimate (p < 0.05)

1 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Canada'.

2 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Brandon'.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents. Emergency planning activities include: an emergency exit plan, an emergency supply kit, photocopies/electronic copies of important documents and a list of emergency contact numbers. Precautionary measures include: a battery-operated or wind-up radio, an alternate heat source, a back-up generator and an alternative water source. Fire safety measures include a working smoke detector, a working carbon monoxide detector and a working fire extinguisher.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

**Table 1.3**  
**Planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures residents engaged in, community of Brandon, Manitoba, 2014**

Residents whose households were involved in the following:	Brandon	Manitoba	Canada
	percent		
<b>Emergency planning activities</b>			
Emergency exit plan	70 **	64	60
Exit plan has been practised/reviewed in last 12 months <sup>1</sup>	44	42	46
Designated meeting place for household members <sup>2</sup>	32	39	33
Contact plan for household members <sup>2</sup>	57	53	55
Household emergency supply kit	40	41	47
Vehicle emergency supply kit <sup>3</sup>	65	67	59
Extra copies of important documents	54	50	53
List of emergency contact numbers	57 **	65	69
Plan for meeting special health needs <sup>4</sup>	56	62	62
<b>Precautionary measures</b>			
Wind-up or battery-operated radio	59	51	58
Alternate heat source	40	41	48
Back-up generator	17 <sup>E</sup>	21	23
Alternate water source	48	44	43
Other <sup>5</sup>	16 <sup>E</sup>	19	21
<b>Fire safety measures</b>			
Working smoke detector	98	97	98
Working carbon monoxide detector	56	60	60
Working fire extinguisher	62	63	66

<sup>E</sup> use with caution

\*\* significantly different from Canada level estimate (p < 0.05)

1 Percentage based only on those indicating that they have an emergency exit plan.

2 Excludes Canadians living in single-person households.

3 Excludes those who reported that they lived in a household that did not have a vehicle.

4 Percentage based only on those indicating that they or someone in their household has special medical needs.

5 'Other precautionary measures' include having an escape/rescue plan for pets, extra supply of fuel, checking and replenishing emergency supplies, and keeping exits clear.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

**Table 1.4**  
**High or moderately high levels of emergency planning, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents, by social and political involvement,**

community of Brandon, Manitoba, 2014

Social and political involvement	Percentage of residents who had high or moderately high levels of...		
	Planning activities	Precautionary measures	Fire safety measures
	percent		
<b>Engagement in political activities <sup>1</sup></b>			
Yes <sup>7 †</sup>	45	23 <sup>E</sup>	40
No	45 <sup>E</sup>	29 <sup>E</sup>	27 <sup>E</sup>
<b>High level of civic engagement <sup>2</sup></b>			
Yes <sup>7 †</sup>	46	26 <sup>E</sup>	41
No <sup>7</sup>	44	22 <sup>E</sup>	29 <sup>E</sup>
<b>High level of social support <sup>3</sup></b>			
Yes <sup>8 †</sup>	57	30 <sup>E</sup>	27 <sup>E</sup>
No	41	22 <sup>E</sup>	36
<b>Strong sense of belonging to community <sup>4</sup></b>			
Yes <sup>7 †</sup>	47	24 <sup>E</sup>	42
No <sup>7</sup>	44	25 <sup>E</sup>	28 <sup>E</sup>
<b>High neighbourhood trust <sup>5</sup></b>			
Yes <sup>7 †</sup>	49	27 <sup>E</sup>	39
No	43	21 <sup>E</sup>	33 <sup>E</sup>
<b>High level of self-efficacy <sup>6</sup></b>			
Yes <sup>†</sup>	47	29 <sup>E</sup>	47
No <sup>9</sup>	44	20 <sup>E</sup>	24 <sup>E *</sup>
<p><sup>E</sup> use with caution</p> <p>* significantly different from reference category (<math>p &lt; 0.05</math>)</p> <p>† reference category</p> <p>1 Includes individuals over the age of 17 years who are eligible to vote, and who have participated in or volunteered for political parties or events in the past 12 months, including municipal, provincial, or federal elections, or expressed views on political or social issues through signing a petition, contacting news agencies or politicians, or attended a meeting involving social or community issues.</p> <p>2 Civic engagement measures individuals over the age of 17 years who were involved in a recreational group or organization in the past 12 months, and includes engagement in political activities. A 'high level' is defined as having been involved in at least 4 activities in the past 12 months.</p> <p>3 A 'high level of social support' is defined as having five or more people whom that individual could turn to for help in an emergency if they are physically injured, require emotional support, shelter, and/or financial assistance.</p> <p>4 A 'strong sense of belonging to community' is rating one's own sense of belonging to their community as a 4 or a 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "very weak" and 5 "very strong".</p> <p>5 'High neighbourhood trust' is rating one's own trust in the people in one's neighbourhood as 4 or 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "cannot be trusted at all" and 5 represents "can be trusted a lot", as well as having a response of "very likely" when asked about the likelihood of someone in their neighbourhood returning a lost wallet or purse containing two hundred dollars with the money still inside.</p> <p>6 A 'high level of self-efficacy' is derived from having a high self-rating on a scale of 1 (poor) to 5 (excellent) for the following three categories: an ability to think clearly and solve day-to-day problems, to handle unexpected and difficult problems, and to figure out what to do if faced with an emergency situation.</p> <p>7 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Fire safety measures'.</p> <p>8 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were equal to 20% for 'Fire safety measures'.</p> <p>9 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were equal to 11% for 'Fire safety measures'.</p> <p><b>Note:</b> Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents. Households with 'moderately high' or 'high' levels of emergency planning engaged in 3 or 4 of the following: having an exit plan, an emergency supply kit, extra copies of important documents and an emergency contact list. 'Moderately high' or 'high' levels of precautionary measures include having 3 or 4 of the following: a wind-up or battery operated radio, a back-up generator, an alternate source of heat and additional water. 'Moderately high' or 'high' levels of fire safety measure include having all 3 of the following: a working smoke detector, a working fire extinguisher, and a working carbon monoxide detector.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.</p>			



## Notes

<sup>E</sup> use with caution

- 1 A Census Metropolitan Area (CMA) or a Census Agglomeration (CA) is formed by one or more adjacent municipalities centred on a population centre (known as the core). A CMA must have a total population of at least 100,000 of which 50,000 or more must live in the core. A CA must have a core population of at least 10,000. To be included in the CMA or CA, other adjacent municipalities must have a high degree of integration with the core as measured by commuting flows derived from census data.
- 2 The target population for the SEPR included all persons 15 years of age or older, residing in households in Canada's 10 provinces, excluding full-time residents of institutions (e.g. nursing homes, group homes, hospitals).
- 3 The SEPR covers three types of communities: Census Metropolitan Areas (CMAs), Census Agglomerations (CAs) with population greater than 50,000, and 'smaller communities' which include CAs with population 50,000 or less and those areas that fall outside of CMAs and CAs. All CMAs and CAs (with population greater than 50,000) were included in the SEPR. A sample of households were selected from smaller communities within each province to represent all households within the province in similar communities. Additional information on the SEPR and its sampling methodology can be found in the 'Survey description' section.
- 4 Throughout this fact sheet, responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.
- 5 This section focuses on personal experiences with emergencies or disasters that happened in Canada, in a community where the person was living at the time, and was significant enough to severely interrupt the individual's regular daily activities.
- 6 Emergency planning activities include: having an emergency exit plan, a household emergency supply kit, extra copies of important documents and an emergency contact list.
- 7 Precautionary measures include: having a wind-up or battery-operated radio, an alternate heat source such as a non-electric stove or heater or a wood-burning fireplace, a back-up generator and an alternative water source such as a well, tank or litres of stored water.
- 8 Unless otherwise specified, differences are statistically significant ( $p < 0.05$ ).
- 9 A 'strong sense of belonging to community' is rating one's own sense of belonging to their community as a 4 or a 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "very weak" and 5 "very strong".
- 10 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% when respondents were asked about their sense of belonging to their community.
- 11 A proportion (13%) of respondents were not asked questions regarding neighbourhood helpfulness in the event of an emergency and as such these cases are not included in the analysis on neighbourhood helpfulness in general or in the event of an emergency.



## Fact sheet Smaller communities of Manitoba

---

In 2014, information on the emergency preparedness of people living in 'smaller communities' of Manitoba was collected through the Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada (SEPR).<sup>1 2 3</sup> This fact sheet presents information on the risk awareness and level of emergency preparedness of the residents of Manitoba's smaller communities, which could help improve the understanding of community resilience in the event of an emergency.<sup>4</sup>

### Risk awareness and anticipated sources of help in an emergency or disaster

- People living in the smaller communities of Manitoba anticipated winter storms (including blizzards, ice storms and extreme cold) (95%), extended power outages lasting 24 hours or longer (74%) and tornadoes (59%) as the events most likely to occur in their communities.
- Residents most commonly anticipated turning to their utility company as an initial source for help and information if they were faced with an extended power outage lasting 24 hours or longer (64%), and to a hospital, clinic, doctor or other medical professional in the event of an outbreak of a serious or life-threatening disease (62%). Residents anticipated turning to police or law enforcement in the event of rioting or civil unrest (44%<sup>E</sup>) or an act of terrorism or terrorist threat (39%<sup>E</sup>), and to local government if they faced a contamination or shortage of water or food (40%) (Table 1.1).
- Residents also stated that they would seek out news on the radio in the event of a weather-related emergency or natural disaster (25%) or an industrial or transportation accident (15%<sup>E</sup>).

### Prior lifetime experience with a major emergency or disaster<sup>5</sup>

- Over one-third (36%) of residents of the smaller communities of Manitoba have faced a major emergency or disaster in Canada in a community they were living in at the time of the event, two-thirds (68%) of whom reported experiencing severe disruptions to their daily activities as a result of the event.
- Winter storms which include blizzards and ice storms (29%<sup>E</sup>), floods (25%<sup>E</sup>) and extended power outages lasting 24 hours or longer (23%<sup>E</sup>) were the most commonly experienced emergencies or disasters by residents of the smaller communities of Manitoba.
- The most common types of disruption to daily activities endured by residents who had experienced major emergencies or disasters included missing work or school (69%) and missing an appointment or planned activity (49%).<sup>6</sup> More severe disruptions experienced were an inability to use roads or transportation in the community (39%), home evacuation (20%<sup>E</sup>) and an inability to communicate outside the household (9%<sup>E</sup>).
- Nearly three-quarters (72%) of residents who experienced an emergency or disaster were able to resume their daily activities within one week of the event; one-half (48%<sup>E</sup>) within two days or less.
- More than half (57%) of residents who had experienced an emergency or disaster received help during or immediately following the event, most commonly from a neighbour (35%<sup>E</sup>) or a family member (23%<sup>E</sup>).
- Nearly one-third (31%<sup>E</sup>) of residents of the smaller communities of Manitoba who experienced a major emergency or disaster in Canada in a community where they were living at the time of the event and which was significant enough to disrupt their regular daily routine also endured a loss of property or financial impact. Long-term emotional or psychological consequences were experienced by 9%<sup>E</sup> of individuals affected by a major emergency or disaster.

## Emergency planning, precautionary and fire safety behaviours

- Seven out of ten (69%) people residing in the smaller communities of Manitoba lived in households that were engaged in at least two emergency planning activities,<sup>7</sup> and four in ten (42%) lived in households with three or four such activities (Table 1.2). Less than one in ten (7%<sup>E</sup>) people lived in a household that had not participated in any emergency planning activities.
- Six in ten (61%) lived in a household with at least two precautionary measures<sup>8</sup> taken in case of an emergency, and more than one-third (36%) lived in a household with three or four such measures. More than one in ten (13%) people lived in a household with no precautionary measures in place.
- Most (98%) residents reported living in a household with a working smoke detector, and the majority (69%) reported living in a household with a working fire extinguisher (Table 1.3). Half (49%) of residents stated that they had a working carbon monoxide detector in their household. However, less than four in ten (37%) residents of the smaller communities of Manitoba stated that they had implemented all three fire safety measures with their households.
- There were some significant differences in the number of emergency planning activities and precautionary measures taken by residents of the smaller communities of Manitoba and residents of Manitoba in general. For example, the proportion of residents of the smaller communities of Manitoba reported less often that they had not participated in any emergency planning activities (7%<sup>E</sup>) and had no precautionary measures in place (13%) compared to residents of Manitoba (10% and 20%, respectively). In addition, residents of the smaller communities of Manitoba were significantly more likely to have all four precautionary measures in place (10%<sup>E</sup>) than Manitobans in general (5%)<sup>9</sup>.
- There were some differences in the types of activities and measures set in place by residents of smaller communities in Manitoba when compared to Manitoba and Canada's 10 provinces in general. In terms of emergency planning activities, the proportion of residents of smaller communities in Manitoba who had a vehicle emergency supply kit (73%) and a designated meeting place for household members (48%) was significantly higher than Manitobans and Canadians in general. Residents of the smaller communities of Manitoba were more likely to have an alternate water source (58%) and a back-up generator (37%) than residents in Manitoba and Canada in general. Residents of the smaller communities of Manitoba were less likely to have a working carbon monoxide detector than those in Manitoba and Canada; however, they were more likely to have a working fire extinguisher when compared to residents of Manitoba.

## Social networks and sense of belonging

- Nearly two-thirds (64%) of residents of the smaller communities of Manitoba had a strong sense of belonging<sup>10</sup> to their community.
- Most (93%) residents described the neighbourhood they lived in as a place where neighbours generally help each other.<sup>11</sup> Of those who did not describe their neighbourhood this way, most (82%) still described it as a place where neighbours would help each other in an emergency.<sup>12</sup>
- More than two-thirds of individuals had a large network of support in the event of an emergency or disaster, with more than five people to turn to for help if physically injured (71%), for emotional support (69%), as well as in case of a home evacuation (69%). One-third of residents had a large support network if financial help was needed (33%). However, 8% reported that they had no one to turn to for financial help.
- High levels of sense of belonging and neighbourhood trust, as well as civic engagement, were sometimes associated with a higher level of emergency preparedness (Table 1.4).

## Data tables

Table 1.1

Most commonly anticipated sources of initial help and information, by type of emergency or disaster, residents of smaller communities of Manitoba, 2014

Most common sources of initial help and information by type of emergency or disaster	percent
<b>Weather-related emergency or natural disaster<sup>1</sup></b>	
News- Radio	25
News- Internet	21

Family	14 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Extended power outages</b>	
Utility company	64
Family	11 <sup>E</sup>
News- Radio	7 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Outbreak of serious or life-threatening disease</b>	
Hospital, clinic, doctor or other medical professional	62
News- Internet	11 <sup>E</sup>
News- Radio	8 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Industrial or transportation accident</b>	
News- Radio	15 <sup>E</sup>
911	15 <sup>E</sup>
Police/law enforcement	14 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Contamination or shortage of water or food <sup>1</sup></b>	
Local government	40
<b>Act of terrorism or terrorist threat</b>	
Police/law enforcement	39 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Rioting or civil unrest</b>	
Police/law enforcement	44 <sup>E</sup>
<sup>E</sup> use with caution	
<sup>1</sup> Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% when respondents were asked about their likely sources of initial help and information.	
<b>Note:</b> Respondents who perceived their community was at risk for any form of emergency or disaster were then asked where they would turn to first for information or assistance in the event of the perceived emergency or disaster. Respondents could provide more than one response. Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.	
<b>Source:</b> Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.	

**Table 1.2**  
**Number of emergency planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents, smaller communities of Manitoba, 2014**

Number of planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents	Smaller communities of Manitoba	Manitoba	Canada
	percent		
<b>Number of emergency planning activities</b>			
None	7 <sup>E</sup> *	10	8
1 activity	21	19	17
2 activities	27	25	25
3 activities	25	27	27
4 activities	17	16	19
<b>Number of precautionary measures</b>			
None	13 *	20	16
1 measure	23	28	27
2 measures	25	26	28
3 measures	26 ***	18	20
4 measures	10 <sup>E</sup> *	5	7
<b>Number of fire safety measures <sup>1</sup></b>			
None	F	F	1
1 measure	15	15	14

2 measures	42	37	38
3 measures	37	41	42
<p><sup>E</sup> use with caution  <sup>F</sup> too unreliable to be published</p> <p>* significantly different from provincial level estimate (p &lt; 0.05)</p> <p>*** significantly different from both provincial and Canada level estimates (p &lt; 0.05)</p> <p>1 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Canada'.</p> <p><b>Note:</b> Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents. Emergency planning activities include: an emergency exit plan, an emergency supply kit, photocopies/electronic copies of important documents and a list of emergency contact numbers. Precautionary measures include: a battery-operated or wind-up radio, an alternative heat source, a back-up generator and an alternative water source. Fire safety measures include a working smoke detector, a working carbon monoxide detector and a working fire extinguisher.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.</p>			

**Table 1.3**  
**Planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures residents engaged in, smaller communities of Manitoba, 2014**

Residents whose households were involved in the following:	Smaller communities of Manitoba	Manitoba	Canada
	percent		
<b>Emergency planning activities</b>			
Emergency exit plan	62	64	60
Exit plan has been practised/reviewed in last 12 months <sup>1</sup>	47	42	46
Designated meeting place for household members <sup>2</sup>	48 ***	39	33
Contact plan for household members <sup>2</sup>	58	53	55
Household emergency supply kit	42	41	47
Vehicle emergency supply kit <sup>3</sup>	73 ***	67	59
Extra copies of important documents	49	50	53
List of emergency contact numbers	69	65	69
Plan for meeting special health needs <sup>4</sup>	69	62	62
<b>Precautionary measures</b>			
Wind-up or battery-operated radio	53	51	58
Alternate heat source	48 *	41	48
Back-up generator	37 ***	21	23
Alternate water source	58 ***	44	43
Other <sup>5</sup>	18	19	21
<b>Fire safety measures</b>			
Working smoke detector	98	97	98
Working carbon monoxide detector	49 ***	60	60
Working fire extinguisher	69 *	63	66

\* significantly different from provincial level estimate (p < 0.05)

\*\*\* significantly different from both provincial and Canada level estimates (p < 0.05)

1 Percentage based only on those indicating that they have an emergency exit plan.

2 Excludes Canadians living in single-person households.

3 Excludes those who reported that they lived in a household that did not have a vehicle.

4 Percentage based only on those indicating that they or someone in their household has special medical needs.

5 'Other precautionary measures' include having an escape/rescue plan for pets, extra supply of fuel, checking and replenishing emergency supplies, and keeping exits clear.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

**Table 1.4**

**High or moderately high levels of emergency planning, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents, by social and political involvement, smaller communities of Manitoba, 2014**

Social and political involvement	Percentage of residents who had high or moderately high levels of...		
	Planning activities	Precautionary measures	Fire safety measures
	percent		
<b>Engagement in political activities <sup>1</sup></b>			
Yes †	45	39	34
No <sup>7</sup>	35 <sup>E</sup>	28 <sup>E</sup>	40 <sup>E</sup>
<b>High level of civic engagement <sup>2</sup></b>			
Yes †	48	37	38
No <sup>7</sup>	35 *	34	33
<b>High level of social support <sup>3</sup></b>			
Yes †	46	37	40
No <sup>7</sup>	40	37	37
<b>Strong sense of belonging to community <sup>4</sup></b>			
Yes †	48	40	41
No <sup>7 8</sup>	33 *	32 <sup>E</sup>	31 <sup>E</sup>
<b>High neighbourhood trust <sup>5</sup></b>			
Yes †	45	43	43
No <sup>7</sup>	40	30 *	32
<b>High level of self-efficacy <sup>6</sup></b>			
Yes †	48	36	38
No <sup>7</sup>	38	38	39

<sup>E</sup> use with caution

\* significantly different from reference category ( $p < 0.05$ )

† reference category

- 1 Includes individuals over the age of 17 years who are eligible to vote, and who have participated in or volunteered for political parties or events in the past 12 months, including municipal, provincial, or federal elections, or expressed views on political or social issues through signing a petition, contacting news agencies or politicians, or attended a meeting involving social or community issues.
- 2 Civic engagement measures individuals over the age of 17 years who were involved in a recreational group or organization in the past 12 months, and includes engagement in political activities. A 'high level' is defined as having been involved in at least 4 activities in the past 12 months.
- 3 A 'high level of social support' is defined as having five or more people whom that individual could turn to for help in an emergency if they are physically injured, require emotional support, shelter, and/or financial assistance.
- 4 A 'strong sense of belonging to community' is rating one's own sense of belonging to their community as a 4 or a 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "very weak" and 5 "very strong".
- 5 'High neighbourhood trust' is rating one's own trust in the people in one's neighbourhood as 4 or 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "cannot be trusted at all" and 5 represents "can be trusted a lot", as well as having a response of "very likely" when asked about the likelihood of someone in their neighbourhood returning a lost wallet or purse containing two hundred dollars with the money still inside.
- 6 A 'high level of self-efficacy' is derived from having a high self-rating on a scale of 1 (poor) to 5 (excellent) for the following three categories: an ability to think clearly and solve day-to-day problems, to handle unexpected and difficult problems, and to figure out what to do if faced with an emergency situation.
- 7 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Fire safety measures'.
- 8 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Planning activities'.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents. Households with 'moderately high' or 'high' levels of emergency planning engaged in 3 or 4 of the following: having an exit plan, an emergency supply kit, extra copies of important documents and an emergency contact list. 'Moderately high' or 'high' levels of precautionary measures include having 3 or 4 of the following: a wind-up or battery operated radio, a back-up generator, an alternate source of heat and additional water. 'Moderately high' or 'high' levels of fire safety measure include having all 3 of the following: a working smoke detector, a working fire extinguisher, and a working carbon monoxide detector.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

## Notes

<sup>E</sup> use with caution

- 1 A Census Metropolitan Area (CMA) or a Census Agglomeration (CA) is formed by one or more adjacent municipalities centred on a population centre (known as the core). A CMA must have a total population of at least 100,000 of which 50,000 or more must live in the core. A CA must have a core population of at least 10,000. To be included in the CMA or CA, other adjacent municipalities must have a high degree of integration with the core as measured by commuting flows derived from census data.
- 2 The target population for the SEPR included all persons 15 years of age or older, residing in households in Canada's 10 provinces, excluding full-time residents of institutions (e.g. nursing homes, group homes, hospitals).
- 3 The SEPR covers three types of communities: Census Metropolitan Areas (CMAs), Census Agglomerations (CAs) with population greater than 50,000, and 'smaller communities' which include CAs with population 50,000 or less and those areas that fall outside of CMAs and CAs. All CMAs and CAs (with population greater than 50,000) were included in the SEPR. A sample of households were selected from smaller communities within each province to represent all households within the province in similar communities. Additional information on the SEPR and its sampling methodology can be found in the 'Survey description' section.
- 4 Throughout this fact sheet, responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.
- 5 This section focuses on personal experiences with emergencies or disasters that happened in Canada, in a community where the person was living at the time, and was significant enough to severely interrupt the individual's regular daily activities.

- 6 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% when respondents were asked about whether the emergency they experienced caused them to miss an appointment or a planned activity.
- 7 Emergency planning activities include: having an emergency exit plan, a household emergency supply kit, extra copies of important documents and an emergency contact list.
- 8 Precautionary measures include: having a wind-up or battery-operated radio, an alternate heat source such as a non-electric stove or heater or a wood-burning fireplace, a back-up generator and an alternative water source such as a well, tank or litres of stored water.
- 9 Unless otherwise specified, differences are statistically significant ( $p < 0.05$ ).
- 10 A 'strong sense of belonging to community' is rating one's own sense of belonging to their community as a 4 or a 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "very weak" and 5 "very strong".
- 11 A proportion (9%) of respondents were not asked questions regarding neighbourhood helpfulness in the event of an emergency and as such these cases are not included in the analysis on neighbourhood helpfulness in general or in the event of an emergency.
- 12 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% when respondents were asked about whether their neighbourhood is a place where neighbours would help each other if there is an emergency.





## Fact sheet Community of Regina (CMA), Saskatchewan

---

In 2014, information on the emergency preparedness of people living in the Census Metropolitan Area<sup>1</sup> of Regina was collected through the Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada (SEPR).<sup>2</sup> This fact sheet presents information on the risk awareness and level of emergency preparedness of the residents of Regina, which could help improve the understanding of community resilience in the event of an emergency.<sup>3,4</sup>

### **Risk awareness and anticipated sources of help in an emergency or disaster**

- Winter storms (including blizzards, ice storms and extreme cold) (95%), tornadoes (72%), industrial or transportation accidents (72%), droughts (69%) and extended power outages lasting 24 hours or longer (66%) were named by residents of Regina as the events most likely to occur in their community.
- Residents most commonly reported that they would anticipate turning to their utility company as an initial source for help and information during an extended power outage (48%) and to a hospital, clinic, doctor or other medical professional in the event of an outbreak of a serious or life-threatening disease (45%). In addition, residents also reported that they would turn to local government if they faced a contamination or shortage of water or food (32%) (Table 1.1).
- Depending on the type of emergency or disaster, residents often anticipated turning to some form of news as an initial source of help or information. Specifically, in the event of an act of terrorism or terrorist threat (35%<sup>E</sup>) or an industrial or transportation accident (28%), residents stated they would commonly first turn to news on the radio, and to news on the television if faced with rioting or civil unrest (34%<sup>E</sup>) or a weather-related emergency or natural disaster (28%).

### **Prior lifetime experience with a major emergency or disaster<sup>5</sup>**

- One-quarter (25%) of Regina residents have faced a major emergency or disaster in Canada in a community they were living in at the time of the event, over half (57%) of whom reported experiencing severe disruptions to their daily activities as a result of the event.
- Floods (25%<sup>E</sup>) and tornadoes (23%<sup>E</sup>) were the most commonly experienced emergency or disaster by residents of Regina, followed by winter storms (including blizzards and ice storms) (18%<sup>E</sup>) and extended power outages lasting 24 hours or longer (14%<sup>E</sup>).
- The most common types of disruption to daily activities endured by residents who had experienced major emergencies or disasters included missing work or school (59%), missing an appointment or planned activity (46%) and an inability to use electrical appliances at home (44%). A more severe disruption experienced was an inability to use roads or transportation in the community (36%<sup>E</sup>).
- Most (80%) residents who experienced an emergency or disaster were able to resume their daily activities within one week of the event; six in ten (60%<sup>E</sup>) within two days or less.
- Over half (55%) of residents who had experienced an emergency or disaster received help during or immediately following the event, most commonly from a neighbour (32%<sup>E</sup>), local government (29%<sup>E</sup>) or a family member (26%<sup>E</sup>).
- Nearly half (45%) of residents of Regina who experienced a major emergency or disaster in Canada in a community where they were living at the time of the event and which was significant enough to disrupt their regular daily routine

also endured a loss of property or financial impact. Long-term emotional or psychological consequences were experienced by 14%<sup>E</sup> of individuals affected by a major emergency or disaster.

## Emergency planning, precautionary and fire safety behaviours

- Seven in ten (69%) people residing in Regina lived in households that were engaged in at least two emergency planning activities,<sup>6</sup> and four in ten (42%) lived in households with three or four such activities (Table 1.2). One in ten (10%<sup>E</sup>) people lived in a household that had not participated in any emergency planning activities.
- Nearly half (47%) lived in a household with at least two precautionary measures<sup>7</sup> taken in case of an emergency, and less than one-quarter (22%) lived in a household with three or four such measures. Around one-fifth (17%) of people lived in a household with no precautionary measures in place.
- Nearly all (99%) residents reported living in a household with a working smoke detector, and three in five (59%) reported living in a household with a working fire extinguisher (Table 1.3). Two in three (65%) residents stated that they had a working carbon monoxide detector in their household. Overall, four in ten (39%) residents of Regina stated that they had implemented all three fire safety measures in their household.
- The number of emergency planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures of residents of Regina sometimes differed significantly from residents in Saskatchewan and Canada's 10 provinces in general. Specifically, residents of Regina were less likely to have all three fire safety measures in place (39%) compared to residents of Saskatchewan (44%), and they were less likely to have participated in three emergency planning activities (23%) compared to Canadians (27%). In addition, Regina residents were less likely to have all four precautionary measures in place (4%<sup>E</sup>) than those in Saskatchewan (8%) and Canada (7%) more broadly.<sup>8</sup>
- There were a number of differences in the types of activities and measures in place by residents of Regina when compared to Saskatchewan and Canada. For instance, Regina residents were more likely than Canadians in general to have a vehicle emergency supply kit (74% versus 59%), but were less likely to have a household emergency supply kit (41%), an alternate heat source (40%) or a working fire extinguisher (59%) than Canadians (47%, 48% and 66%, respectively). In addition, when compared to residents of Saskatchewan as a whole (48%), those in Regina (40%) were less likely to report having an alternate water source.

## Social networks and sense of belonging

- More than half (55%) of Regina's residents had a strong sense of belonging<sup>9</sup> to their community.
- Most (88%) residents described the neighbourhood they lived in as a place where neighbours generally help each other.<sup>10 11</sup> Of those who did not describe their neighbourhood this way, six in ten (63%) still described it as a place where neighbours would help each other in an emergency.<sup>12</sup>
- The majority of individuals had a large network of support in the event of an emergency or disaster, with more than five people to turn to for emotional support (73%), for help if physically injured (69%) and in the event of a home evacuation (57%). About three in ten (31%) residents had a large support network if financial help was needed, and approximately one in ten (8%) reported that they had no one to turn to for financial help.
- High levels of sense of belonging, social support and self-efficacy, as well as civic engagement, were sometimes associated with a higher level of emergency preparedness (Table 1.4).

## Data tables

**Table 1.1**  
Most commonly anticipated sources of initial help and information, by type of emergency or disaster, residents of Regina, Saskatchewan, 2014

Most common sources of initial help and information by type of emergency or disaster	percent
<b>Weather-related emergency or natural disaster</b>	
News- Television	28
News- Radio	25
News- Internet	22
<b>Extended power outages<sup>1</sup></b>	

Utility company	48
News- Radio	16 <sup>E</sup>
News- Internet	11 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Outbreak of serious or life-threatening disease</b>	
Hospital, clinic, doctor or other medical professional	45
News- Television	20
News- Radio	19
<b>Industrial or transportation accident</b>	
News- Radio	28
News- Television	26
News- Internet	19
<b>Contamination or shortage of water or food <sup>1</sup></b>	
Local government	32
News- Radio	19 <sup>E</sup>
News- Television	17 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Act of terrorism or terrorist threat</b>	
News- Radio	35 <sup>E</sup>
Police/law enforcement	34 <sup>E</sup>
News- Television	33
<b>Rioting or civil unrest</b>	
News- Television	34 <sup>E</sup>
Police/law enforcement	34 <sup>E</sup>
News- Radio	29 <sup>E</sup>
<sup>E</sup> use with caution	
1 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% when respondents were asked about their likely sources of initial help and information.	
<b>Note:</b> Respondents who perceived their community was at risk for any form of emergency or disaster were then asked where they would turn to first for information or assistance in the event of the perceived emergency or disaster. Respondents could provide more than one response. Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.	
<b>Source:</b> Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.	

**Table 1.2**  
**Number of emergency planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents, community of Regina, Saskatchewan, 2014**

Number of planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents	Regina	Saskatchewan	Canada
	percent		
<b>Number of emergency planning activities</b>			
None	10 <sup>E</sup>	9	8
1 activity	20	18	17
2 activities	27	26	25
3 activities	23 **	28	27
4 activities	19	17	19
<b>Number of precautionary measures <sup>1</sup></b>			
None	17	14	16
1 measure	30	25	27
2 measures	25	28	28
3 measures	18	21	20

4 measures	4 <sup>E ***</sup>	8	7
<b>Number of fire safety measures <sup>2</sup></b>			
None	F	F	1
1 measure	14	13	14
2 measures	42	38	38
3 measures	39 <sup>*</sup>	44	42
<sup>E</sup> use with caution <sup>F</sup> too unreliable to be published <sup>*</sup> significantly different from provincial level estimate (p < 0.05) <sup>**</sup> significantly different from Canada level estimate (p < 0.05) <sup>***</sup> significantly different from both provincial and Canada level estimates (p < 0.05) 1 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Regina'. 2 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Canada'.  <b>Note:</b> Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents. Emergency planning activities include: an emergency exit plan, an emergency supply kit, photocopies/electronic copies of important documents and a list of emergency contact numbers. Precautionary measures include: a battery-operated or wind-up radio, an alternative heat source, a back-up generator and an alternative water source. Fire safety measures include a working smoke detector, a working carbon monoxide detector and a working fire extinguisher. <b>Source:</b> Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.			

**Table 1.3**  
**Planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures residents engaged in, community of Regina, Saskatchewan, 2014**

Residents whose households were involved in the following:	Regina	Saskatchewan	Canada
	percent		
<b>Emergency planning activities</b>			
Emergency exit plan	59	61	60
Exit plan has been practised/reviewed in last 12 months <sup>1</sup>	42	45	46
Designated meeting place for household members <sup>2</sup>	34	40	33
Contact plan for household members <sup>2</sup>	51	57	55
Household emergency supply kit	41 <sup>**</sup>	41	47
Vehicle emergency supply kit <sup>3</sup>	74 <sup>**</sup>	74	59
Extra copies of important documents	55	52	53
List of emergency contact numbers	63 <sup>**</sup>	66	69
Plan for meeting special health needs <sup>4</sup>	74 <sup>**</sup>	54	62
<b>Precautionary measures</b>			
Wind-up or battery-operated radio	57	58	58
Alternate heat source	40 <sup>**</sup>	44	48
Back-up generator	16 <sup>***</sup>	30	23
Alternate water source	40 <sup>*</sup>	48	43
Other <sup>5</sup>	18	20	21
<b>Fire safety measures</b>			
Working smoke detector	99 <sup>***</sup>	98	98
Working carbon monoxide detector	65	66	60
Working fire extinguisher	59 <sup>**</sup>	63	66

\* significantly different from provincial level estimate (p < 0.05)

\*\* significantly different from Canada level estimate (p < 0.05)

\*\*\* significantly different from both provincial and Canada level estimates (p < 0.05)

1 Percentage based only on those indicating that they have an emergency exit plan.

2 Excludes Canadians living in single-person households.

3 Excludes those who reported that they lived in a household that did not have a vehicle.

4 Percentage based only on those indicating that they or someone in their household has special medical needs.

5 'Other precautionary measures' include having an escape/rescue plan for pets, extra supply of fuel, checking and replenishing emergency supplies, and keeping exits clear.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

**Table 1.4**  
**High or moderately high levels of emergency planning, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents, by social and political involvement, community of Regina, Saskatchewan, 2014**

Social and political involvement	Percentage of residents who had high or moderately high levels of...		
	Planning activities	Precautionary measures	Fire safety measures
	percent		
<b>Engagement in political activities <sup>1</sup></b>			
Yes <sup>†</sup>	40	24	39
No <sup>7</sup>	32 <sup>E</sup>	F	28 <sup>E</sup>
<b>High level of civic engagement <sup>2</sup></b>			
Yes <sup>†</sup>	44	24	40
No	31 <sup>*</sup>	19 <sup>E</sup>	32
<b>High level of social support <sup>3</sup></b>			
Yes <sup>8 9 †</sup>	50	32 <sup>E</sup>	54
No <sup>8</sup>	38	18 <sup>*</sup>	34 <sup>*</sup>
<b>Strong sense of belonging to community <sup>4</sup></b>			
Yes <sup>9 †</sup>	48	24	38
No <sup>8</sup>	34 <sup>*</sup>	19 <sup>E</sup>	41
<b>High neighbourhood trust <sup>5</sup></b>			
Yes <sup>8 9 †</sup>	49	23	42
No <sup>8</sup>	38	22	37
<b>High level of self-efficacy <sup>6</sup></b>			
Yes <sup>†</sup>	49	34	39
No <sup>8</sup>	34 <sup>*</sup>	11 <sup>E</sup> <sup>*</sup>	39

<sup>E</sup> use with caution

F too unreliable to be published

\* significantly different from reference category ( $p < 0.05$ )

† reference category

- 1 Includes individuals over the age of 17 years who are eligible to vote, and who have participated in or volunteered for political parties or events in the past 12 months, including municipal, provincial, or federal elections, or expressed views on political or social issues through signing a petition, contacting news agencies or politicians, or attended a meeting involving social or community issues.
- 2 Civic engagement measures individuals over the age of 17 years who were involved in a recreational group or organization in the past 12 months, and includes engagement in political activities. A 'high level' is defined as having been involved in at least 4 activities in the past 12 months.
- 3 A 'high level of social support' is defined as having five or more people whom that individual could turn to for help in an emergency if they are physically injured, require emotional support, shelter, and/or financial assistance.
- 4 A 'strong sense of belonging to community' is rating one's own sense of belonging to their community as a 4 or a 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "very weak" and 5 "very strong".
- 5 'High neighbourhood trust' is rating one's own trust in the people in one's neighbourhood as 4 or 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "cannot be trusted at all" and 5 represents "can be trusted a lot", as well as having a response of "very likely" when asked about the likelihood of someone in their neighbourhood returning a lost wallet or purse containing two hundred dollars with the money still inside.
- 6 A 'high level of self-efficacy' is derived from having a high self-rating on a scale of 1 (poor) to 5 (excellent) for the following three categories: an ability to think clearly and solve day-to-day problems, to handle unexpected and difficult problems, and to figure out what to do if faced with an emergency situation.
- 7 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Planning activities'.
- 8 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Precautionary measures'.
- 9 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Fire safety measures'.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents. Households with 'moderately high' or 'high' levels of emergency planning engaged in 3 or 4 of the following: having an exit plan, an emergency supply kit, extra copies of important documents and an emergency contact list. 'Moderately high' or 'high' levels of precautionary measures include having 3 or 4 of the following: a wind-up or battery operated radio, a back-up generator, an alternate source of heat and additional water. 'Moderately high' or 'high' levels of fire safety measure include having all 3 of the following: a working smoke detector, a working fire extinguisher, and a working carbon monoxide detector.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

## Notes

<sup>E</sup> use with caution

- 1 A Census Metropolitan Area (CMA) or a Census Agglomeration (CA) is formed by one or more adjacent municipalities centred on a population centre (known as the core). A CMA must have a total population of at least 100,000 of which 50,000 or more must live in the core. A CA must have a core population of at least 10,000. To be included in the CMA or CA, other adjacent municipalities must have a high degree of integration with the core as measured by commuting flows derived from census data.
- 2 The target population for the SEPR included all persons 15 years of age or older, residing in households in Canada's 10 provinces, excluding full-time residents of institutions (e.g. nursing homes, group homes, hospitals).
- 3 The SEPR covers three types of communities: Census Metropolitan Areas (CMAs), Census Agglomerations (CAs) with population greater than 50,000, and 'smaller communities' which include CAs with population 50,000 or less and those areas that fall outside of CMAs and CAs. All CMAs and CAs (with population greater than 50,000) were included in the SEPR. A sample of households were selected from smaller communities within each province to represent all households within the province in similar communities. Additional information on the SEPR and its sampling methodology can be found in the 'Survey description' section.
- 4 Throughout this fact sheet, responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.

- 5 This section focuses on personal experiences with emergencies or disasters that happened in Canada, in a community where the person was living at the time, and was significant enough to severely interrupt the individual's regular daily activities.
- 6 Emergency planning activities include: having an emergency exit plan, a household emergency supply kit, extra copies of important documents and an emergency contact list.
- 7 Precautionary measures include: having a wind-up or battery-operated radio, an alternate heat source such as a non-electric stove or heater or a wood-burning fireplace, a back-up generator and an alternative water source such as a well, tank or litres of stored water.
- 8 Unless otherwise specified, differences are statistically significant ( $p < 0.05$ ).
- 9 A 'strong sense of belonging to community' is rating one's own sense of belonging to their community as a 4 or a 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "very weak" and 5 "very strong".
- 10 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% when respondents were asked about whether their neighbourhood is generally a place where neighbours help each other.
- 11 A proportion (5%) of respondents were not asked questions regarding neighbourhood helpfulness in the event of an emergency and as such these cases are not included in the analysis on neighbourhood helpfulness in general or in the event of an emergency.
- 12 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were equal to 19% when respondents were asked about whether their neighbourhood is a place where neighbours would help each other if there is an emergency.



## Fact sheet

# Community of Saskatoon (CMA), Saskatchewan

---

In 2014, information on the emergency preparedness of people living in the Census Metropolitan Area<sup>1</sup> of Saskatoon was collected through the Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada (SEPR).<sup>2</sup> This fact sheet presents information on the risk awareness and level of emergency preparedness of the residents of Saskatoon, which could help improve the understanding of community resilience in the event of an emergency.<sup>3,4</sup>

### Risk awareness and anticipated sources of help in an emergency or disaster

- Winter storms (including blizzards, ice storms and extreme cold) (97%), extended power outages lasting 24 hours or longer (70%), industrial or transportation accidents (66%), droughts (66%) and tornadoes (61%) were named by residents of Saskatoon as the events most likely to occur within their community.
- Residents most commonly anticipated turning to a hospital, clinic, doctor or other medical professional as an initial source for help and information if they were faced with an outbreak of a serious or life-threatening disease (53%), to their utility company during an extended power outage (46%) and to police or law enforcement in the event of rioting or civil unrest (41%) (Table 1.1).
- Residents also anticipated turning to news on the television in the event of an act of terrorism or terrorist threat (34%), to local government if they faced a contamination or shortage of water or food (32%), and to news on the radio in the event of an industrial or transportation accident (32%) or a weather-related emergency or natural disaster (28%).

### Prior lifetime experience with a major emergency or disaster<sup>5</sup>

- Almost one-third (31%) of Saskatoon residents have faced a major emergency or disaster in Canada in a community they were living in at the time of the event, nearly two-thirds (64%) of whom reported experiencing severe disruptions to their daily activities as a result of the event.
- Winter storms which include blizzards and ice storms (55%) were the most commonly experienced emergency or disaster by residents of Saskatoon. Previous experience with floods (16%<sup>E</sup>), tornadoes (14%<sup>E</sup>) and extended power outages lasting 24 hours or longer (13%<sup>E</sup>) was also reported.
- The most common types of disruption to daily activities endured by residents who had experienced major emergencies or disasters included missing work or school (56%) and missing an appointment or planned activity (50%). More severe disruptions experienced were an inability to use roads or transportation in the community (53%), as well as home evacuations (10%<sup>E</sup>).
- Most (84%) residents who experienced an emergency or disaster were able to resume their daily activities within one week of the event; nearly two-thirds (64%) within two days or less.
- Six in ten (59%) residents who had experienced an emergency or disaster received help during or immediately following the event, most commonly from a family member (29%<sup>E</sup>).
- Close to one-quarter (23%<sup>E</sup>) of residents of Saskatoon who experienced a major emergency or disaster in Canada in a community where they were living at the time of the event and which was significant enough to disrupt their regular daily routine also endured a loss of property or financial impact.

### Emergency planning, precautionary and fire safety behaviours



- Nearly seven in ten (67%) people residing in Saskatoon lived in households that were engaged in at least two emergency planning activities,<sup>6</sup> and four in ten (39%) lived in households with three or four such activities (Table 1.2). One in ten (10%) people lived in a household that had not participated in any emergency planning activities.
- One-half (51%) lived in a household with at least two precautionary measures<sup>7</sup> taken in case of an emergency, and less than one-quarter (22%) lived in a household with three or four such measures. One-fifth (19%) of people lived in a household with no precautionary measures in place.
- The majority (98%) of residents reported living in a household with a working smoke detector, and more than three in five (64%) reported living in a household with a working fire extinguisher (Table 1.3). Nearly three-quarters (72%) of residents stated that they had a working carbon monoxide detector in their household. Overall, one-half (50%) of the residents of Saskatoon stated that they had implemented all three fire safety measures within their households.
- The number of fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents of Saskatoon sometimes differed significantly from residents in Saskatchewan and Canada's 10 provinces in general. For example, residents of Saskatoon (19%) were more likely to have no precautionary measures in place compared to residents of Saskatchewan as a whole (14%). In addition, the proportion of Saskatoon residents who had three precautionary measures in place (15%) was lower than that of Saskatchewan residents (21%) and Canadians (20%). However, residents in Saskatoon were significantly more likely to have all three fire safety measures in place (50%) compared to those in Saskatchewan in general (44%) and Canada more broadly (42%).<sup>8</sup>
- There were some significant differences in the types of activities and measures set in place by residents of Saskatoon when compared to Saskatchewan and Canada. Residents of Saskatoon were less likely to have an alternate heat source (40%) and a household emergency supply kit (36%) compared to Canadians (48% and 47%, respectively), but they were more likely to have a vehicle emergency supply kit (71%) compared to Canadians (59%). Residents of Saskatoon (37%) were also less likely to have an alternate water source compared to those in Saskatchewan (48%) and Canada (43%).

## Social networks and sense of belonging

- More than half (53%) of Saskatoon's residents had a strong sense of belonging<sup>9</sup> to their community.
- Most (87%) residents described the neighbourhood they lived in as a place where neighbours generally help each other.<sup>10</sup> Of those who did not describe their neighbourhood this way, most (90%) still described it as a place where neighbours would help each other in an emergency.<sup>11</sup>
- Approximately two-thirds of individuals had a large network of support in the event of an emergency or disaster, with more than five people to turn to for emotional support (68%), for help if physically injured (66%) as well as in case of a home evacuation (62%). Three in ten residents had such a large support network if financial help was needed (30%). However, 9%<sup>E</sup> reported that they had no one to turn to for financial help.
- High levels of sense of belonging and self-efficacy, as well as political and civic engagement, were sometimes associated with a higher level of emergency preparedness (Table 1.4).

## Data tables

Table 1.1

Most commonly anticipated sources of initial help and information, by type of emergency or disaster, residents of Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, 2014

Most common sources of initial help and information by type of emergency or disaster	percent
<b>Weather-related emergency or natural disaster</b>	
News- Radio	28
News- Internet	24
News- Television	23
<b>Extended power outages</b>	
Utility company	46
News- Radio	14

News- Internet	12 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Outbreak of serious or life-threatening disease</b>	
Hospital, clinic, doctor or other medical professional	53
News- Internet	21
News- Radio	18
<b>Industrial or transportation accident</b>	
News- Radio	32
News- Internet	24
News- Television	23
<b>Contamination or shortage of water or food <sup>1</sup></b>	
Local government	32
News- Radio	18
News- Television	17
<b>Act of terrorism or terrorist threat</b>	
News- Television	34
News- Radio	31
Police/law enforcement	27 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Rioting or civil unrest</b>	
Police/law enforcement	41
News- Radio	27 <sup>E</sup>
News- Television	26 <sup>E</sup>
<sup>E</sup> use with caution	
1 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% when respondents were asked about their likely sources of initial help and information.	
<b>Note:</b> Respondents who perceived their community was at risk for any form of emergency or disaster were then asked where they would turn to first for information or assistance in the event of the perceived emergency or disaster. Respondents could provide more than one response. Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.	
<b>Source:</b> Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.	

**Table 1.2**  
**Number of emergency planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents, community of Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, 2014**

Number of planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents	Saskatoon	Saskatchewan	Canada
	percent		
<b>Number of emergency planning activities</b>			
None	10	9	8
1 activity	19	18	17
2 activities	28	26	25
3 activities	23	28	27
4 activities	16	17	19
<b>Number of precautionary measures</b>			
None	19 *	14	16
1 measure	26	25	27
2 measures	29	28	28
3 measures	15 ***	21	20
4 measures	7 <sup>E</sup>	8	7
<b>Number of fire safety measures <sup>1 2</sup></b>			

None	F	F	1
1 measure	11 <sup>E</sup>	13	14
2 measures	33	38	38
3 measures	50 <sup>***</sup>	44	42

<sup>E</sup> use with caution  
<sup>F</sup> too unreliable to be published

\* significantly different from provincial level estimate (p < 0.05)

\*\*\* significantly different from both provincial and Canada level estimates (p < 0.05)

1 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Canada'.

2 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Saskatoon'.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents. Emergency planning activities include: an emergency exit plan, an emergency supply kit, photocopies/electronic copies of important documents and a list of emergency contact numbers. Precautionary measures include: a battery-operated or wind-up radio, an alternative heat source, a back-up generator and an alternative water source. Fire safety measures include a working smoke detector, a working carbon monoxide detector and a working fire extinguisher.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

**Table 1.3**  
**Planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures residents engaged in, community of Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, 2014**

Residents whose households were involved in the following:	Saskatoon	Saskatchewan	Canada
	percent		
<b>Emergency planning activities</b>			
Emergency exit plan	56	61	60
Exit plan has been practised/reviewed in last 12 months <sup>1</sup>	40	45	46
Designated meeting place for household members <sup>2</sup>	29 <sup>*</sup>	40	33
Contact plan for household members <sup>2</sup>	53	57	55
Household emergency supply kit	36 <sup>**</sup>	41	47
Vehicle emergency supply kit <sup>3</sup>	71 <sup>**</sup>	74	59
Extra copies of important documents	56	52	53
List of emergency contact numbers	65	66	69
Plan for meeting special health needs <sup>4</sup>	57	54	62
<b>Precautionary measures</b>			
Wind-up or battery-operated radio	60	58	58
Alternate heat source	40 <sup>**</sup>	44	48
Back-up generator	23 <sup>*</sup>	30	23
Alternate water source	37 <sup>***</sup>	48	43
Other <sup>5</sup>	18	20	21
<b>Fire safety measures</b>			
Working smoke detector	98	98	98
Working carbon monoxide detector	72 <sup>***</sup>	66	60
Working fire extinguisher	64	63	66

\* significantly different from provincial level estimate (p < 0.05)

\*\* significantly different from Canada level estimate (p < 0.05)

\*\*\* significantly different from both provincial and Canada level estimates (p < 0.05)

1 Percentage based only on those indicating that they have an emergency exit plan.

2 Excludes Canadians living in single-person households.

3 Excludes those who reported that they lived in a household that did not have a vehicle.

4 Percentage based only on those indicating that they or someone in their household has special medical needs.

5 'Other precautionary measures' include having an escape/rescue plan for pets, extra supply of fuel, checking and replenishing emergency supplies, and keeping exits clear.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

**Table 1.4**  
**High or moderately high levels of emergency planning, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents, by social and political involvement, community of Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, 2014**

Social and political involvement	Percentage of residents who had high or moderately high levels of...		
	Planning activities	Precautionary measures	Fire safety measures
	percent		
<b>Engagement in political activities <sup>1</sup></b>			
Yes †	44	25	53
No <sup>7 8</sup>	21 <sup>E *</sup>	F	40 <sup>E</sup>
<b>High level of civic engagement <sup>2</sup></b>			
Yes †	48	25	54
No <sup>9</sup>	26 <sup>E *</sup>	18 <sup>E</sup>	45
<b>High level of social support <sup>3</sup></b>			
Yes †	49	25 <sup>E</sup>	57
No <sup>9</sup>	36	20	47
<b>Strong sense of belonging to community <sup>4</sup></b>			
Yes <sup>7 †</sup>	48	25	52
No <sup>9</sup>	31 <sup>*</sup>	19 <sup>E</sup>	49
<b>High neighbourhood trust <sup>5</sup></b>			
Yes †	42	27	52
No <sup>9</sup>	39	19 <sup>E</sup>	49
<b>High level of self-efficacy <sup>6</sup></b>			
Yes †	46	27	52
No <sup>9</sup>	33 <sup>*</sup>	16 <sup>E *</sup>	49

<sup>E</sup> use with caution

F too unreliable to be published

\* significantly different from reference category ( $p < 0.05$ )

† reference category

- 1 Includes individuals over the age of 17 years who are eligible to vote, and who have participated in or volunteered for political parties or events in the past 12 months, including municipal, provincial, or federal elections, or expressed views on political or social issues through signing a petition, contacting news agencies or politicians, or attended a meeting involving social or community issues.
- 2 Civic engagement measures individuals over the age of 17 years who were involved in a recreational group or organization in the past 12 months, and includes engagement in political activities. A 'high level' is defined as having been involved in at least 4 activities in the past 12 months.
- 3 A 'high level of social support' is defined as having five or more people whom that individual could turn to for help in an emergency if they are physically injured, require emotional support, shelter, and/or financial assistance.
- 4 A 'strong sense of belonging to community' is rating one's own sense of belonging to their community as a 4 or a 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "very weak" and 5 "very strong".
- 5 'High neighbourhood trust' is rating one's own trust in the people in one's neighbourhood as 4 or 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "cannot be trusted at all" and 5 represents "can be trusted a lot", as well as having a response of "very likely" when asked about the likelihood of someone in their neighbourhood returning a lost wallet or purse containing two hundred dollars with the money still inside.
- 6 A 'high level of self-efficacy' is derived from having a high self-rating on a scale of 1 (poor) to 5 (excellent) for the following three categories: an ability to think clearly and solve day-to-day problems, to handle unexpected and difficult problems, and to figure out what to do if faced with an emergency situation.
- 7 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Precautionary measures'.
- 8 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were equal to 14% for 'Fire safety measures'.
- 9 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Fire safety measures'.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents. Households with 'moderately high' or 'high' levels of emergency planning engaged in 3 or 4 of the following: having an exit plan, an emergency supply kit, extra copies of important documents and an emergency contact list. 'Moderately high' or 'high' levels of precautionary measures include having 3 or 4 of the following: a wind-up or battery operated radio, a back-up generator, an alternate source of heat and additional water. 'Moderately high' or 'high' levels of fire safety measure include having all 3 of the following: a working smoke detector, a working fire extinguisher, and a working carbon monoxide detector.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

## Notes

<sup>E</sup> use with caution

- 1 A Census Metropolitan Area (CMA) or a Census Agglomeration (CA) is formed by one or more adjacent municipalities centred on a population centre (known as the core). A CMA must have a total population of at least 100,000 of which 50,000 or more must live in the core. A CA must have a core population of at least 10,000. To be included in the CMA or CA, other adjacent municipalities must have a high degree of integration with the core as measured by commuting flows derived from census data.
- 2 The target population for the SEPR included all persons 15 years of age or older, residing in households in Canada's 10 provinces, excluding full-time residents of institutions (e.g. nursing homes, group homes, hospitals).
- 3 The SEPR covers three types of communities: Census Metropolitan Areas (CMAs), Census Agglomerations (CAs) with population greater than 50,000, and 'smaller communities' which include CAs with population 50,000 or less and those areas that fall outside of CMAs and CAs. All CMAs and CAs (with population greater than 50,000) were included in the SEPR. A sample of households were selected from smaller communities within each province to represent all households within the province in similar communities. Additional information on the SEPR and its sampling methodology can be found in the 'Survey description' section.
- 4 Throughout this fact sheet, responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.

- 5 This section focuses on personal experiences with emergencies or disasters that happened in Canada, in a community where the person was living at the time, and was significant enough to severely interrupt the individual's regular daily activities.
- 6 Emergency planning activities include: having an emergency exit plan, a household emergency supply kit, extra copies of important documents and an emergency contact list.
- 7 Precautionary measures include: having a wind-up or battery-operated radio, an alternate heat source such as a non-electric stove or heater or a wood-burning fireplace, a back-up generator and an alternative water source such as a well, tank or litres of stored water.
- 8 Unless otherwise specified, differences are statistically significant ( $p < 0.05$ ).
- 9 A 'strong sense of belonging to community' is rating one's own sense of belonging to their community as a 4 or a 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "very weak" and 5 "very strong".
- 10 A proportion (4%) of respondents were not asked questions regarding neighbourhood helpfulness in the event of an emergency and as such these cases are not included in the analysis on neighbourhood helpfulness in general or in the event of an emergency.
- 11 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% when respondents were asked about whether their neighbourhood is a place where neighbours would help each other if there is an emergency.



## Fact sheet Smaller communities of Saskatchewan

---

In 2014, information on the emergency preparedness of people living in 'smaller communities' of Saskatchewan was collected through the Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada (SEPR).<sup>1 2 3</sup> This fact sheet presents information on the risk awareness and level of emergency preparedness of the residents of Saskatchewan's smaller communities, which could help improve the understanding of community resilience in the event of an emergency.<sup>4</sup>

### **Risk awareness and anticipated sources of help in an emergency or disaster**

- People living in the smaller communities of Saskatchewan anticipated winter storms (including blizzards, ice storms and extreme cold) (93%), extended power outages lasting 24 hours or longer (78%), droughts (78%) and tornadoes (71%) as the most likely events to occur within their communities.
- Residents most commonly anticipated turning to their utility company in the event of an extended power outage (69%), and to a hospital, clinic, doctor or other medical professional in the event of a serious or life-threatening disease (67%). Residents also anticipated turning to police or law enforcement as an initial source for help and information if they were faced with an act of terrorism or terrorist threat (52%<sup>E</sup>), rioting or civil unrest (28%<sup>E</sup>) or an industrial or transportation accident (24%) (Table 1.1).
- Residents stated that local government was the most commonly anticipated source of initial help and information in the event of a contamination or shortage of water or food (40%), and news on the television in the event of a weather-related emergency or natural disaster (22%).

### **Prior lifetime experience with a major emergency or disaster<sup>5</sup>**

- Close to one in four (38%) residents of the smaller communities of Saskatchewan has faced a major emergency or disaster in Canada in a community they were living in at the time of the event, two-thirds (67%) of whom reported experiencing severe disruptions to their daily activities as a result of the event.
- Extended power outages lasting 24 hours or longer (38%<sup>E</sup>), floods (24%<sup>E</sup>) and winter storms which include blizzards and ice storms (24%<sup>E</sup>) were the most commonly experienced emergencies or disasters by residents of the smaller communities of Saskatchewan.
- The most common types of disruption to daily activities endured by residents who had experienced major emergencies or disasters included missing work or school (58%), boiling drinking water or drinking bottled water (54%), missing an appointment or planned activity (49%), an inability to use electrical appliances (47%) and an inability to use water at home for tasks (45%). More severe disruptions experienced were an inability to use roads or transportation within the community (33%<sup>E</sup>) or communicate outside of the home (10%<sup>E</sup>).
- Over three-quarters (77%) of residents who experienced an emergency or disaster were able to resume their daily activities within one week of the event; half (51%) of whom resumed activities within two days or less.
- More than half (56%) of residents who had experienced an emergency or disaster received help during or immediately following the event, most commonly from a neighbour (38%<sup>E</sup>) or a friend (21%<sup>E</sup>).<sup>6</sup>
- Four in ten (38%) residents of the smaller communities of Saskatchewan who experienced a major emergency or disaster in Canada in a community where they were living at the time of the event and which was significant enough to disrupt their regular daily routine also endured a loss of property or financial impact.

## Emergency planning, precautionary and fire safety behaviours

- Nearly three-quarters (72%) of people residing in the smaller communities of Saskatchewan lived in households that were engaged in at least two emergency planning activities,<sup>7</sup> one-half (48%) lived in households with three or four such activities (Table 1.2). About one in ten (9%<sup>E</sup>) people lived in a household that had not participated in any emergency planning activities.
- Close to two-thirds (64%) lived in a household with at least two precautionary measures<sup>8</sup> taken in case of an emergency, and more than one-third (36%) lived in a household with three or four such measures. One in ten (11%) people lived in a household with no precautionary measures in place.
- The vast majority (98%) of residents reported living in a household with a working smoke detector, and two-thirds (65%) reported living in a household with a working fire extinguisher (Table 1.3). Nearly two out of three (64%) residents stated that they had a working carbon monoxide detector in their household. Less than one-half (44%) of the residents of the smaller communities of Saskatchewan stated that they had implemented all three fire safety measures within their households.
- Generally, the number of emergency planning activities and fire safety measures taken by residents of the smaller communities of Saskatchewan did not significantly differ from residents of Saskatchewan overall or Canada's 10 provinces in general. Residents of smaller communities (11%), however, were less likely than residents of Saskatchewan (14%) and Canada (16%) to have no precautionary measures in place.<sup>9</sup>
- There were some differences in the types of activities and measures in place by residents of the smaller communities of Saskatchewan when compared to residents of the province overall and Canada in general. For example, in terms of emergency planning activities, the proportion of residents in the smaller communities who had a contact plan for household members (61%) as well as a designated meeting place for household members (48%) was higher than those in Saskatchewan as a whole (57% and 40%, respectively) and Canada (55% and 33%, respectively). In addition, residents of the smaller communities of Saskatchewan were more likely to have an alternate water source (58%) and a back-up generator (39%) compared to residents of Saskatchewan and Canada in general.

## Social networks and sense of belonging

- Six in ten (61%) residents of the smaller communities of Saskatchewan had a strong sense of belonging<sup>10</sup> to their community.
- Most (93%) residents described the neighbourhood they lived in as a place where neighbours generally help each other.<sup>11</sup> Of those who did not describe their neighbourhood this way, most (81%) still described it as a place where neighbours would help each other in an emergency.<sup>12</sup>
- Many individuals had a large network of support in the event of an emergency or disaster, with more than five people to turn to in the event of a home evacuation (71%), for emotional support (70%) and for help if physically injured (67%). About one-third (35%) of residents had a large support network if financial help was needed. However, 7%<sup>E</sup> reported that they had no one to turn to for financial help.
- High levels of sense of belonging, self-efficacy, neighbourhood trust and social support, as well as civic engagement, were often associated with a higher level of emergency preparedness (Table 1.4).

## Data tables

Table 1.1

Most commonly anticipated sources of initial help and information, by type of emergency or disaster, residents of smaller communities of Saskatchewan, 2014

Most common sources of initial help and information by type of emergency or disaster	percent
<b>Weather-related emergency or natural disaster<sup>1</sup></b>	
News- Television	22
News- Internet	21
News- Radio	21
<b>Extended power outages</b>	



Utility company	69
News- Radio	11 <sup>E</sup>
Local government	5 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Outbreak of serious or life-threatening disease</b>	
Hospital, clinic, doctor or other medical professional	67
News- Internet	12 <sup>E</sup>
News- Radio	9 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Industrial or transportation accident</b>	
Police/law enforcement	24
News- Radio	19
News- Internet	14 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Contamination or shortage of water or food <sup>2</sup></b>	
Local government	40
News- Radio	10 <sup>E</sup>
News- Television	9 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Act of terrorism or terrorist threat</b>	
Police/law enforcement	52 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Rioting or civil unrest <sup>1</sup></b>	
Police/law enforcement	28 <sup>E</sup>
<sup>E</sup> use with caution	
1 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% when respondents were asked about their likely sources of initial help and information.	
2 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were equal to 12% for sources of initial help and information.	
<b>Note:</b> Respondents who perceived their community was at risk for any form of emergency or disaster were then asked where they would turn to first for information or assistance in the event of the perceived emergency or disaster. Respondents could provide more than one response. Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.	
<b>Source:</b> Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.	

**Table 1.2**  
**Number of emergency planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents, smaller communities of Saskatchewan, 2014**

Number of planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents	Smaller communities of Saskatchewan	Saskatchewan	Canada
	percent		
<b>Number of emergency planning activities</b>			
None	9 <sup>E</sup>	9	8
1 activity	16	18	17
2 activities	24	26	25
3 activities	32 *	28	27
4 activities	16	17	19
<b>Number of precautionary measures</b>			
None	11 ***	14	16
1 measure	23	25	27
2 measures	28	28	28
3 measures	26 ***	21	20
4 measures	10 <sup>E</sup> *	8	7
<b>Number of fire safety measures <sup>1</sup></b>			
None	F	F	1

1 measure	13 <sup>E</sup>	13	14
2 measures	39	38	38
3 measures	44	44	42

<sup>E</sup> use with caution  
<sup>F</sup> too unreliable to be published

\* significantly different from provincial level estimate (p < 0.05)

\*\*\* significantly different from both provincial and Canada level estimates (p < 0.05)

1 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Canada'.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents. Emergency planning activities include: an emergency exit plan, an emergency supply kit, photocopies/electronic copies of important documents and a list of emergency contact numbers. Precautionary measures include: a battery-operated or wind-up radio, an alternative heat source, a back-up generator and an alternative water source. Fire safety measures include a working smoke detector, a working carbon monoxide detector and a working fire extinguisher.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

**Table 1.3**  
**Planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures residents engaged in, smaller communities of Saskatchewan, 2014**

Residents whose households were involved in the following:	Smaller communities of Saskatchewan	Saskatchewan	Canada
	percent		
<b>Emergency planning activities</b>			
Emergency exit plan	65 *	61	60
Exit plan has been practised/reviewed in last 12 months <sup>1</sup>	49	45	46
Designated meeting place for household members <sup>2</sup>	48 ***	40	33
Contact plan for household members <sup>2</sup>	61 ***	57	55
Household emergency supply kit	44	41	47
Vehicle emergency supply kit <sup>3</sup>	75 **	74	59
Extra copies of important documents	49	52	53
List of emergency contact numbers	68	66	69
Plan for meeting special health needs <sup>4</sup>	55	54	62
<b>Precautionary measures</b>			
Wind-up or battery-operated radio	57	58	58
Alternate heat source	47	44	48
Back-up generator	39 ***	30	23
Alternate water source	58 ***	48	43
Other <sup>5</sup>	22	20	21
<b>Fire safety measures</b>			
Working smoke detector	98	98	98
Working carbon monoxide detector	64	66	60
Working fire extinguisher	65	63	66

\* significantly different from provincial level estimate (p < 0.05)

\*\* significantly different from Canada level estimate (p < 0.05)

\*\*\* significantly different from both provincial and Canada level estimates (p < 0.05)

1 Percentage based only on those indicating that they have an emergency exit plan.

2 Excludes Canadians living in single-person households.

3 Excludes those who reported that they lived in a household that did not have a vehicle.

4 Percentage based only on those indicating that they or someone in their household has special medical needs.

5 'Other precautionary measures' include having an escape/rescue plan for pets, extra supply of fuel, checking and replenishing emergency supplies, and keeping exits clear.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

**Table 1.4**

**High or moderately high levels of emergency planning, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents, by social and political involvement, smaller communities of Saskatchewan, 2014**

Social and political involvement	Percentage of residents who had high or moderately high levels of...		
	Planning activities	Precautionary measures	Fire safety measures
	percent		
<b>Engagement in political activities <sup>1</sup></b>			
Yes †	49	39	43
No <sup>7 8 9</sup>	41 <sup>E</sup>	F	35 <sup>E</sup>
<b>High level of civic engagement <sup>2</sup></b>			
Yes †	53	40	44
No	40	24 <sup>E *</sup>	39
<b>High level of social support <sup>3</sup></b>			
Yes †	60	51	55
No	42 <sup>*</sup>	29 <sup>*</sup>	38 <sup>*</sup>
<b>Strong sense of belonging to community <sup>4</sup></b>			
Yes †	56	38	47
No <sup>7</sup>	36 <sup>*</sup>	34	37
<b>High neighbourhood trust <sup>5</sup></b>			
Yes †	55	40	49
No	41 <sup>*</sup>	33	38
<b>High level of self-efficacy <sup>6</sup></b>			
Yes †	58	43	43
No <sup>7</sup>	38 <sup>*</sup>	30 <sup>*</sup>	43

<sup>E</sup> use with caution

F too unreliable to be published

\* significantly different from reference category ( $p < 0.05$ )

† reference category

1 Includes individuals over the age of 17 years who are eligible to vote, and who have participated in or volunteered for political parties or events in the past 12 months, including municipal, provincial, or federal elections, or expressed views on political or social issues through signing a petition, contacting news agencies or politicians, or attended a meeting involving social or community issues.

2 Civic engagement measures individuals over the age of 17 years who were involved in a recreational group or organization in the past 12 months, and includes engagement in political activities. A 'high level' is defined as having been involved in at least 4 activities in the past 12 months.

3 A 'high level of social support' is defined as having five or more people whom that individual could turn to for help in an emergency if they are physically injured, require emotional support, shelter, and/or financial assistance.

4 A 'strong sense of belonging to community' is rating one's own sense of belonging to their community as a 4 or a 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "very weak" and 5 "very strong".

5 'High neighbourhood trust' is rating one's own trust in the people in one's neighbourhood as 4 or 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "cannot be trusted at all" and 5 represents "can be trusted a lot", as well as having a response of "very likely" when asked about the likelihood of someone in their neighbourhood returning a lost wallet or purse containing two hundred dollars with the money still inside.

6 A 'high level of self-efficacy' is derived from having a high self-rating on a scale of 1 (poor) to 5 (excellent) for the following three categories: an ability to think clearly and solve day-to-day problems, to handle unexpected and difficult problems, and to figure out what to do if faced with an emergency situation.

7 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Planning activities'.

8 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were equal to 11% for 'Precautionary measures'.

9 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Fire safety measures'.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents. Households with 'moderately high' or 'high' levels of emergency planning engaged in 3 or 4 of the following: having an exit plan, an emergency supply kit, extra copies of important documents and an emergency contact list. 'Moderately high' or 'high' levels of precautionary measures include having 3 or 4 of the following: a wind-up or battery operated radio, a back-up generator, an alternate source of heat and additional water. 'Moderately high' or 'high' levels of fire safety measure include having all 3 of the following: a working smoke detector, a working fire extinguisher, and a working carbon monoxide detector.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

## Notes

<sup>E</sup> use with caution

1 A Census Metropolitan Area (CMA) or a Census Agglomeration (CA) is formed by one or more adjacent municipalities centred on a population centre (known as the core). A CMA must have a total population of at least 100,000 of which 50,000 or more must live in the core. A CA must have a core population of at least 10,000. To be included in the CMA or CA, other adjacent municipalities must have a high degree of integration with the core as measured by commuting flows derived from census data.

2 The target population for the SEPR included all persons 15 years of age or older, residing in households in Canada's 10 provinces, excluding full-time residents of institutions (e.g., nursing homes, group homes, hospitals).

3 The SEPR covers three types of communities: Census Metropolitan Areas (CMAs), Census Agglomerations (CAs) with population greater than 50,000, and 'smaller communities' which include CAs with population 50,000 or less and those areas that fall outside of CMAs and CAs. All CMAs and CAs (with population greater than 50,000) were included in the SEPR. A sample of households were selected from smaller communities within each province to represent all households within the province in similar communities. Additional information on the SEPR and its sampling methodology can be found in the 'Survey description' section.

4 Throughout this fact sheet, responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.

- 5 This section focuses on personal experiences with emergencies or disasters that happened in Canada, in a community where the person was living at the time, and was significant enough to severely interrupt the individual's regular daily activities.
- 6 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% when respondents were asked about the source of information or assistance they received during or immediately following the emergency they experienced.
- 7 Emergency planning activities include: having an emergency exit plan, a household emergency supply kit, extra copies of important documents and an emergency contact list.
- 8 Precautionary measures include: having a wind-up or battery-operated radio, an alternate heat source such as a non-electric stove or heater or a wood-burning fireplace, a back-up generator and an alternative water source such as a well, tank or litres of stored water.
- 9 Unless otherwise specified, differences are statistically significant ( $p < 0.05$ ).
- 10 A 'strong sense of belonging to community' is rating one's own sense of belonging to their community as a 4 or a 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "very weak" and 5 "very strong".
- 11 A proportion (14%) of respondents were not asked questions regarding neighbourhood helpfulness in the event of an emergency and as such these cases are not included in the analysis on neighbourhood helpfulness in general or in the event of an emergency.
- 12 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% when respondents were asked about whether their neighbourhood is a place where neighbours would help each other if there is an emergency.



## Fact sheet Community of Medicine Hat (CA), Alberta

---

In 2014, information on the emergency preparedness of people living in the Census Agglomeration<sup>1</sup> of Medicine Hat was collected through the Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada (SEPR).<sup>2</sup> This fact sheet presents information on the risk awareness and level of emergency preparedness of the residents of Medicine Hat, which could help improve the understanding of community resilience in the event of an emergency.<sup>3,4</sup>

### **Risk awareness and anticipated sources of help in an emergency or disaster**

- Winter storms (including blizzards, ice storms and extreme cold) (88%), floods (75%) and industrial or transportation accidents (72%) were named by residents of Medicine Hat as the events most likely to occur within their community.
- Residents most commonly reported that they would anticipate turning to a hospital, clinic, doctor or other medical professional in the event of an outbreak of a serious or life-threatening disease (58%) and to local government as an initial source for help and information if they were faced with a contamination or shortage of water or food (40%) or an extended power outage lasting 24 hours or longer (33%) (Table 1.1).
- Residents also anticipated turning to news on the radio in the event of an industrial or transportation accident (35%), a weather-related emergency or natural disaster (34%) or an act of terrorism or terrorist threat (34%<sup>E</sup>).

### **Prior lifetime experience with a major emergency or disaster<sup>5</sup>**

- More than half (56%) of Medicine Hat residents have faced a major emergency or disaster in Canada in a community they were living in at the time of the event, two-thirds (65%) of whom reported experiencing severe disruptions to their daily activities as a result of the event.
- Floods (80%) were the most commonly experienced emergency or disaster by residents of Medicine Hat.
- Common types of disruption to daily activities endured by residents who had experienced major emergencies or disasters included missing work or school (52%), having to boil drinking water or drink bottled water (51%) and missing an appointment or planned activity (48%). More severe disruptions experienced were an inability to use roads or transportation in the community (58%), as well as home evacuations (33%).
- Six in ten (61%) residents who experienced an emergency or disaster were able to resume their daily activities within one week of the event. Close to one in five (19%<sup>E</sup>) residents needed more than one week but less than two weeks to resume daily activities.
- Two-thirds (67%) of residents who had experienced an emergency or disaster received help during or immediately following the event, most commonly from local government (35%<sup>E</sup>), a family member (25%<sup>E</sup>), a neighbour (22%<sup>E</sup>) or a friend (20%<sup>E</sup>).
- One-quarter (23%) of residents of Medicine Hat who experienced a major emergency or disaster in Canada in a community where they were living at the time of the event and which was significant enough to disrupt their regular daily routine also endured a loss of property or financial impact. Long-term emotional or psychological consequences were experienced by 11%<sup>E</sup> of individuals affected by a major emergency or disaster.

### **Emergency planning, precautionary and fire safety behaviours**

- Three-quarters (74%) of people residing in Medicine Hat lived in households that were engaged in at least two emergency planning activities,<sup>6</sup> and half (50%) lived in households with three or four such activities (Table 1.2). Less than one in ten (7%<sup>E</sup>) people lived in a household that had not participated in any emergency planning activities.
- Six in ten (58%) lived in a household with at least two precautionary measures<sup>7</sup> taken in case of an emergency, and one-quarter (27%) lived in a household with three or four such measures. One in five (18%) people lived in a household with no precautionary measures in place.
- The vast majority (98%) of residents reported living in a household with a working smoke detector, and three in five (60%) reported living in a household with a working fire extinguisher (Table 1.3). Two out of three (65%) residents stated that they had a working carbon monoxide detector in their household. Overall, four in ten (41%) residents of Medicine Hat stated that they had implemented all three fire safety measures within their households.
- The number of emergency planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents of Medicine Hat did not differ significantly from residents in Canada's 10 provinces overall; however, there were a couple of differences between those in Medicine Hat and Alberta more broadly. The proportion of residents in Medicine Hat who had two precautionary measures (31%) and two fire safety measures (40%) in place was significantly higher than that of Albertans (23% and 31%, respectively).<sup>8</sup>
- The types of fire safety and precautionary measures taken by Medicine Hat residents did not significantly differ from residents in Alberta or Canada in general. When significant differences existed in the types of emergency planning activities taken, residents of Medicine Hat were always more likely than residents of Alberta overall or Canada in general to have engaged in the specific activity. For instance, of those who stated that they had an emergency exit plan, residents in Medicine Hat (56%) were significantly more likely to have practised or reviewed the plan in the last 12 months than Albertans (45%) or Canadians (46%). In addition, Medicine Hat residents (44%) were also more likely to state that they had a designated meeting place for household members than the province or Canada in general (both 33%).

## Social networks and sense of belonging

- Close to six in ten (57%) of Medicine Hat's residents had a strong sense of belonging<sup>9</sup> to their community.
- Most (87%) residents described the neighbourhood they lived in as a place where neighbours generally help each other.<sup>10</sup> Of those who did not describe their neighbourhood this way, three-quarters (76%) still described it as a place where neighbours would help each other in an emergency.<sup>11</sup>
- More than six in ten individuals had a large network of support in the event of an emergency or disaster, with more than five people to turn to in the event of home evacuation (66%), for emotional support (63%) and for help if physically injured (61%). About one-quarter of residents had a large support network if financial help was needed (26%). However, 13% reported that they had no one to turn to for financial help.
- High levels of neighbourhood trust and self-efficacy, as well as engagement in political activities, were sometimes associated with a higher level of emergency preparedness (Table 1.4).

## Data tables

**Table 1.1**  
Most commonly anticipated sources of initial help and information, by type of emergency or disaster, residents of Medicine Hat, Alberta, 2014

Most common sources of initial help and information by type of emergency or disaster	percent
<b>Weather-related emergency or natural disaster</b>	
News- Radio	34
News- Internet	28
News- Television	28
<b>Extended power outages</b>	
Local government	33
Utility company	19 <sup>E</sup>

News- Radio	15 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Outbreak of serious or life-threatening disease</b>	
Hospital, clinic, doctor or other medical professional	58
News- Radio	15 <sup>E</sup>
News- Internet	11 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Industrial or transportation accident</b>	
News- Radio	35
News- Television	23
Police/law enforcement	21
<b>Contamination or shortage of water or food</b>	
Local government	40
News- Radio	19 <sup>E</sup>
News- Internet	14 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Act of terrorism or terrorist threat</b>	
News- Radio	34 <sup>E</sup>
Police/law enforcement	25 <sup>E</sup>
News- Internet	22 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Rioting or civil unrest</b>	
F	F
<sup>E</sup> use with caution <sup>F</sup> too unreliable to be published <b>Note:</b> Respondents who perceived their community was at risk for any form of emergency or disaster were then asked where they would turn to first for information or assistance in the event of the perceived emergency or disaster. Respondents could provide more than one response. Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents. <b>Source:</b> Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.	

**Table 1.2**  
**Number of emergency planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents, community of Medicine Hat, Alberta, 2014**

Number of planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents	Medicine Hat	Alberta	Canada
	percent		
<b>Number of emergency planning activities</b>			
None	7 <sup>E</sup>	8	8
1 activity	18	17	17
2 activities	24	25	25
3 activities	31	26	27
4 activities	19	20	19
<b>Number of precautionary measures</b>			
None	18	21	16
1 measure	23	27	27
2 measures	31 *	23	28
3 measures	20	18	20
4 measures	7 <sup>E</sup>	6	7
<b>Number of fire safety measures <sup>1 2</sup></b>			
None	F	1 <sup>E</sup>	1
1 measure	14	14	14
2 measures	40 *	31	38



3 measures	41	48	42
<p><sup>E</sup> use with caution  <sup>F</sup> too unreliable to be published</p> <p>* significantly different from provincial level estimate (p &lt; 0.05)</p> <p>1 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Canada'.</p> <p>2 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Alberta'.</p> <p><b>Note:</b> Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents. Emergency planning activities include: an emergency exit plan, an emergency supply kit, photocopies/electronic copies of important documents and a list of emergency contact numbers. Precautionary measures include: a battery-operated or wind-up radio, an alternative heat source, a back-up generator and an alternative water source. Fire safety measures include a working smoke detector, a working carbon monoxide detector and a working fire extinguisher.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.</p>			

**Table 1.3**  
**Planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures residents engaged in, community of Medicine Hat, Alberta, 2014**

Residents whose households were involved in the following:	Medicine Hat	Alberta	Canada
	percent		
<b>Emergency planning activities</b>			
Emergency exit plan	64	63	60
Exit plan has been practised/reviewed in last 12 months <sup>1</sup>	56 ***	45	46
Designated meeting place for household members <sup>2</sup>	44 ***	33	33
Contact plan for household members <sup>2</sup>	58	55	55
Household emergency supply kit	47	43	47
Vehicle emergency supply kit <sup>3</sup>	72 **	69	59
Extra copies of important documents	52	55	53
List of emergency contact numbers	74 *	68	69
Plan for meeting special health needs <sup>4</sup>	60	64	62
<b>Precautionary measures</b>			
Wind-up or battery-operated radio	54	49	58
Alternate heat source	48	45	48
Back-up generator	27	22	23
Alternate water source	47	41	43
Other <sup>5</sup>	22	17	21
<b>Fire safety measures</b>			
Working smoke detector	98	96	98
Working carbon monoxide detector	65	65	60
Working fire extinguisher	60	65	66

\* significantly different from provincial level estimate (p < 0.05)

\*\* significantly different from Canada level estimate (p < 0.05)

\*\*\* significantly different from both provincial and Canada level estimates (p < 0.05)

1 Percentage based only on those indicating that they have an emergency exit plan.

2 Excludes Canadians living in single-person households.

3 Excludes those who reported that they lived in a household that did not have a vehicle.

4 Percentage based only on those indicating that they or someone in their household has special medical needs.

5 'Other precautionary measures' include having an escape/rescue plan for pets, extra supply of fuel, checking and replenishing emergency supplies, and keeping exits clear.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

**Table 1.4**

**High or moderately high levels of emergency planning, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents, by social and political involvement, community of Medicine Hat, Alberta, 2014**

Social and political involvement	Percentage of residents who had high or moderately high levels of...		
	Planning activities	Precautionary measures	Fire safety measures
	percent		
<b>Engagement in political activities <sup>1</sup></b>			
Yes †	51	29	45
No	38 <sup>E</sup>	22 <sup>E</sup>	28 <sup>E *</sup>
<b>High level of civic engagement <sup>2</sup></b>			
Yes †	53	31	46
No	41	22 <sup>E</sup>	33
<b>High level of social support <sup>3</sup></b>			
Yes †	58	36 <sup>E</sup>	50
No	49	26	40
<b>Strong sense of belonging to community <sup>4</sup></b>			
Yes †	54	24 <sup>E</sup>	43
No	46	34	41
<b>High neighbourhood trust <sup>5</sup></b>			
Yes †	56	39	50
No	47	21 <sup>E *</sup>	36
<b>High level of self-efficacy <sup>6</sup></b>			
Yes †	59	26	48
No	44 *	31	36

<sup>E</sup> use with caution

\* significantly different from reference category ( $p < 0.05$ )

† reference category

- 1 Includes individuals over the age of 17 years who are eligible to vote, and who have participated in or volunteered for political parties or events in the past 12 months, including municipal, provincial, or federal elections, or expressed views on political or social issues through signing a petition, contacting news agencies or politicians, or attended a meeting involving social or community issues.
- 2 Civic engagement measures individuals over the age of 17 years who were involved in a recreational group or organization in the past 12 months, and includes engagement in political activities. A 'high level' is defined as having been involved in at least 4 activities in the past 12 months.
- 3 A 'high level of social support' is defined as having five or more people whom that individual could turn to for help in an emergency if they are physically injured, require emotional support, shelter, and/or financial assistance.
- 4 A 'strong sense of belonging to community' is rating one's own sense of belonging to their community as a 4 or a 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "very weak" and 5 "very strong".
- 5 'High neighbourhood trust' is rating one's own trust in the people in one's neighbourhood as 4 or 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "cannot be trusted at all" and 5 represents "can be trusted a lot", as well as having a response of "very likely" when asked about the likelihood of someone in their neighbourhood returning a lost wallet or purse containing two hundred dollars with the money still inside.
- 6 A 'high level of self-efficacy' is derived from having a high self-rating on a scale of 1 (poor) to 5 (excellent) for the following three categories: an ability to think clearly and solve day-to-day problems, to handle unexpected and difficult problems, and to figure out what to do if faced with an emergency situation.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents. Households with 'moderately high' or 'high' levels of emergency planning engaged in 3 or 4 of the following: having an exit plan, an emergency supply kit, extra copies of important documents and an emergency contact list. 'Moderately high' or 'high' levels of precautionary measures include having 3 or 4 of the following: a wind-up or battery operated radio, a back-up generator, an alternate source of heat and additional water. 'Moderately high' or 'high' levels of fire safety measure include having all 3 of the following: a working smoke detector, a working fire extinguisher, and a working carbon monoxide detector.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

## Notes

<sup>E</sup> use with caution

- 1 A Census Metropolitan Area (CMA) or a Census Agglomeration (CA) is formed by one or more adjacent municipalities centred on a population centre (known as the core). A CMA must have a total population of at least 100,000 of which 50,000 or more must live in the core. A CA must have a core population of at least 10,000. To be included in the CMA or CA, other adjacent municipalities must have a high degree of integration with the core as measured by commuting flows derived from census data.
- 2 The target population for the SEPR included all persons 15 years of age or older, residing in households in Canada's 10 provinces, excluding full-time residents of institutions (e.g., nursing homes, group homes, hospitals).
- 3 The SEPR covers three types of communities: Census Metropolitan Areas (CMAs), Census Agglomerations (CAs) with population greater than 50,000, and 'smaller communities' which include CAs with population 50,000 or less and those areas that fall outside of CMAs and CAs. All CMAs and CAs (with population greater than 50,000) were included in the SEPR. A sample of households were selected from smaller communities within each province to represent all households within the province in similar communities. Additional information on the SEPR and its sampling methodology can be found in the 'Survey description' section.
- 4 Throughout this fact sheet, responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.
- 5 This section focuses on personal experiences with emergencies or disasters that happened in Canada, in a community where the person was living at the time, and was significant enough to severely interrupt the individual's regular daily activities.
- 6 Emergency planning activities include: having an emergency exit plan, a household emergency supply kit, extra copies of important documents and an emergency contact list.

- 7 Precautionary measures include: having a wind-up or battery-operated radio, an alternate heat source such as a non-electric stove or heater or a wood-burning fireplace, a back-up generator and an alternative water source such as a well, tank or litres of stored water.
- 8 Unless otherwise specified, differences are statistically significant ( $p < 0.05$ ).
- 9 A 'strong sense of belonging to community' is rating one's own sense of belonging to their community as a 4 or a 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "very weak" and 5 "very strong".
- 10 A proportion (9%) of respondents were not asked questions regarding neighbourhood helpfulness in the event of an emergency and as such these cases are not included in the analysis on neighbourhood helpfulness in general or in the event of an emergency.
- 11 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% when respondents were asked about whether their neighbourhood is a place where neighbours would help each other if there is an emergency.



## Fact sheet Community of Lethbridge (CA), Alberta

---

In 2014, information on the emergency preparedness of people living in the Census Agglomeration<sup>1</sup> of Lethbridge was collected through the Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada (SEPR).<sup>2</sup> This fact sheet presents information on the risk awareness and level of emergency preparedness of the residents of Lethbridge, which could help improve the understanding of community resilience in the event of an emergency.<sup>3,4</sup>

### **Risk awareness and anticipated sources of help in an emergency or disaster**

- Winter storms (including blizzards, ice storms and extreme cold) (95%), wildfires (74%), droughts (70%), and extended power outages lasting 24 hours or longer (68%) were named by residents of Lethbridge as the events most likely to occur in their community.
- Residents most commonly anticipated turning to news on the radio as an initial source for help and information if they were faced with a weather-related emergency or natural disaster (34%) or an industrial or transportation accident (31%) (Table 1.1). If faced with an event of rioting or civil unrest (41%<sup>E</sup>) or an act of terrorism or terrorist threat (38%<sup>E</sup>), residents most frequently anticipated turning to police or law enforcement.
- Residents stated that a hospital, clinic, doctor or other medical professional would be the most commonly anticipated first source of information or assistance in the event of an outbreak of a serious illness or life-threatening disease (54%). In the event of a contamination or shortage of water or food, residents most frequently reported that they would first seek information or assistance from local government (49%), and in the event of an extended power outage, residents commonly anticipated first turning to their utility company (28%).

### **Prior lifetime experience with a major emergency or disaster<sup>5</sup>**

- Half (51%) of Lethbridge residents have faced a major emergency or disaster in Canada in a community where they were living at the time of the event. For three-quarters (76%) of these people, the emergency or disaster was significant enough to have resulted in severe disruptions to daily activities.
- Wildfires (38%), floods (31%) and winter storms (including blizzards and ice storms) (30%) were the most commonly experienced emergencies or disasters by residents of Lethbridge.
- The most frequently endured types of disruption to daily activities by residents who experienced emergencies or disasters included missing work or school (57%), missing an appointment or planned activity (56%) and boiling water for drinking or drinking bottled water (48%). More severe disruptions experienced were an inability to use roads or transportation within the community (44%) and home evacuation (29%).
- Most (86%) residents who experienced an emergency or disaster were able to resume their daily activities within one week of the event: 24%<sup>E</sup> within 24 hours, 34% within one to two days, 19%<sup>E</sup> within three to five days and 9%<sup>E</sup> within six to seven days.
- Approximately six in ten (58%) residents who had experienced an emergency or disaster received help during or immediately following the event, many of whom turned to family (29%<sup>E</sup>) or local government (26%<sup>E</sup>).
- One in five (21%<sup>E</sup>) residents of Lethbridge who experienced a major emergency or disaster in Canada in a community where they were living at the time of the event and which was severe enough to disrupt their regular daily activities also endured a loss of property or some kind of a financial impact.

## Emergency planning, precautionary and fire safety behaviours

- Four in five (82%) Lethbridge residents lived in a household that engaged in at least two emergency planning activities,<sup>6</sup> and over half (54%) reported living in a household with three or four such activities (Table 1.2). Less than one in ten (6%<sup>E</sup>) people in Lethbridge lived in a household that had not participated in any emergency planning activities.
- Six in ten (59%) Lethbridge residents lived in a household with at least two precautionary measures<sup>7</sup> taken in case of an emergency, with three in ten (30%) living in a household with three or four such measures. Conversely, almost two in ten residents (17%) lived in a household with no precautionary measures in place.
- The vast majority (99%) of residents reported living in a household with a working smoke detector, while seven in ten (71%) reported living in a household with a working fire extinguisher (Table 1.3). Approximately six in ten (62%) stated that they had a working carbon monoxide detector in their household. Close to half (47%) of Lethbridge residents stated that they had implemented all three fire safety measures within their household.
- In general, the number of fire safety and precautionary measures taken by Lethbridge residents did not differ from residents of Alberta or those in Canada's 10 provinces. There were, however, some differences in the number of emergency planning activities taken. For example, residents of Lethbridge (25%) were more likely than Canadians (19%) to have taken all four emergency planning activities.<sup>8</sup>
- There were some differences in the types of activities and measures set in place by residents of Lethbridge when compared to Alberta and Canada in general. It is of interest to note that when differences existed, residents of Lethbridge were always more likely than Albertans and Canadians in general to have engaged in the activity or measure. For example, residents of Lethbridge were more likely to have a list of emergency contact numbers (74%), an emergency exit plan (71%) and a designated meeting place for household members (43%) than Albertans and Canadians.

## Social networks and sense of belonging

- Over half (54%) of Lethbridge residents had a strong sense of belonging<sup>9</sup> to their community.
- Most (86%) residents described the neighbourhood they lived in as a place where neighbours generally help each other.<sup>10</sup> Of those who did not describe their neighbourhood this way, the majority (77%) still described it as a place where neighbours would help each other in an emergency.<sup>11</sup>
- More than half of residents had a strong network of support in the event of an emergency or disaster, with more than five people to turn to for emotional support (66%), for help if physically injured (63%), as well as in the event of a home evacuation (58%). Three in ten (29%) residents had a large support network if financial help was needed, and one in ten (8%<sup>E</sup>) reported that they had no one to turn to for financial help.
- High levels of neighbourhood trust, social support and self-efficacy, as well as engagement in political activities, were not associated with a higher level of emergency preparedness (Table 1.4).

## Data tables

Table 1.1

Most commonly anticipated sources of initial help and information, by type of emergency or disaster, residents of Lethbridge, Alberta, 2014

Most common sources of initial help and information by type of emergency or disaster	percent
<b>Weather-related emergency or natural disaster</b>	
News- Radio	34
News- Internet	29
News- Television	25
<b>Extended power outages<sup>1</sup></b>	
Utility company	28
Local government	24
News- Radio	19

<b>Outbreak of serious or life-threatening disease</b>		
Hospital, clinic, doctor or other medical professional		54
News- Internet		18 <sup>E</sup>
News- Television		17 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Industrial or transportation accident</b>		
News- Radio		31
News- Internet		23
News- Television		19
<b>Contamination or shortage of water or food</b>		
Local government		49
News- Internet		18 <sup>E</sup>
News- Radio		15 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Act of terrorism or terrorist threat</b>		
Police/law enforcement		38 <sup>E</sup>
News- Television		23 <sup>E</sup>
News- Radio		23 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Rioting or civil unrest</b>		
Police/law enforcement		41 <sup>E</sup>
News- Radio		22 <sup>E</sup>
News- Television		16 <sup>E</sup>
<sup>E</sup> use with caution		
1 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% when respondents were asked about their likely sources of initial help and information.		
<b>Note:</b> Respondents who perceived their community was at risk for any form of emergency or disaster were then asked where they would turn to first for information or assistance in the event of the perceived emergency or disaster. Respondents could provide more than one response. Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.		
<b>Source:</b> Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.		

**Table 1.2**  
**Number of emergency planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents, community of Lethbridge, Alberta, 2014**

Number of planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents	Lethbridge	Alberta	Canada
	percent		
<b>Number of emergency planning activities</b>			
None	6 <sup>E</sup> **	8	8
1 activity	12 <sup>E</sup> ***	17	17
2 activities	28	25	25
3 activities	29	26	27
4 activities	25 **	20	19
<b>Number of precautionary measures</b>			
None	17	21	16
1 measure	23	27	27
2 measures	29	23	28
3 measures	24 *	18	20
4 measures	6 <sup>E</sup>	6	7
<b>Number of fire safety measures <sup>1 2</sup></b>			
None	F	1 <sup>E</sup>	1

1 measure	13	14	14
2 measures	36	31	38
3 measures	47	48	42
<p><sup>E</sup> use with caution  <sup>F</sup> too unreliable to be published</p> <p>* significantly different from provincial level estimate (p &lt; 0.05)</p> <p>** significantly different from Canada level estimate (p &lt; 0.05)</p> <p>*** significantly different from both provincial and Canada level estimates (p &lt; 0.05)</p> <p>1 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Canada'.</p> <p>2 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Alberta'.</p> <p><b>Note:</b> Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents. Emergency planning activities include: an emergency exit plan, an emergency supply kit, photocopies/electronic copies of important documents and a list of emergency contact numbers. Precautionary measures include: a battery-operated or wind-up radio, an alternative heat source, a back-up generator and an alternative water source. Fire safety measures include a working smoke detector, a working carbon monoxide detector and a working fire extinguisher.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.</p>			

**Table 1.3**  
**Planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures residents engaged in, community of Lethbridge, Alberta, 2014**

Residents whose households were involved in the following:	Lethbridge	Alberta	Canada
	percent		
<b>Emergency planning activities</b>			
Emergency exit plan	71 ***	63	60
Exit plan has been practised/reviewed in last 12 months <sup>1</sup>	45	45	46
Designated meeting place for household members <sup>2</sup>	43 ***	33	33
Contact plan for household members <sup>2</sup>	60	55	55
Household emergency supply kit	53 *	43	47
Vehicle emergency supply kit <sup>3</sup>	68 **	69	59
Extra copies of important documents	56	55	53
List of emergency contact numbers	74 ***	68	69
Plan for meeting special health needs <sup>4</sup>	67	64	62
<b>Precautionary measures</b>			
Wind-up or battery-operated radio	55 *	49	58
Alternate heat source	46	45	48
Back-up generator	28 *	22	23
Alternate water source	47	41	43
Other <sup>5</sup>	18	17	21
<b>Fire safety measures</b>			
Working smoke detector	99 *	96	98
Working carbon monoxide detector	62	65	60
Working fire extinguisher	71	65	66



\* significantly different from provincial level estimate (p < 0.05)

\*\* significantly different from Canada level estimate (p < 0.05)

\*\*\* significantly different from both provincial and Canada level estimates (p < 0.05)

1 Percentage based only on those indicating that they have an emergency exit plan.

2 Excludes Canadians living in single-person households.

3 Excludes those who reported that they lived in a household that did not have a vehicle.

4 Percentage based only on those indicating that they or someone in their household has special medical needs.

5 'Other precautionary measures' include having an escape/rescue plan for pets, extra supply of fuel, checking and replenishing emergency supplies, and keeping exits clear.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

**Table 1.4**

**High or moderately high levels of emergency planning, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents, by social and political involvement, community of Lethbridge, Alberta, 2014**

Social and political involvement	Percentage of residents who had high or moderately high levels of...		
	Planning activities	Precautionary measures	Fire safety measures
	percent		
<b>Engagement in political activities <sup>1</sup></b>			
Yes †	54	27	49
No	45	34 <sup>E</sup>	38 <sup>E</sup>
<b>High level of civic engagement <sup>2</sup></b>			
Yes †	56	27	52
No	48	30	38 *
<b>High level of social support <sup>3</sup></b>			
Yes †	64	35 <sup>E</sup>	53
No	50	28	44
<b>Strong sense of belonging to community <sup>4</sup></b>			
Yes †	62	29	52
No	44 *	30	40
<b>High neighbourhood trust <sup>5</sup></b>			
Yes †	58	34	49
No	51	27	45
<b>High level of self-efficacy <sup>6</sup></b>			
Yes †	56	34	51
No	52	25	42

<sup>E</sup> use with caution

\* significantly different from reference category ( $p < 0.05$ )

† reference category

- 1 Includes individuals over the age of 17 years who are eligible to vote, and who have participated in or volunteered for political parties or events in the past 12 months, including municipal, provincial, or federal elections, or expressed views on political or social issues through signing a petition, contacting news agencies or politicians, or attended a meeting involving social or community issues.
- 2 Civic engagement measures individuals over the age of 17 years who were involved in a recreational group or organization in the past 12 months, and includes engagement in political activities. A 'high level' is defined as having been involved in at least 4 activities in the past 12 months.
- 3 A 'high level of social support' is defined as having five or more people whom that individual could turn to for help in an emergency if they are physically injured, require emotional support, shelter, and/or financial assistance.
- 4 A 'strong sense of belonging to community' is rating one's own sense of belonging to their community as a 4 or a 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "very weak" and 5 "very strong".
- 5 'High neighbourhood trust' is rating one's own trust in the people in one's neighbourhood as 4 or 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "cannot be trusted at all" and 5 represents "can be trusted a lot", as well as having a response of "very likely" when asked about the likelihood of someone in their neighbourhood returning a lost wallet or purse containing two hundred dollars with the money still inside.
- 6 A 'high level of self-efficacy' is derived from having a high self-rating on a scale of 1 (poor) to 5 (excellent) for the following three categories: an ability to think clearly and solve day-to-day problems, to handle unexpected and difficult problems, and to figure out what to do if faced with an emergency situation.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents. Households with 'moderately high' or 'high' levels of emergency planning engaged in 3 or 4 of the following: having an exit plan, an emergency supply kit, extra copies of important documents and an emergency contact list. 'Moderately high' or 'high' levels of precautionary measures include having 3 or 4 of the following: a wind-up or battery operated radio, a back-up generator, an alternate source of heat and additional water. 'Moderately high' or 'high' levels of fire safety measure include having all 3 of the following: a working smoke detector, a working fire extinguisher, and a working carbon monoxide detector.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

## Notes

<sup>E</sup> use with caution

- 1 A Census Metropolitan Area (CMA) or a Census Agglomeration (CA) is formed by one or more adjacent municipalities centred on a population centre (known as the core). A CMA must have a total population of at least 100,000 of which 50,000 or more must live in the core. A CA must have a core population of at least 10,000. To be included in the CMA or CA, other adjacent municipalities must have a high degree of integration with the core as measured by commuting flows derived from census data.
- 2 The target population for the SEPR included all persons 15 years of age or older, residing in households in Canada's 10 provinces, excluding full-time residents of institutions (e.g. nursing homes, group homes, hospitals).
- 3 The SEPR covers three types of communities: Census Metropolitan Areas (CMAs), Census Agglomerations (CAs) with population greater than 50,000, and 'smaller communities' which include CAs with population 50,000 or less and those areas that fall outside of CMAs and CAs. All CMAs and CAs (with population greater than 50,000) were included in the SEPR. A sample of households were selected from smaller communities within each province to represent all households within the province in similar communities. Additional information on the SEPR and its sampling methodology can be found in the 'Survey description' section.
- 4 Throughout this fact sheet, responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.
- 5 This section focuses on personal experiences with emergencies or disasters that happened in Canada, in a community where the person was living at the time, and was significant enough to severely interrupt the individual's regular daily activities.
- 6 Emergency planning activities include: having an emergency exit plan, a household emergency supply kit, extra copies of important documents and an emergency contact list.

- 7 Precautionary measures include: having a wind-up or battery-operated radio, an alternate heat source such as a non-electric stove or heater or a wood-burning fireplace, a back-up generator and an alternative water source such as a well, tank or litres of stored water.
- 8 Unless otherwise specified, differences are statistically significant ( $p < 0.05$ ).
- 9 A 'strong sense of belonging to community' is rating one's own sense of belonging to their community as a 4 or a 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "very weak" and 5 "very strong".
- 10 A proportion (7%) of respondents were not asked questions regarding neighbourhood helpfulness in the event of an emergency and as such these cases are not included in the analysis on neighbourhood helpfulness in general or in the event of an emergency.
- 11 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were equal to 13% when respondents were asked about whether their neighbourhood is a place where neighbours would help each other if there is an emergency.



## Fact sheet Community of Calgary (CMA), Alberta

---

In 2014, information on the emergency preparedness of people living in the Census Metropolitan Area<sup>1</sup> of Calgary was collected through the Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada (SEPR).<sup>2</sup> This fact sheet presents information on the risk awareness and level of emergency preparedness of the residents of Calgary, which could help improve the understanding of community resilience in the event of an emergency.<sup>3,4</sup>

### **Risk awareness and anticipated sources of help in an emergency or disaster**

- Winter storms (including blizzards, ice storms and extreme cold) (92%), extended power outages lasting 24 hours or longer (61%) and floods (58%) were named by residents of Calgary as the events most likely to occur in their community.
- Residents most commonly reported that they would anticipate turning to news on the television as an initial source for information and assistance in the event of an act of terrorism or terrorist threat (37%), a weather-related emergency or natural disaster (32%), or an industrial or transportation accident (28%) (Table 1.1).
- Residents also anticipated turning to local government in the event of a contamination or shortage of water or food (37%) and to a hospital, clinic, doctor or other medical professional if faced with an outbreak of a serious or life-threatening disease (34%). In addition, residents most commonly reported that they would first turn to police or law enforcement in the event of rioting or civil unrest (31%<sup>E</sup>) and to their utility company if they faced an extended power outage (26%).

### **Prior lifetime experience with a major emergency or disaster<sup>5</sup>**

- Four in ten (41%) Calgary residents have faced a major emergency or disaster in Canada in a community they were living in at the time of the event, the majority (71%) of whom reported experiencing severe disruptions to their daily activities as a result of the event.
- Floods (80%) were the most commonly experienced emergency or disaster by residents of Calgary, followed by winter storms which include blizzards and ice storms (10%<sup>E</sup>).
- Common types of disruption to daily activities endured by residents who had experienced major emergencies or disasters included missing work or school (74%), missing appointments or planned activities (57%) and having to boil water for drinking or drink bottled water (33%). More severe disruptions experienced were an inability to use roads or transportation in the community (49%), home evacuation (17%<sup>E</sup>) and an inability to communicate outside of the home (10%<sup>E</sup>).
- Nearly two-thirds (65%) of residents who experienced an emergency or disaster were able to resume their daily activities within one week of the event: 8%<sup>E</sup> within 24 hours, 16%<sup>E</sup> within one to two days, 19%<sup>E</sup> within three to five days and 21%<sup>E</sup> within six to seven days.
- Six in ten (59%) residents who had experienced an emergency or disaster received help during or immediately following the event, most commonly from local government (35%<sup>E</sup>) or family (25%<sup>E</sup>).
- Less than one in five (16%<sup>E</sup>) residents of Calgary who experienced a major emergency or disaster in Canada in a community where they were living at the time of the event and which was significant enough to disrupt their regular

daily routine also endured a loss of property or financial impact. In addition, one in ten (11%<sup>E</sup>) reported enduring long-term emotional or psychological consequences.

## Emergency planning, precautionary and fire safety behaviours

- Seven in ten (69%) people residing in Calgary lived in households that were engaged in at least two emergency planning activities,<sup>6</sup> and four in ten (42%) lived in households with three or four such activities (Table 1.2). One in ten (9%) people lived in a household that had not participated in any emergency planning activities.
- More than four in ten (43%) lived in a household with at least two precautionary measures<sup>7</sup> taken in case of an emergency, and one in five (19%) lived in a household with three or four such measures. Around one-quarter (24%) of people lived in a household with no precautionary measures in place.
- Nearly all (97%) residents reported living in a household with a working smoke detector, and three in five (59%) reported living in a household with a working fire extinguisher (Table 1.3). Two in three (67%) residents stated that they had a working carbon monoxide detector in their household. Less than one-half (45%) of residents of Calgary stated that they had implemented all three fire safety measures in their household.
- The number of fire safety and precautionary measures implemented by residents of Calgary sometimes differed significantly from residents in Alberta and Canada's 10 provinces in general. For example, residents of Calgary were less likely to have three (15%) or four (4%<sup>E</sup>) precautionary measures in place compared to Albertans (18% and 6%, respectively) and Canadians overall (20% and 7%, respectively). Those in Calgary (32%) were also less likely than Canadians (38%) to have two fire safety measures in place.<sup>8</sup>
- There were a number of significant differences in the types of activities and measures in place by residents of Calgary when compared to Alberta and Canada more broadly. When differences did exist, residents of Calgary were almost always less likely to have implemented the activity or measure. For instance, Calgary residents were less likely to have a designated meeting place for household members (27%), a back-up generator (10%) or a working fire extinguisher (59%) than Albertans and Canadians in general. Calgary residents (67%) were, however, more likely to have a working carbon monoxide detector compared to Canadians (60%).

## Social networks and sense of belonging

- Half (49%) of Calgary's residents had a strong sense of belonging<sup>9</sup> to their community.
- Most (85%) residents described the neighbourhood they lived in as a place where neighbours generally help each other.<sup>10</sup> Of those who did not describe their neighbourhood this way, eight in ten (78%) still described it as a place where neighbours would help each other in an emergency.<sup>11</sup>
- Approximately six in ten individuals had a large network of support in the event of an emergency or disaster, with more than five people to turn to for help if physically injured (64%), for emotional support (61%), and in the event of home evacuation (61%). One-quarter (25%) of residents had a large support network if financial help was needed. However, 8% reported that they had no one to turn to for financial help.
- High levels of sense of belonging, social support, self-efficacy and neighbourhood trust, as well as political and civic engagement, were often associated with a higher level of emergency preparedness (Table 1.4).

## Data tables

Table 1.1

Most commonly anticipated sources of initial help and information, by type of emergency or disaster, residents of Calgary, Alberta, 2014

Most common sources of initial help and information by type of emergency or disaster	percent
<b>Weather-related emergency or natural disaster</b>	
News- Television	32
News- Radio	27
News- Internet	24
<b>Extended power outages</b>	

Utility company	26
Local government	25
News- Radio	20
<b>Outbreak of serious or life-threatening disease</b>	
Hospital, clinic, doctor or other medical professional	34
News- Television	25
News- Radio	21
<b>Industrial or transportation accident</b>	
News- Television	28
News- Radio	26
News- Internet	21
<b>Contamination or shortage of water or food</b>	
Local government	37
News- Television	22
News- Radio	21
<b>Act of terrorism or terrorist threat</b>	
News- Television	37
News- Radio	33
Police/law enforcement	21 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Rioting or civil unrest</b>	
Police/law enforcement	31 <sup>E</sup>
News- Television	30 <sup>E</sup>
News- Radio	28 <sup>E</sup>
<sup>E</sup> use with caution	
<b>Note:</b> Respondents who perceived their community was at risk for any form of emergency or disaster were then asked where they would turn to first for information or assistance in the event of the perceived emergency or disaster. Respondents could provide more than one response. Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.	
<b>Source:</b> Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.	

**Table 1.2**  
**Number of emergency planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents, community of Calgary, Alberta, 2014**

Number of planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents	Calgary	Alberta	Canada
	percent		
<b>Number of emergency planning activities</b>			
None	9	8	8
1 activity	20	17	17
2 activities	27	25	25
3 activities	24	26	27
4 activities	18	20	19
<b>Number of precautionary measures</b>			
None	24 **	21	16
1 measure	28	27	27
2 measures	24	23	28
3 measures	15 ***	18	20
4 measures	4 <sup>E</sup> ***	6	7
<b>Number of fire safety measures</b> <sup>1 2 3</sup>			

None	F	1 <sup>E</sup>	1
1 measure	15	14	14
2 measures	32 **	31	38
3 measures	45	48	42
<sup>E</sup> use with caution <sup>F</sup> too unreliable to be published ** significantly different from Canada level estimate (p < 0.05) *** significantly different from both provincial and Canada level estimates (p < 0.05) 1 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Canada'. 2 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Alberta'. 3 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Calgary'.  <b>Note:</b> Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents. Emergency planning activities include: an emergency exit plan, an emergency supply kit, photocopies/electronic copies of important documents and a list of emergency contact numbers. Precautionary measures include: a battery-operated or wind-up radio, an alternative heat source, a back-up generator and an alternative water source. Fire safety measures include a working smoke detector, a working carbon monoxide detector and a working fire extinguisher. <b>Source:</b> Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.			

**Table 1.3**  
**Planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures residents engaged in, community of Calgary, Alberta, 2014**

Residents whose households were involved in the following:	Calgary	Alberta	Canada
	percent		
<b>Emergency planning activities</b>			
Emergency exit plan	58 *	63	60
Exit plan has been practised/reviewed in last 12 months <sup>1</sup>	42	45	46
Designated meeting place for household members <sup>2</sup>	27 ***	33	33
Contact plan for household members <sup>2</sup>	52	55	55
Household emergency supply kit	39 **	43	47
Vehicle emergency supply kit <sup>3</sup>	65 ***	69	59
Extra copies of important documents	54	55	53
List of emergency contact numbers	66	68	69
Plan for meeting special health needs <sup>4 6</sup>	64	64	62
<b>Precautionary measures</b>			
Wind-up or battery-operated radio	49 **	49	58
Alternate heat source	44	45	48
Back-up generator	10 ***	22	23
Alternate water source	37 **	41	43
Other <sup>5</sup>	15 **	17	21
<b>Fire safety measures</b>			
Working smoke detector	97	96	98
Working carbon monoxide detector	67 **	65	60
Working fire extinguisher	59 ***	65	66

\* significantly different from provincial level estimate (p < 0.05)

\*\* significantly different from Canada level estimate (p < 0.05)

\*\*\* significantly different from both provincial and Canada level estimates (p < 0.05)

1 Percentage based only on those indicating that they have an emergency exit plan.

2 Excludes Canadians living in single-person households.

3 Excludes those who reported that they lived in a household that did not have a vehicle.

4 Percentage based only on those indicating that they or someone in their household has special medical needs.

5 'Other precautionary measures' include having an escape/rescue plan for pets, extra supply of fuel, checking and replenishing emergency supplies, and keeping exits clear.

6 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Calgary'.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.  
**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

**Table 1.4**  
**High or moderately high levels of emergency planning, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents, by social and political involvement, community of Calgary, Alberta, 2014**

Social and political involvement	Percentage of residents who had high or moderately high levels of...		
	Planning activities	Precautionary measures	Fire safety measures
	percent		
<b>Engagement in political activities <sup>1</sup></b>			
Yes <sup>†</sup>	46	23	55
No <sup>7 8</sup>	30 <sup>E *</sup>	F	36 *
<b>High level of civic engagement <sup>2</sup></b>			
Yes <sup>†</sup>	47	25	58
No <sup>8</sup>	35 *	13 <sup>E *</sup>	39 *
<b>High level of social support <sup>3</sup></b>			
Yes <sup>†</sup>	51	28 <sup>E</sup>	51
No <sup>8</sup>	39	16 *	44
<b>Strong sense of belonging to community <sup>4</sup></b>			
Yes <sup>8 †</sup>	51	21	53
No <sup>8</sup>	32 *	15 <sup>E</sup>	38 *
<b>High neighbourhood trust <sup>5</sup></b>			
Yes <sup>†</sup>	47	24 <sup>E</sup>	58
No <sup>8</sup>	39	16	39 *
<b>High level of self-efficacy <sup>6</sup></b>			
Yes <sup>†</sup>	44	23	48
No <sup>8</sup>	39	14 <sup>E *</sup>	43



<sup>E</sup> use with caution

<sup>F</sup> too unreliable to be published

\* significantly different from reference category ( $p < 0.05$ )

† reference category

1 Includes individuals over the age of 17 years who are eligible to vote, and who have participated in or volunteered for political parties or events in the past 12 months, including municipal, provincial, or federal elections, or expressed views on political or social issues through signing a petition, contacting news agencies or politicians, or attended a meeting involving social or community issues.

2 Civic engagement measures individuals over the age of 17 years who were involved in a recreational group or organization in the past 12 months, and includes engagement in political activities. A 'high level' is defined as having been involved in at least 4 activities in the past 12 months.

3 A 'high level of social support' is defined as having five or more people whom that individual could turn to for help in an emergency if they are physically injured, require emotional support, shelter, and/or financial assistance.

4 A 'strong sense of belonging to community' is rating one's own sense of belonging to their community as a 4 or a 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "very weak" and 5 "very strong".

5 'High neighbourhood trust' is rating one's own trust in the people in one's neighbourhood as 4 or 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "cannot be trusted at all" and 5 represents "can be trusted a lot", as well as having a response of "very likely" when asked about the likelihood of someone in their neighbourhood returning a lost wallet or purse containing two hundred dollars with the money still inside.

6 A 'high level of self-efficacy' is derived from having a high self-rating on a scale of 1 (poor) to 5 (excellent) for the following three categories: an ability to think clearly and solve day-to-day problems, to handle unexpected and difficult problems, and to figure out what to do if faced with an emergency situation.

7 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Precautionary measures'.

8 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Fire safety measures'.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents. Households with 'moderately high' or 'high' levels of emergency planning engaged in 3 or 4 of the following: having an exit plan, an emergency supply kit, extra copies of important documents and an emergency contact list. 'Moderately high' or 'high' levels of precautionary measures include having 3 or 4 of the following: a wind-up or battery operated radio, a back-up generator, an alternate source of heat and additional water. 'Moderately high' or 'high' levels of fire safety measure include having all 3 of the following: a working smoke detector, a working fire extinguisher, and a working carbon monoxide detector.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

## Notes

<sup>E</sup> use with caution

1 A Census Metropolitan Area (CMA) or a Census Agglomeration (CA) is formed by one or more adjacent municipalities centred on a population centre (known as the core). A CMA must have a total population of at least 100,000 of which 50,000 or more must live in the core. A CA must have a core population of at least 10,000. To be included in the CMA or CA, other adjacent municipalities must have a high degree of integration with the core as measured by commuting flows derived from census data.

2 The target population for the SEPR included all persons 15 years of age or older, residing in households in Canada's 10 provinces, excluding full-time residents of institutions (e.g. nursing homes, group homes, hospitals).

3 The SEPR covers three types of communities: Census Metropolitan Areas (CMAs), Census Agglomerations (CAs) with population greater than 50,000, and 'smaller communities' which include CAs with population 50,000 or less and those areas that fall outside of CMAs and CAs. All CMAs and CAs (with population greater than 50,000) were included in the SEPR. A sample of households were selected from smaller communities within each province to represent all households within the province in similar communities. Additional information on the SEPR and its sampling methodology can be found in the 'Survey description' section.

4 Throughout this fact sheet, responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.

5 This section focuses on personal experiences with emergencies or disasters that happened in Canada, in a community where the person was living at the time, and was significant enough to severely interrupt the individual's regular daily activities.

- 6 Emergency planning activities include: having an emergency exit plan, a household emergency supply kit, extra copies of important documents and an emergency contact list.
- 7 Precautionary measures include: having a wind-up or battery-operated radio, an alternate heat source such as a non-electric stove or heater or a wood-burning fireplace, a back-up generator and an alternative water source such as a well, tank or litres of stored water.
- 8 Unless otherwise specified, differences are statistically significant ( $p < 0.05$ ).
- 9 A 'strong sense of belonging to community' is rating one's own sense of belonging to their community as a 4 or a 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "very weak" and 5 "very strong".
- 10 A proportion (11%) of respondents were not asked questions regarding neighbourhood helpfulness in the event of an emergency and as such these cases are not included in the analysis on neighbourhood helpfulness in general or in the event of an emergency.
- 11 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were equal to 12% when respondents were asked about whether their neighbourhood is a place where neighbours would help each other if there is an emergency.



## Fact sheet Community of Red Deer (CA), Alberta

---

In 2014, information on the emergency preparedness of people living in the Census Agglomeration<sup>1</sup> of Red Deer was collected through the Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada (SEPR).<sup>2</sup> This fact sheet presents information on the risk awareness and level of emergency preparedness of the residents of Red Deer, which could help improve the understanding of community resilience in the event of an emergency.<sup>3,4</sup>

### **Risk awareness and anticipated sources of help in an emergency or disaster**

- Winter storms (including blizzards, ice storms and extreme cold) (94%), tornadoes (64%), industrial or transportation accidents (63%) and extended power outages lasting 24 hours or longer (63%) were named by residents of Red Deer as the most likely events to occur within their community.
- Residents most commonly anticipated turning to police or law enforcement in the event of rioting or civil unrest (57%) or an act of terrorism or terrorist threat (48%). They also reported that they would turn to news on the radio if they faced a weather-related emergency or natural disaster (38%) or an industrial or transportation accident (28%) (Table 1.1).
- Residents most frequently stated that they would anticipate turning to local government in the event of a contamination or shortage of water or food (51%) or an extended power outage (29%), and to a hospital, clinic, doctor or other medical professional if there was an outbreak of a serious or life-threatening disease (48%).

### **Prior lifetime experience with a major emergency or disaster<sup>5</sup>**

- Three in ten (29%) Red Deer residents have faced a major emergency or disaster in Canada in a community they were living in at the time of the event, more than half (56%) of whom reported experiencing severe disruptions to their daily activities as a result of the event.
- Floods (23%<sup>E</sup>) were the most commonly experienced emergencies or disasters by residents of Red Deer.
- The most common types of disruption to daily activities endured by residents who had experienced major emergencies or disasters included missing work or school (61%), missing an appointment or planned activity (52%) and an inability to use electrical appliances (39%<sup>E</sup>). More severe disruptions experienced were an inability to use roads or transportation within the community (46%<sup>E</sup>) and home evacuation (39%<sup>E</sup>).
- Most (84%) residents who experienced an emergency or disaster were able to resume their daily activities within one week of the event: 30%<sup>E</sup> within one to two days and another 31%<sup>E</sup> within three to five days.
- More than half (57%) of residents who had experienced an emergency or disaster received help during or immediately following the event, most commonly from a neighbour (35%<sup>E</sup>).<sup>6</sup>
- One-quarter (26%<sup>E</sup>) of residents of Red Deer who experienced a major emergency or disaster in Canada in a community where they were living at the time of the event and which was significant enough to disrupt their regular daily routine also endured a loss of property or financial impact.

### **Emergency planning, precautionary and fire safety behaviours**

- Three-quarters (76%) of people residing in Red Deer lived in households that were engaged in at least two emergency planning activities,<sup>7</sup> and one-half (53%) lived in households with three or four such activities (Table 1.2). One in twenty

(5%<sup>E</sup>) people lived in a household that had not participated in any emergency planning activities.

- Half (50%) lived in a household with at least two precautionary measures<sup>8</sup> taken in case of an emergency, and one-quarter (26%) lived in a household with three or four such measures. One-quarter (24%) of people lived in a household with no precautionary measures in place.
- The vast majority (98%) of residents reported living in a household with a working smoke detector, and approximately six in ten (63%) reported living in a household with a working fire extinguisher (Table 1.3). Two-thirds (68%) of residents stated that they had a working carbon monoxide detector in their household. However, less than one-half (44%) of the residents of Red Deer stated that they had implemented all three fire safety measures within their households.
- Generally, the number of emergency planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents of Red Deer did not significantly differ from Alberta residents overall or Canada's 10 provinces in general. There were two exceptions: Red Deer residents (5%<sup>E</sup>) were less likely to have participated in no emergency planning activities but more likely to have no precautionary measures in place (24%) than Canadians in general (8% and 16%, respectively).<sup>9</sup>
- There were some differences in the types of activities and measures set in place by residents of Red Deer when compared to residents of Alberta and Canada. For example, Red Deer residents (46%) were more likely to have a designated meeting place for household members but they were less likely to have an alternate heat source (36%) than both Albertans (33% and 45%, respectively) and Canadians (33% and 48%, respectively). In addition, residents of Red Deer were more likely to have an emergency exit plan (69%) and a working carbon monoxide detector (68%), but less likely to have a wind-up or battery-operated radio (48%) than Canadian residents in general.

## Social networks and sense of belonging

- Half (52%) of Red Deer's residents had a strong sense of belonging<sup>10</sup> to their community.
- Most (85%) residents described the neighbourhood they lived in as a place where neighbours generally help each other.<sup>11</sup> Of those who did not describe their neighbourhood this way, the majority (75%) still described it as a place where neighbours would help each other in an emergency.<sup>12</sup>
- Many individuals had a large network of support in the event of an emergency or disaster, with more than five people to turn to for emotional support (68%), for help if physically injured (60%) as well as in case of a home evacuation (49%). One-quarter (25%) of residents had a large support network if financial help was needed. However, 6%<sup>E</sup> reported that they had no one to turn to for financial help.
- High levels of sense of belonging and social support, as well as civic engagement and involvement in political activities, were often associated with a higher level of emergency preparedness (Table 1.4).

## Data tables

Table 1.1

Most commonly anticipated sources of initial help and information, by type of emergency or disaster, residents of Red Deer, Alberta, 2014

Most common sources of initial help and information by type of emergency or disaster	percent
<b>Weather-related emergency or natural disaster</b>	
News- Radio	38
News- Television	25
News- Internet	20
<b>Extended power outages</b>	
Local government	29
Utility company	28
News- Radio	14 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Outbreak of serious or life-threatening disease</b>	

Hospital, clinic, doctor or other medical professional	48
News- Television	18 <sup>E</sup>
News- Radio	17 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Industrial or transportation accident</b>	
News- Radio	28
Local government	21 <sup>E</sup>
Police/law enforcement	20
<b>Contamination or shortage of water or food</b>	
Local government	51
News- Radio	16 <sup>E</sup>
News- Television	13 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Act of terrorism or terrorist threat</b>	
Police/law enforcement	48
News- Radio	19 <sup>E</sup>
News- Television	15 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Rioting or civil unrest</b>	
Police/law enforcement	57
News- Television	20 <sup>E</sup>
News- Radio	18 <sup>E</sup>
<sup>E</sup> use with caution <b>Note:</b> Respondents who perceived their community was at risk for any form of emergency or disaster were then asked where they would turn to first for information or assistance in the event of the perceived emergency or disaster. Respondents could provide more than one response. Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents. <b>Source:</b> Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.	

**Table 1.2**  
**Number of emergency planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents, community of Red Deer, Alberta, 2014**

Number of planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents	Red Deer	Alberta	Canada
	percent		
<b>Number of emergency planning activities</b>			
None	5 <sup>E</sup> **	8	8
1 activity	17 <sup>E</sup>	17	17
2 activities	23	25	25
3 activities	28	26	27
4 activities	25	20	19
<b>Number of precautionary measures</b>			
None	24 **	21	16
1 measure	24	27	27
2 measures	24	23	28
3 measures	19 <sup>E</sup>	18	20
4 measures	7 <sup>E</sup>	6	7
<b>Number of fire safety measures <sup>1 2 3</sup></b>			
None	F	1 <sup>E</sup>	1
1 measure	11 <sup>E</sup>	14	14
2 measures	38	31	38
3 measures	44	48	42

E use with caution  
 F too unreliable to be published

\*\* significantly different from Canada level estimate (p < 0.05)

1 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Canada'.

2 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Alberta'.

3 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Red Deer'.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents. Emergency planning activities include: an emergency exit plan, an emergency supply kit, photocopies/electronic copies of important documents and a list of emergency contact numbers. Precautionary measures include: a battery-operated or wind-up radio, an alternative heat source, a back-up generator and an alternative water source. Fire safety measures include a working smoke detector, a working carbon monoxide detector and a working fire extinguisher.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

**Table 1.3**  
**Planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures residents engaged in, community of Red Deer, Alberta, 2014**

Residents whose households were involved in the following:	Red Deer	Alberta	Canada
	percent		
<b>Emergency planning activities</b>			
Emergency exit plan	69 **	63	60
Exit plan has been practised/reviewed in last 12 months <sup>1</sup>	54	45	46
Designated meeting place for household members <sup>2</sup>	46 ***	33	33
Contact plan for household members <sup>2</sup>	58	55	55
Household emergency supply kit	47	43	47
Vehicle emergency supply kit <sup>3</sup>	74 **	69	59
Extra copies of important documents	60	55	53
List of emergency contact numbers	70	68	69
Plan for meeting special health needs <sup>4</sup>	75	64	62
<b>Precautionary measures</b>			
Wind-up or battery-operated radio	48 **	49	58
Alternate heat source	36 ***	45	48
Back-up generator	29	22	23
Alternate water source	45	41	43
Other <sup>5</sup>	24 *	17	21
<b>Fire safety measures</b>			
Working smoke detector	98	96	98
Working carbon monoxide detector <sup>6</sup>	68 **	65	60
Working fire extinguisher	63	65	66

\* significantly different from provincial level estimate (p < 0.05)

\*\* significantly different from Canada level estimate (p < 0.05)

\*\*\* significantly different from both provincial and Canada level estimates (p < 0.05)

1 Percentage based only on those indicating that they have an emergency exit plan.

2 Excludes Canadians living in single-person households.

3 Excludes those who reported that they lived in a household that did not have a vehicle.

4 Percentage based only on those indicating that they or someone in their household has special medical needs.

5 'Other precautionary measures' include having an escape/rescue plan for pets, extra supply of fuel, checking and replenishing emergency supplies, and keeping exits clear.

6 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Red Deer'.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

**Table 1.4**

**High or moderately high levels of emergency planning, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents, by social and political involvement, community of Red Deer, Alberta, 2014**

Social and political involvement	Percentage of residents who had high or moderately high levels of...		
	Planning activities	Precautionary measures	Fire safety measures
	percent		
<b>Engagement in political activities <sup>1</sup></b>			
Yes <sup>†</sup>	53	28	53
No	44 <sup>E</sup>	F	26 <sup>E *</sup>
<b>High level of civic engagement <sup>2</sup></b>			
Yes <sup>†</sup>	59	31	55
No	41 <sup>*</sup>	16 <sup>E *</sup>	39 <sup>E *</sup>
<b>High level of social support <sup>3</sup></b>			
Yes <sup>†</sup>	65	33 <sup>E</sup>	61
No <sup>7</sup>	49	25	40 <sup>*</sup>
<b>Strong sense of belonging to community <sup>4</sup></b>			
Yes <sup>†</sup>	62	34	48
No <sup>7</sup>	42 <sup>*</sup>	18 <sup>E *</sup>	40
<b>High neighbourhood trust <sup>5</sup></b>			
Yes <sup>7 †</sup>	59	35 <sup>E</sup>	43
No <sup>7</sup>	49	23 <sup>E</sup>	45
<b>High level of self-efficacy <sup>6</sup></b>			
Yes <sup>7 †</sup>	55	32	49
No <sup>7</sup>	51	22 <sup>E</sup>	40

<sup>E</sup> use with caution

<sup>F</sup> too unreliable to be published

\* significantly different from reference category ( $p < 0.05$ )

† reference category

- 1 Includes individuals over the age of 17 years who are eligible to vote, and who have participated in or volunteered for political parties or events in the past 12 months, including municipal, provincial, or federal elections, or expressed views on political or social issues through signing a petition, contacting news agencies or politicians, or attended a meeting involving social or community issues.
- 2 Civic engagement measures individuals over the age of 17 years who were involved in a recreational group or organization in the past 12 months, and includes engagement in political activities. A 'high level' is defined as having been involved in at least 4 activities in the past 12 months.
- 3 A 'high level of social support' is defined as having five or more people whom that individual could turn to for help in an emergency if they are physically injured, require emotional support, shelter, and/or financial assistance.
- 4 A 'strong sense of belonging to community' is rating one's own sense of belonging to their community as a 4 or a 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "very weak" and 5 "very strong".
- 5 'High neighbourhood trust' is rating one's own trust in the people in one's neighbourhood as 4 or 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "cannot be trusted at all" and 5 represents "can be trusted a lot", as well as having a response of "very likely" when asked about the likelihood of someone in their neighbourhood returning a lost wallet or purse containing two hundred dollars with the money still inside.
- 6 A 'high level of self-efficacy' is derived from having a high self-rating on a scale of 1 (poor) to 5 (excellent) for the following three categories: an ability to think clearly and solve day-to-day problems, to handle unexpected and difficult problems, and to figure out what to do if faced with an emergency situation.
- 7 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Fire safety measures'.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents. Households with 'moderately high' or 'high' levels of emergency planning engaged in 3 or 4 of the following: having an exit plan, an emergency supply kit, extra copies of important documents and an emergency contact list. 'Moderately high' or 'high' levels of precautionary measures include having 3 or 4 of the following: a wind-up or battery operated radio, a back-up generator, an alternate source of heat and additional water. 'Moderately high' or 'high' levels of fire safety measure include having all 3 of the following: a working smoke detector, a working fire extinguisher, and a working carbon monoxide detector.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

## Notes

<sup>E</sup> use with caution

- 1 A Census Metropolitan Area (CMA) or a Census Agglomeration (CA) is formed by one or more adjacent municipalities centred on a population centre (known as the core). A CMA must have a total population of at least 100,000 of which 50,000 or more must live in the core. A CA must have a core population of at least 10,000. To be included in the CMA or CA, other adjacent municipalities must have a high degree of integration with the core as measured by commuting flows derived from census data.
- 2 The target population for the SEPR included all persons 15 years of age or older, residing in households in Canada's 10 provinces, excluding full-time residents of institutions (e.g. nursing homes, group homes, hospitals).
- 3 The SEPR covers three types of communities: Census Metropolitan Areas (CMAs), Census Agglomerations (CAs) with population greater than 50,000, and 'smaller communities' which include CAs with population 50,000 or less and those areas that fall outside of CMAs and CAs. All CMAs and CAs (with population greater than 50,000) were included in the SEPR. A sample of households were selected from smaller communities within each province to represent all households within the province in similar communities. Additional information on the SEPR and its sampling methodology can be found in the 'Survey description' section.
- 4 Throughout this fact sheet, responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.
- 5 This section focuses on personal experiences with emergencies or disasters that happened in Canada, in a community where the person was living at the time, and was significant enough to severely interrupt the individual's regular daily activities.



- 6 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% when respondents were asked about the source of information or assistance they received during or immediately following the emergency they experienced.
- 7 Emergency planning activities include: having an emergency exit plan, a household emergency supply kit, extra copies of important documents and an emergency contact list.
- 8 Precautionary measures include: having a wind-up or battery-operated radio, an alternate heat source such as a non-electric stove or heater or a wood-burning fireplace, a back-up generator and an alternative water source such as a well, tank or litres of stored water.
- 9 Unless otherwise specified, differences are statistically significant ( $p < 0.05$ ).
- 10 A 'strong sense of belonging to community' is rating one's own sense of belonging to their community as a 4 or a 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "very weak" and 5 "very strong".
- 11 A proportion (6%) of respondents were not asked questions regarding neighbourhood helpfulness in the event of an emergency and as such these cases are not included in the analysis on neighbourhood helpfulness in general or in the event of an emergency.
- 12 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% when respondents were asked about whether their neighbourhood is a place where neighbours would help each other if there is an emergency.



## Fact sheet Community of Edmonton (CMA), Alberta

---

In 2014, information on the emergency preparedness of people living in the Census Metropolitan Area<sup>1</sup> of Edmonton was collected through the Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada (SEPR).<sup>2</sup> This fact sheet presents information on the risk awareness and level of emergency preparedness of the residents of Edmonton, which could help improve the understanding of community resilience in the event of an emergency.<sup>3,4</sup>

### **Risk awareness and anticipated sources of help in an emergency or disaster**

- Winter storms (including blizzards, ice storms and extreme cold) (87%), tornadoes (64%) and extended power outages lasting 24 hours or longer (59%) were named by residents of Edmonton as the most likely events to occur within their community.
- Residents most commonly anticipated turning to news on the television as an initial source for help and information if they were faced with an act of terrorism or terrorist threat (33%), a weather-related emergency or natural disaster (29%) or an industrial or transportation accident (25%) (Table 1.1).
- Residents also stated that hospitals, clinics, doctors and other medical professionals were the most commonly anticipated sources of initial help and information in the event of an outbreak of a serious or life-threatening disease (47%). In the event of an extended power outage, residents anticipated turning to their utility company (39%). If they faced a contamination or shortage of water or food, they anticipated seeking help from local government (33%), and in the event of rioting or civil unrest, they would turn to police or law enforcement (33%).

### **Prior lifetime experience with a major emergency or disaster<sup>5</sup>**

- Three in ten (30%) Edmonton residents have faced a major emergency or disaster in Canada in a community they were living in at the time of the event, two-thirds (67%) of whom reported experiencing severe disruptions to their daily activities as a result of the event.
- Tornadoes (53%) were the most commonly experienced emergencies or disasters by residents of Edmonton, followed by winter storms which include blizzards and ice storms (16%<sup>E</sup>) and floods (14%<sup>E</sup>).
- The most common types of disruption to daily activities endured by residents who had experienced major emergencies or disasters included missing work or school (48%) and missing an appointment or planned activity (43%). More severe disruptions experienced were an inability to use roads or transportation within the community (39%) or communicate outside the home (23%<sup>E</sup>), and home evacuation (21%<sup>E</sup>).
- Four out of five (82%) residents who experienced an emergency or disaster were able to resume their daily activities within one week of the event, three in five (60%) within two days or less.
- More than half (55%) of residents who had experienced an emergency or disaster received help during or immediately following the event, most commonly from a family member (35%<sup>E</sup>), a neighbour (22%<sup>E</sup>) or a friend (21%<sup>E</sup>).
- Three in ten (29%<sup>E</sup>) residents of Edmonton who experienced a major emergency or disaster in Canada in a community where they were living at the time of the event and which was significant enough to disrupt their regular daily routine also endured a loss of property or financial impact. A smaller proportion (7%<sup>E</sup>) of residents reported that they endured long-term emotional or psychological consequences.

### **Emergency planning, precautionary and fire safety behaviours**

- Three-quarters (74%) of people residing in Edmonton lived in households that were engaged in at least two emergency planning activities,<sup>6</sup> and one-half (48%) lived in households with three or four such activities (Table 1.2). Less than one in ten (7%<sup>E</sup>) people lived in a household that had not participated in any emergency planning activities.
- Four in ten (42%) lived in a household with at least two precautionary measures<sup>7</sup> taken in case of an emergency, and two in ten (19%) lived in a household with three or four such measures. Close to two in ten (22%) people lived in a household with no precautionary measures in place.
- The vast majority (96%) of residents reported living in a household with a working smoke detector, and two-thirds (67%) reported living in a household with a working fire extinguisher (Table 1.3). Three out of five (59%) residents stated that they had a working carbon monoxide detector in their household. However, less than one-half (46%) of the residents of Edmonton stated that they had implemented all three fire safety measures within their households.
- The number of emergency planning activities and fire safety measures taken by residents of Edmonton generally did not differ from residents in Alberta and Canada's 10 provinces. However, differences did exist for precautionary measures. For example, Edmonton residents were less likely to have three (15%) or four (4%<sup>E</sup>) precautionary measures in place compared to Albertans (18% and 6%, respectively) and Canadians (20% and 7%, respectively). In fact, those in Edmonton (22%) were significantly more likely to have no precautionary measures in place compared to residents of Canada (16%).<sup>8</sup>
- There were some significant differences in the types of emergency planning activities Edmonton residents engaged in when compared to Canadians. For instance, residents in Edmonton were more likely to have a vehicle emergency supply kit (67%), an emergency exit plan (66%) and extra copies of important documents (59%) compared to Canadians in general. In terms of precautionary measures, residents of Edmonton were less likely to have an alternate heat source (40%), an alternate water source (35%) and a back-up generator (17%) compared to residents of both Alberta overall and Canadians in general.

## Social networks and sense of belonging

- Less than half (43%) of Edmonton's residents had a strong sense of belonging<sup>9</sup> to their community.<sup>10</sup>
- Most (85%) residents described the neighbourhood they lived in as a place where neighbours generally help each other.<sup>11</sup> Of those who did not describe their neighbourhood this way, the majority (72%) still described it as a place where neighbours would help each other in an emergency.<sup>12</sup>
- More than half of individuals had a large network of support in the event of an emergency or disaster, with more than five people to turn to for emotional support (62%),<sup>13</sup> for help if physically injured (59%)<sup>14</sup> as well as in case of a home evacuation (57%).<sup>15</sup> About one-quarter (27%) of residents had a large support network if financial help was needed. However, 8% reported that they had no one to turn to for financial help.<sup>16</sup>
- High levels of self-efficacy and social support, as well as civic engagement, were sometimes associated with a higher level of emergency preparedness (Table 1.4).

## Data tables

**Table 1.1**  
Most commonly anticipated sources of initial help and information, by type of emergency or disaster, residents of Edmonton, Alberta, 2014

Most common sources of initial help and information by type of emergency or disaster	percent
<b>Weather-related emergency or natural disaster</b>	
News- Television	29
News- Radio	27
News- Internet	22
<b>Extended power outages<sup>1</sup></b>	
Utility company	39
News- Radio	15
Local government	12 <sup>E</sup>

<b>Outbreak of serious or life-threatening disease</b>		
Hospital, clinic, doctor or other medical professional		47
News- Television		20
News- Internet		17
<b>Industrial or transportation accident</b>		
News- Television		25
News- Radio		24
News- Internet		20
<b>Contamination or shortage of water or food <sup>1</sup></b>		
Local government		33
News- Television		18
News- Internet		17
<b>Act of terrorism or terrorist threat</b>		
News- Television		33
News- Radio		30
Police/law enforcement		24
<b>Rioting or civil unrest <sup>1</sup></b>		
Police/law enforcement		33
News- Television		26 <sup>E</sup>
News- Radio		17 <sup>E</sup>
<sup>E</sup> use with caution		
1 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% when respondents were asked about their likely sources of initial help and information.		
<b>Note:</b> Respondents who perceived their community was at risk for any form of emergency or disaster were then asked where they would turn to first for information or assistance in the event of the perceived emergency or disaster. Respondents could provide more than one response. Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.		
<b>Source:</b> Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.		

**Table 1.2**

**Number of emergency planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents, community of Edmonton, Alberta, 2014**

Number of planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents	Edmonton	Alberta	Canada
	percent		
<b>Number of emergency planning activities</b>			
None	7 <sup>E</sup>	8	8
1 activity	16	17	17
2 activities	26	25	25
3 activities	29	26	27
4 activities	19	20	19
<b>Number of precautionary measures</b>			
None	22 <sup>**</sup>	21	16
1 measure	31 <sup>***</sup>	27	27
2 measures	23 <sup>**</sup>	23	28
3 measures	15 <sup>***</sup>	18	20
4 measures	4 <sup>E</sup> <sup>***</sup>	6	7
<b>Number of fire safety measures <sup>1 2 3</sup></b>			
None	F	1 <sup>E</sup>	1

1 measure	15	14	14
2 measures	31 **	31	38
3 measures	46	48	42

E use with caution  
F too unreliable to be published

\*\* significantly different from Canada level estimate (p < 0.05)

\*\*\* significantly different from both provincial and Canada level estimates (p < 0.05)

1 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Canada'.

2 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Alberta'.

3 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Edmonton'.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents. Emergency planning activities include: an emergency exit plan, an emergency supply kit, photocopies/electronic copies of important documents and a list of emergency contact numbers. Precautionary measures include: a battery-operated or wind-up radio, an alternative heat source, a back-up generator and an alternative water source. Fire safety measures include a working smoke detector, a working carbon monoxide detector and a working fire extinguisher.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

**Table 1.3**  
**Planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures residents engaged in, community of Edmonton, Alberta, 2014**

Residents whose households were involved in the following:	Edmonton	Alberta	Canada
	percent		
<b>Emergency planning activities</b>			
Emergency exit plan	66 **	63	60
Exit plan has been practised/reviewed in last 12 months <sup>1</sup>	42	45	46
Designated meeting place for household members <sup>2</sup>	36	33	33
Contact plan for household members <sup>2</sup>	59 <sup>†</sup>	55	55
Household emergency supply kit	44	43	47
Vehicle emergency supply kit <sup>3</sup>	67 **	69	59
Extra copies of important documents	59 **	55	53
List of emergency contact numbers	67	68	69
Plan for meeting special health needs <sup>4</sup>	61	64	62
<b>Precautionary measures</b>			
Wind-up or battery-operated radio	48 **	49	58
Alternate heat source	40 ***	45	48
Back-up generator	17 ***	22	23
Alternate water source	35 ***	41	43
Other <sup>5</sup>	20	17	21
<b>Fire safety measures</b>			
Working smoke detector	96	96	98
Working carbon monoxide detector	59 <sup>†</sup>	65	60
Working fire extinguisher	67	65	66

\* significantly different from provincial level estimate (p < 0.05)

\*\* significantly different from Canada level estimate (p < 0.05)

\*\*\* significantly different from both provincial and Canada level estimates (p < 0.05)

1 Percentage based only on those indicating that they have an emergency exit plan.

2 Excludes Canadians living in single-person households.

3 Excludes those who reported that they lived in a household that did not have a vehicle.

4 Percentage based only on those indicating that they or someone in their household has special medical needs.

5 'Other precautionary measures' include having an escape/rescue plan for pets, extra supply of fuel, checking and replenishing emergency supplies, and keeping exits clear.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

**Table 1.4**

**High or moderately high levels of emergency planning, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents, by social and political involvement, community of Edmonton, Alberta, 2014**

Social and political involvement	Percentage of residents who had high or moderately high levels of...		
	Planning activities	Precautionary measures	Fire safety measures
	percent		
<b>Engagement in political activities <sup>1</sup></b>			
Yes †	51	21	50
No	41	15 <sup>E</sup>	40
<b>High level of civic engagement <sup>2</sup></b>			
Yes †	54	22	54
No	42 *	16 <sup>E</sup>	40 *
<b>High level of social support <sup>3</sup></b>			
Yes <sup>7 8</sup> †	57	18 <sup>E</sup>	56
No <sup>9</sup>	45	18	43 *
<b>Strong sense of belonging to community <sup>4</sup></b>			
Yes †	53	21	45
No	46	15	47
<b>High neighbourhood trust <sup>5</sup></b>			
Yes †	53	19	51
No <sup>9</sup>	47	18	46
<b>High level of self-efficacy <sup>6</sup></b>			
Yes †	55	21	47
No	43 *	15 <sup>E</sup>	47

<sup>E</sup> use with caution

\* significantly different from reference category ( $p < 0.05$ )

† reference category

- 1 Includes individuals over the age of 17 years who are eligible to vote, and who have participated in or volunteered for political parties or events in the past 12 months, including municipal, provincial, or federal elections, or expressed views on political or social issues through signing a petition, contacting news agencies or politicians, or attended a meeting involving social or community issues.
- 2 Civic engagement measures individuals over the age of 17 years who were involved in a recreational group or organization in the past 12 months, and includes engagement in political activities. A 'high level' is defined as having been involved in at least 4 activities in the past 12 months.
- 3 A 'high level of social support' is defined as having five or more people whom that individual could turn to for help in an emergency if they are physically injured, require emotional support, shelter, and/or financial assistance.
- 4 A 'strong sense of belonging to community' is rating one's own sense of belonging to their community as a 4 or a 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "very weak" and 5 "very strong".
- 5 'High neighbourhood trust' is rating one's own trust in the people in one's neighbourhood as 4 or 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "cannot be trusted at all" and 5 represents "can be trusted a lot", as well as having a response of "very likely" when asked about the likelihood of someone in their neighbourhood returning a lost wallet or purse containing two hundred dollars with the money still inside.
- 6 A 'high level of self-efficacy' is derived from having a high self-rating on a scale of 1 (poor) to 5 (excellent) for the following three categories: an ability to think clearly and solve day-to-day problems, to handle unexpected and difficult problems, and to figure out what to do if faced with an emergency situation.
- 7 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Planning activities'.
- 8 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Precautionary measures'.
- 9 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Fire safety measures'.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents. Households with 'moderately high' or 'high' levels of emergency planning engaged in 3 or 4 of the following: having an exit plan, an emergency supply kit, extra copies of important documents and an emergency contact list. 'Moderately high' or 'high' levels of precautionary measures include having 3 or 4 of the following: a wind-up or battery operated radio, a back-up generator, an alternate source of heat and additional water. 'Moderately high' or 'high' levels of fire safety measure include having all 3 of the following: a working smoke detector, a working fire extinguisher, and a working carbon monoxide detector.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

## Notes

<sup>E</sup> use with caution

- 1 A Census Metropolitan Area (CMA) or a Census Agglomeration (CA) is formed by one or more adjacent municipalities centred on a population centre (known as the core). A CMA must have a total population of at least 100,000 of which 50,000 or more must live in the core. A CA must have a core population of at least 10,000. To be included in the CMA or CA, other adjacent municipalities must have a high degree of integration with the core as measured by commuting flows derived from census data.
- 2 The target population for the SEPR included all persons 15 years of age or older, residing in households in Canada's 10 provinces, excluding full-time residents of institutions (e.g., nursing homes, group homes, hospitals).
- 3 The SEPR covers three types of communities: Census Metropolitan Areas (CMAs), Census Agglomerations (CAs) with population greater than 50,000, and 'smaller communities' which include CAs with population 50,000 or less and those areas that fall outside of CMAs and CAs. All CMAs and CAs (with population greater than 50,000) were included in the SEPR. A sample of households were selected from smaller communities within each province to represent all households within the province in similar communities. Additional information on the SEPR and its sampling methodology can be found in the 'Survey description' section.
- 4 Throughout this fact sheet, responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.
- 5 This section focuses on personal experiences with emergencies or disasters that happened in Canada, in a community where the person was living at the time, and was significant enough to severely interrupt the individual's regular daily activities.

- 6 Emergency planning activities include: having an emergency exit plan, a household emergency supply kit, extra copies of important documents and an emergency contact list.
- 7 Precautionary measures include: having a wind-up or battery-operated radio, an alternate heat source such as a non-electric stove or heater or a wood-burning fireplace, a back-up generator and an alternative water source such as a well, tank or litres of stored water.
- 8 Unless otherwise specified, differences are statistically significant ( $p < 0.05$ ).
- 9 A 'strong sense of belonging to community' is rating one's own sense of belonging to their community as a 4 or a 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "very weak" and 5 "very strong".
- 10 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% when respondents were asked about their sense of belonging to their community.
- 11 A proportion (32%) of respondents were not asked questions regarding neighbourhood helpfulness in the event of an emergency and as such these cases are not included in the analysis on neighbourhood helpfulness in general or in the event of an emergency.
- 12 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were equal to 11% when respondents were asked about whether their neighbourhood is a place where neighbours would help each other if there is an emergency.
- 13 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% when respondents were asked about the number of people they could turn to for emotional support.
- 14 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% when respondents were asked about the number of people they could turn to for help if they were physically injured.
- 15 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% when respondents were asked about the number of people they could turn to for help in case of home evacuation.
- 16 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were equal to 10% when respondents were asked about the number of people they could turn to for help if financial support is needed.





## Fact sheet Community of Grande Prairie (CA), Alberta

---

In 2014, information on the emergency preparedness of people living in the Census Agglomeration<sup>1</sup> of Grande Prairie was collected through the Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada (SEPR).<sup>2</sup> This fact sheet presents information on the risk awareness and level of emergency preparedness of the residents of Grande Prairie, which could help improve the understanding of community resilience in the event of an emergency.<sup>3,4</sup>

### Risk awareness and anticipated sources of help in an emergency or disaster

- Winter storms (including blizzards, ice storms and extreme cold) (93%), industrial or transportation accidents (78%) and wildfires (73%) were named by residents of Grande Prairie as the most likely events to occur within their community.
- Residents most commonly anticipated turning to police or law enforcement as an initial source for help and information if they were faced with an act of terrorism or terrorist threat (43%), rioting or civil unrest (37%<sup>E</sup>) or an industrial or transportation accident (26%) (Table 1.1).
- Residents also stated that they would anticipate turning to a hospital, clinic, doctor or other medical professional in the event of an outbreak of a serious or life-threatening disease (61%) and to their utility company if they faced an extended power outage lasting 24 hours or longer (47%). They also reported news on the radio as an initial source of help and information in the event of a weather-related emergency or natural disaster (31%) and local government if they faced a contamination or shortage of water or food (29%).

### Prior lifetime experience with a major emergency or disaster<sup>5</sup>

- Over one-quarter (28%) of Grande Prairie residents has faced a major emergency or disaster in Canada in a community they were living in at the time of the event, more than half (55%) of whom reported experiencing severe disruptions to their daily activities as a result of the event.
- Floods (26%<sup>E</sup>) were the most commonly experienced emergencies or disasters by residents of Grande Prairie.
- Common types of disruption to daily activities endured by residents who had experienced major emergencies or disasters included having to boil drinking water or drink bottled water (51%<sup>E</sup>)<sup>6</sup> and missing work or school (41%<sup>E</sup>). More severe disruptions experienced were an inability to use roads or transportation within the community (43%<sup>E</sup>) and home evacuation (26%<sup>E</sup>).
- Eight in ten (79%) residents who experienced an emergency or disaster were able to resume their daily activities within one week of the event, with more than one-third (37%<sup>E</sup>) resuming their activities within 24 hours.
- More than half (57%) of residents who had experienced an emergency or disaster received help during or immediately following the event.<sup>7</sup>

### Emergency planning, precautionary and fire safety behaviours

- Seven in ten (69%) people residing in Grande Prairie lived in households that were engaged in at least two emergency planning activities,<sup>8</sup> and four in ten (43%) lived in households with three or four such activities (Table 1.2).
- Nearly half (46%) lived in a household with at least two precautionary measures<sup>9</sup> taken in case of an emergency, and less than one-quarter (22%) lived in a household with three or four such measures. Close to one-quarter (23%) of

people lived in a household with no precautionary measures in place.

- The vast majority (98%) of residents reported living in a household with a working smoke detector, and two-thirds (65%) reported living in a household with a working fire extinguisher (Table 1.3). Approximately six out of ten (63%) residents stated that they had a working carbon monoxide detector in their household. Less than one-half (44%) of residents of Grande Prairie stated that they had implemented all three fire safety measures within their households.
- Generally, the number of emergency planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents of Grande Prairie did not significantly differ from residents in Alberta and Canada's 10 provinces overall. There were two exceptions: residents of Grande Prairie were more likely to have no precautionary measures in place (23%) and less likely to have three precautionary measures in place (14%<sup>E</sup>) compared to Canadians (16% and 20%, respectively).<sup>10</sup>
- There were some differences in the types of activities and measures set in place by residents of Grande Prairie when compared to residents of Alberta and Canada in general. For example, Grande Prairie residents were more likely to have a back-up generator (30%) than residents of Alberta (22%) and Canada (23%), but they were less likely to have an alternate heat source (37%, 45% and 48%, respectively). In addition, Grande Prairie residents were more likely to have a vehicle emergency supply kit (71%) but less likely to have a list of emergency contact numbers (61%) or a wind-up or battery-operated radio (50%) compared to Canadians (59%, 69% and 58%, respectively).

## Social networks and sense of belonging

- Nearly half (47%) of Grande Prairie's residents had a strong sense of belonging<sup>11</sup> to their community.
- Most (84%) residents described the neighbourhood they lived in as a place where neighbours generally help each other.<sup>12</sup> Of those who did not describe their neighbourhood this way, the majority (76%) still described it as a place where neighbours would help each other in an emergency.
- Many individuals had a large network of support in the event of an emergency or disaster, with more than five people to turn to for emotional support (60%), for help if physically injured (60%) as well as in case of a home evacuation (51%). About one in four (23%) residents had a large support network if financial help was needed. However, 9%<sup>E</sup> reported that they had no one to turn to for financial help.
- High levels of self-efficacy and social support, as well as civic engagement and involvement in political activities, were sometimes associated with a higher level of emergency preparedness (Table 1.4).

## Data tables

Table 1.1

Most commonly anticipated sources of initial help and information, by type of emergency or disaster, residents of Grande Prairie, Alberta, 2014

Most common sources of initial help and information by type of emergency or disaster	percent
<b>Weather-related emergency or natural disaster</b>	
News- Radio	31
News- Internet	26
News- Television	20
<b>Extended power outages</b>	
Utility company	47
News- Radio	12 <sup>E</sup>
Local government	8 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Outbreak of serious or life-threatening disease</b>	
Hospital, clinic, doctor or other medical professional	61
News- Radio	17 <sup>E</sup>
News- Internet	17 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Industrial or transportation accident</b>	
Police/law enforcement	26

News- Radio	25
News- Internet	17 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Contamination or shortage of water or food</b>	
Local government	29
News- Internet	21 <sup>E</sup>
News- Radio	19 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Act of terrorism or terrorist threat</b>	
Police/law enforcement	43
News- Radio	26 <sup>E</sup>
News- Television	21 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Rioting or civil unrest</b>	
Police/law enforcement	37 <sup>E</sup>
News- Radio	26 <sup>E</sup>
News- Internet	26 <sup>E</sup>
<sup>E</sup> use with caution	
<b>Note:</b> Respondents who perceived their community was at risk for any form of emergency or disaster were then asked where they would turn to first for information or assistance in the event of the perceived emergency or disaster. Respondents could provide more than one response. Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.	
<b>Source:</b> Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.	

**Table 1.2**  
**Number of emergency planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents, community of Grande Prairie, Alberta, 2014**

Number of planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents	Grande Prairie	Alberta	Canada
	percent		
<b>Number of emergency planning activities</b>			
None	F	8	8
1 activity	19	17	17
2 activities	26	25	25
3 activities	24	26	27
4 activities	19	20	19
<b>Number of precautionary measures</b>			
None	23 **	21	16
1 measure	29	27	27
2 measures	24	23	28
3 measures	14 <sup>E</sup> **	18	20
4 measures	8 <sup>E</sup>	6	7
<b>Number of fire safety measures <sup>1 2 3</sup></b>			
None	F	1 <sup>E</sup>	1
1 measure	11 <sup>E</sup>	14	14
2 measures	37	31	38
3 measures	44	48	42

<sup>E</sup> use with caution  
<sup>F</sup> too unreliable to be published

\*\* significantly different from Canada level estimate (p < 0.05)

1 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Canada'.

2 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Alberta'.

3 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Grande Prairie'.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents. Emergency planning activities include: an emergency exit plan, an emergency supply kit, photocopies/electronic copies of important documents and a list of emergency contact numbers. Precautionary measures include: a battery-operated or wind-up radio, an alternative heat source, a back-up generator and an alternative water source. Fire safety measures include a working smoke detector, a working carbon monoxide detector and a working fire extinguisher.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

**Table 1.3**  
**Planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures residents engaged in, community of Grande Prairie, Alberta, 2014**

Residents whose households were involved in the following:	Grande Prairie	Alberta	Canada
	percent		
<b>Emergency planning activities</b>			
Emergency exit plan	64	63	60
Exit plan has been practised/reviewed in last 12 months <sup>1</sup>	49	45	46
Designated meeting place for household members <sup>2</sup>	34	33	33
Contact plan for household members <sup>2</sup>	52	55	55
Household emergency supply kit	47	43	47
Vehicle emergency supply kit <sup>3</sup>	71 **	69	59
Extra copies of important documents	53	55	53
List of emergency contact numbers	61 **	68	69
Plan for meeting special health needs <sup>4</sup>	58	64	62
<b>Precautionary measures</b>			
Wind-up or battery-operated radio	50 **	49	58
Alternate heat source	37 ***	45	48
Back-up generator	30 ***	22	23
Alternate water source	39	41	43
Other <sup>5</sup>	17	17	21
<b>Fire safety measures</b>			
Working smoke detector	98 *	96	98
Working carbon monoxide detector	63	65	60
Working fire extinguisher	65	65	66

\* significantly different from provincial level estimate (p < 0.05)

\*\* significantly different from Canada level estimate (p < 0.05)

\*\*\* significantly different from both provincial and Canada level estimates (p < 0.05)

1 Percentage based only on those indicating that they have an emergency exit plan.

2 Excludes Canadians living in single-person households.

3 Excludes those who reported that they lived in a household that did not have a vehicle.

4 Percentage based only on those indicating that they or someone in their household has special medical needs.

5 'Other precautionary measures' include having an escape/rescue plan for pets, extra supply of fuel, checking and replenishing emergency supplies, and keeping exits clear.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

**Table 1.4**

**High or moderately high levels of emergency planning, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents, by social and political involvement, community of Grande Prairie, Alberta, 2014**

Social and political involvement	Percentage of residents who had high or moderately high levels of...		
	Planning activities	Precautionary measures	Fire safety measures
	percent		
<b>Engagement in political activities <sup>1</sup></b>			
Yes †	51	24 <sup>E</sup>	44
No	32 <sup>E *</sup>	20 <sup>E</sup>	42
<b>High level of civic engagement <sup>2</sup></b>			
Yes †	55	29 <sup>E</sup>	46
No	34 <sup>*</sup>	17 <sup>E</sup>	41
<b>High level of social support <sup>3</sup></b>			
Yes †	50	38 <sup>E</sup>	51
No <sup>7</sup>	42	19 <sup>E *</sup>	43
<b>Strong sense of belonging to community <sup>4</sup></b>			
Yes <sup>7 †</sup>	47	27 <sup>E</sup>	51
No	42	19 <sup>E</sup>	39
<b>High neighbourhood trust <sup>5</sup></b>			
Yes <sup>8 †</sup>	50	34 <sup>E</sup>	53
No <sup>7</sup>	41	19 <sup>E</sup>	41
<b>High level of self-efficacy <sup>6</sup></b>			
Yes <sup>7 †</sup>	54	33	54
No	34 <sup>*</sup>	12 <sup>E *</sup>	34 <sup>*</sup>

<sup>E</sup> use with caution

\* significantly different from reference category ( $p < 0.05$ )

† reference category

- 1 Includes individuals over the age of 17 years who are eligible to vote, and who have participated in or volunteered for political parties or events in the past 12 months, including municipal, provincial, or federal elections, or expressed views on political or social issues through signing a petition, contacting news agencies or politicians, or attended a meeting involving social or community issues.
- 2 Civic engagement measures individuals over the age of 17 years who were involved in a recreational group or organization in the past 12 months, and includes engagement in political activities. A 'high level' is defined as having been involved in at least 4 activities in the past 12 months.
- 3 A 'high level of social support' is defined as having five or more people whom that individual could turn to for help in an emergency if they are physically injured, require emotional support, shelter, and/or financial assistance.
- 4 A 'strong sense of belonging to community' is rating one's own sense of belonging to their community as a 4 or a 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "very weak" and 5 "very strong".
- 5 'High neighbourhood trust' is rating one's own trust in the people in one's neighbourhood as 4 or 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "cannot be trusted at all" and 5 represents "can be trusted a lot", as well as having a response of "very likely" when asked about the likelihood of someone in their neighbourhood returning a lost wallet or purse containing two hundred dollars with the money still inside.
- 6 A 'high level of self-efficacy' is derived from having a high self-rating on a scale of 1 (poor) to 5 (excellent) for the following three categories: an ability to think clearly and solve day-to-day problems, to handle unexpected and difficult problems, and to figure out what to do if faced with an emergency situation.
- 7 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Fire safety measures'.
- 8 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Planning activities'.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents. Households with 'moderately high' or 'high' levels of emergency planning engaged in 3 or 4 of the following: having an exit plan, an emergency supply kit, extra copies of important documents and an emergency contact list. 'Moderately high' or 'high' levels of precautionary measures include having 3 or 4 of the following: a wind-up or battery operated radio, a back-up generator, an alternate source of heat and additional water. 'Moderately high' or 'high' levels of fire safety measure include having all 3 of the following: a working smoke detector, a working fire extinguisher, and a working carbon monoxide detector.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

## Notes

<sup>E</sup> use with caution

- 1 A Census Metropolitan Area (CMA) or a Census Agglomeration (CA) is formed by one or more adjacent municipalities centred on a population centre (known as the core). A CMA must have a total population of at least 100,000 of which 50,000 or more must live in the core. A CA must have a core population of at least 10,000. To be included in the CMA or CA, other adjacent municipalities must have a high degree of integration with the core as measured by commuting flows derived from census data.
- 2 The target population for the SEPR included all persons 15 years of age or older, residing in households in Canada's 10 provinces, excluding full-time residents of institutions (e.g. nursing homes, group homes, hospitals).
- 3 The SEPR covers three types of communities: Census Metropolitan Areas (CMAs), Census Agglomerations (CAs) with population greater than 50,000, and 'smaller communities' which include CAs with population 50,000 or less and those areas that fall outside of CMAs and CAs. All CMAs and CAs (with population greater than 50,000) were included in the SEPR. A sample of households were selected from smaller communities within each province to represent all households within the province in similar communities. Additional information on the SEPR and its sampling methodology can be found in the 'Survey description' section.
- 4 Throughout this fact sheet, responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.
- 5 This section focuses on personal experiences with emergencies or disasters that happened in Canada, in a community where the person was living at the time, and was significant enough to severely interrupt the individual's regular daily activities.

- 6 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% when respondents were asked about whether the emergency they experienced caused them to have to boil drinking water or use bottled water for drinking.
- 7 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% when respondents were asked about the source of information or assistance they received during or immediately following the emergency they experienced.
- 8 Emergency planning activities include: having an emergency exit plan, a household emergency supply kit, extra copies of important documents and an emergency contact list.
- 9 Precautionary measures include: having a wind-up or battery-operated radio, an alternate heat source such as a non-electric stove or heater or a wood-burning fireplace, a back-up generator and an alternative water source such as a well, tank or litres of stored water.
- 10 Unless otherwise specified, differences are statistically significant ( $p < 0.05$ ).
- 11 A 'strong sense of belonging to community' is rating one's own sense of belonging to their community as a 4 or a 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "very weak" and 5 "very strong".
- 12 A proportion (16%) of respondents were not asked questions regarding neighbourhood helpfulness in the event of an emergency and as such these cases are not included in the analysis on neighbourhood helpfulness in general or in the event of an emergency.



## Fact sheet Community of Wood Buffalo (CA), Alberta

---

In 2014, information on the emergency preparedness of people living in the Census Agglomeration<sup>1</sup> of Wood Buffalo was collected through the Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada (SEPR).<sup>2</sup> This fact sheet presents information on the risk awareness and level of emergency preparedness of the residents of Wood Buffalo, which could help improve the understanding of community resilience in the event of an emergency.<sup>3 4 5</sup>

### **Risk awareness and anticipated sources of help in an emergency or disaster**

- Winter storms (including blizzards, ice storms and extreme cold) (93%), wildfires (91%) and industrial or transportation accidents (87%) were named by residents of Wood Buffalo as the most likely events to occur in their community.
- Residents most commonly anticipated turning to police or law enforcement as an initial source for help and information if they were faced with rioting or civil unrest (46%) or an act of terrorism or terrorist threat (36%). They reported that they would turn to news on the radio in the event of an industrial or transportation accident (28%) or a weather-related emergency or natural disaster (26%) (Table 1.1).
- Residents also stated (53%) that hospitals, clinics, doctors and other medical professionals were the most commonly anticipated sources of initial help and information in the event of an outbreak of a serious or life-threatening disease. In the event of an extended power outage lasting 24 hours or longer, they most commonly said they would seek help from their utility company (47%), and in the event of a contamination or shortage of water or food, residents anticipated first turning to local government (40%).

### **Prior lifetime experience with a major emergency or disaster<sup>6</sup>**

- Close to four in ten (38%) Wood Buffalo residents has faced a major emergency or disaster in Canada in a community they were living in at the time of the event, two-thirds (66%) of whom reported experiencing severe disruptions to their daily activities as a result of the event.
- Floods (42%<sup>E</sup>) and wildfires (33%<sup>E</sup>) were the most commonly experienced emergencies or disasters by residents of Wood Buffalo.
- The most common types of disruption to daily activities endured by residents who had experienced major emergencies or disasters included missing work or school (64%), missing an appointment or planned activity (55%) and having to boil water for drinking or drink bottled water (40%<sup>E</sup>). More severe disruptions experienced were an inability to use roads or transportation within the community (32%<sup>E</sup>) and home evacuation (30%<sup>E</sup>).
- Close to three-quarters (72%) of residents who experienced an emergency or disaster were able to resume their daily activities within one week of the event; one-quarter (26%<sup>E</sup>) of whom reported resuming daily activities within three to five days.
- Six in ten (60%) residents who had experienced an emergency or disaster received help during or immediately following the event, most commonly from a family member (40%<sup>E</sup>) or local government (35%<sup>E</sup>).
- Approximately one-quarter (23%<sup>E</sup>) of residents of Wood Buffalo who experienced a major emergency or disaster in Canada in a community where they were living at the time of the event and which was significant enough to disrupt their regular daily routine also endured a loss of property or financial impact.

### **Emergency planning, precautionary and fire safety behaviours**



- Seven in ten (71%) people residing in Wood Buffalo lived in households that were engaged in at least two emergency planning activities,<sup>7</sup> and more than four in ten (44%) lived in households with three or four such activities (Table 1.2). Around one in ten (9%<sup>E</sup>) people lived in a household that had not participated in any emergency planning activities.
- Nearly half (46%) lived in a household with at least two precautionary measures<sup>8</sup> taken in case of an emergency, and less than one-quarter (22%) lived in a household with three or four such measures. Less than one-quarter (22%) of people lived in a household with no precautionary measures in place.
- The vast majority (98%) of residents reported living in a household with a working smoke detector, and approximately three-quarters (73%) reported living in a household with a working fire extinguisher (Table 1.3). Three-quarters (76%) of residents stated that they had a working carbon monoxide detector in their household. Six in ten (61%) of the residents of Wood Buffalo stated that they had implemented all three fire safety measures within their households.
- Generally, the number of emergency planning activities and precautionary measures taken by residents of Wood Buffalo did not significantly differ from residents of Alberta and Canada's 10 provinces in general. Differences did exist, however, in terms of the number of fire safety measures taken. For instance, Wood Buffalo residents were more likely to have all three fire safety measures in place than residents of Alberta and Canada (61%, 48% and 42%, respectively).<sup>9</sup>
- The types of activities and measures set in place by residents of Wood Buffalo did not generally differ compared to residents of Alberta and Canada. There were, however, a few exceptions. For instance, while Wood Buffalo residents were more likely to have a vehicle emergency supply kit (72%), they were less likely to have a wind-up or battery-operated radio (44%) compared to Canadians (59% and 58%, respectively). In addition, Wood Buffalo residents were more likely to have a working carbon monoxide detector (76%) and a working fire extinguisher (73%) than both residents of Alberta (65% each) and Canada (60% and 66%, respectively).

## Social networks and sense of belonging

- Nearly half (47%) of Wood Buffalo's residents had a strong sense of belonging<sup>10</sup> to their community.
- Most (79%) residents described the neighbourhood they lived in as a place where neighbours generally help each other.<sup>11</sup> Of those who did not describe their neighbourhood this way, most (78%) still described it as a place where neighbours would help each other in an emergency.<sup>12</sup>
- Many individuals had a large network of support in the event of an emergency or disaster, with more than five people to turn to for help if physically injured (60%), for emotional support (59%), as well as in case of a home evacuation (53%). Over one-quarter (28%) of residents had a large support network if financial help was needed. However, 9%<sup>E</sup> reported that they had no one to turn to for financial help.<sup>13</sup>
- Higher levels of sense of belonging, self-efficacy and neighbourhood trust, as well as civic engagement and involvement in political activities, were not often associated with a higher level of emergency preparedness (Table 1.4).

## Data tables

**Table 1.1**

**Most commonly anticipated sources of initial help and information, by type of emergency or disaster, residents of Wood Buffalo, Alberta, 2014**

Most common sources of initial help and information by type of emergency or disaster	percent
<b>Weather-related emergency or natural disaster</b>	
News- Radio	26
News- Internet	20
Local government	19
<b>Extended power outages</b>	
Utility company	47
News- Radio	17 <sup>E</sup>
Local government	17 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Outbreak of serious or life-threatening disease</b>	

Hospital, clinic, doctor or other medical professional	53
News- Radio	19 <sup>E</sup>
News- Internet	10 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Industrial or transportation accident</b>	
News- Radio	28
Police/law enforcement	24
Local government	18 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Contamination or shortage of water or food</b>	
Local government	40
News- Radio	24 <sup>E</sup>
Family	8 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Act of terrorism or terrorist threat</b>	
Police/law enforcement	36
News- Radio	29
Local government	15 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Rioting or civil unrest</b>	
Police/law enforcement	46
News- Radio	25 <sup>E</sup>
<sup>E</sup> use with caution	
<b>Note:</b> Respondents who perceived their community was at risk for any form of emergency or disaster were then asked where they would turn to first for information or assistance in the event of the perceived emergency or disaster. Respondents could provide more than one response. Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.	
<b>Source:</b> Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.	

**Table 1.2**

**Number of emergency planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents, community of Wood Buffalo, Alberta, 2014**

Number of planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents	Wood Buffalo	Alberta	Canada
	percent		
<b>Number of emergency planning activities</b>			
None	9 <sup>E</sup>	8	8
1 activity	17 <sup>E</sup>	17	17
2 activities	27	25	25
3 activities	26	26	27
4 activities	18	20	19
<b>Number of precautionary measures</b>			
None	22 **	21	16
1 measure	28	27	27
2 measures	24	23	28
3 measures	17 <sup>E</sup>	18	20
4 measures	5 <sup>E</sup>	6	7
<b>Number of fire safety measures <sup>1 2 3</sup></b>			
None	F	1 <sup>E</sup>	1
1 measure	9 <sup>E</sup> ***	14	14
2 measures	24 ***	31	38
3 measures	61 ***	48	42

E use with caution  
 F too unreliable to be published

\*\* significantly different from Canada level estimate (p < 0.05)

\*\*\* significantly different from both provincial and Canada level estimates (p < 0.05)

1 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Canada'.

2 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Alberta'.

3 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Wood Buffalo'.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents. Emergency planning activities include: an emergency exit plan, an emergency supply kit, photocopies/electronic copies of important documents and a list of emergency contact numbers. Precautionary measures include: a battery-operated or wind-up radio, an alternative heat source, a back-up generator and an alternative water source. Fire safety measures include a working smoke detector, a working carbon monoxide detector and a working fire extinguisher.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

**Table 1.3**  
**Planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures residents engaged in, community of Wood Buffalo, Alberta, 2014**

Residents whose households were involved in the following:	Wood Buffalo	Alberta	Canada
	percent		
<b>Emergency planning activities</b>			
Emergency exit plan	62	63	60
Exit plan has been practised/reviewed in last 12 months <sup>1</sup>	50	45	46
Designated meeting place for household members <sup>2</sup>	31	33	33
Contact plan for household members <sup>2</sup>	62	55	55
Household emergency supply kit	45	43	47
Vehicle emergency supply kit <sup>3</sup>	72 **	69	59
Extra copies of important documents	52	55	53
List of emergency contact numbers	65	68	69
Plan for meeting special health needs <sup>4</sup>	73	64	62
<b>Precautionary measures</b>			
Wind-up or battery-operated radio	44 **	49	58
Alternate heat source	41	45	48
Back-up generator	25	22	23
Alternate water source	39	41	43
Other <sup>5</sup>	21	17	21
<b>Fire safety measures</b>			
Working smoke detector	98 *	96	98
Working carbon monoxide detector	76 ***	65	60
Working fire extinguisher	73 ***	65	66

\* significantly different from provincial level estimate (p < 0.05)

\*\* significantly different from Canada level estimate (p < 0.05)

\*\*\* significantly different from both provincial and Canada level estimates (p < 0.05)

1 Percentage based only on those indicating that they have an emergency exit plan.

2 Excludes Canadians living in single-person households.

3 Excludes those who reported that they lived in a household that did not have a vehicle.

4 Percentage based only on those indicating that they or someone in their household has special medical needs.

5 'Other precautionary measures' include having an escape/rescue plan for pets, extra supply of fuel, checking and replenishing emergency supplies, and keeping exits clear.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

**Table 1.4**

**High or moderately high levels of emergency planning, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents, by social and political involvement, community of Wood Buffalo, Alberta, 2014**

Social and political involvement	Percentage of residents who had high or moderately high levels of...		
	Planning activities	Precautionary measures	Fire safety measures
	percent		
<b>Engagement in political activities <sup>1</sup></b>			
Yes †	47	25	64
No	34 <sup>E</sup>	F	65
<b>High level of civic engagement <sup>2</sup></b>			
Yes †	47	24 <sup>E</sup>	67
No	39	21 <sup>E</sup>	63
<b>High level of social support <sup>3</sup></b>			
Yes †	53	32 <sup>E</sup>	76
No <sup>7</sup>	42	19 <sup>E</sup>	58 <sup>*</sup>
<b>Strong sense of belonging to community <sup>4</sup></b>			
Yes †	47	21 <sup>E</sup>	66
No <sup>7</sup>	42	24 <sup>E</sup>	59
<b>High neighbourhood trust <sup>5</sup></b>			
Yes †	50	25 <sup>E</sup>	64
No <sup>7</sup>	43	22 <sup>E</sup>	62
<b>High level of self-efficacy <sup>6</sup></b>			
Yes †	48	27 <sup>E</sup>	66
No	41	18 <sup>E</sup>	60

<sup>E</sup> use with caution

<sup>F</sup> too unreliable to be published

\* significantly different from reference category ( $p < 0.05$ )

† reference category

- 1 Includes individuals over the age of 17 years who are eligible to vote, and who have participated in or volunteered for political parties or events in the past 12 months, including municipal, provincial, or federal elections, or expressed views on political or social issues through signing a petition, contacting news agencies or politicians, or attended a meeting involving social or community issues.
- 2 Civic engagement measures individuals over the age of 17 years who were involved in a recreational group or organization in the past 12 months, and includes engagement in political activities. A 'high level' is defined as having been involved in at least 4 activities in the past 12 months.
- 3 A 'high level of social support' is defined as having five or more people whom that individual could turn to for help in an emergency if they are physically injured, require emotional support, shelter, and/or financial assistance.
- 4 A 'strong sense of belonging to community' is rating one's own sense of belonging to their community as a 4 or a 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "very weak" and 5 "very strong".
- 5 'High neighbourhood trust' is rating one's own trust in the people in one's neighbourhood as 4 or 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "cannot be trusted at all" and 5 represents "can be trusted a lot", as well as having a response of "very likely" when asked about the likelihood of someone in their neighbourhood returning a lost wallet or purse containing two hundred dollars with the money still inside.
- 6 A 'high level of self-efficacy' is derived from having a high self-rating on a scale of 1 (poor) to 5 (excellent) for the following three categories: an ability to think clearly and solve day-to-day problems, to handle unexpected and difficult problems, and to figure out what to do if faced with an emergency situation.
- 7 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Fire safety measures'.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents. Households with 'moderately high' or 'high' levels of emergency planning engaged in 3 or 4 of the following: having an exit plan, an emergency supply kit, extra copies of important documents and an emergency contact list. 'Moderately high' or 'high' levels of precautionary measures include having 3 or 4 of the following: a wind-up or battery operated radio, a back-up generator, an alternate source of heat and additional water. 'Moderately high' or 'high' levels of fire safety measure include having all 3 of the following: a working smoke detector, a working fire extinguisher, and a working carbon monoxide detector.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

## Notes

<sup>E</sup> use with caution

- 1 A Census Metropolitan Area (CMA) or a Census Agglomeration (CA) is formed by one or more adjacent municipalities centred on a population centre (known as the core). A CMA must have a total population of at least 100,000 of which 50,000 or more must live in the core. A CA must have a core population of at least 10,000. To be included in the CMA or CA, other adjacent municipalities must have a high degree of integration with the core as measured by commuting flows derived from census data.
- 2 The target population for the SEPR included all persons 15 years of age or older, residing in households in Canada's 10 provinces, excluding full-time residents of institutions (e.g. nursing homes, group homes, hospitals).
- 3 The SEPR covers three types of communities: Census Metropolitan Areas (CMAs), Census Agglomerations (CAs) with population greater than 50,000, and 'smaller communities' which include CAs with population 50,000 or less and those areas that fall outside of CMAs and CAs. All CMAs and CAs (with population greater than 50,000) were included in the SEPR. A sample of households were selected from smaller communities within each province to represent all households within the province in similar communities. Additional information on the SEPR and its sampling methodology can be found in the 'Survey description' section.
- 4 Throughout this fact sheet, responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.
- 5 Of note, the SEPR collected data between January and June 2014.
- 6 This section focuses on personal experiences with emergencies or disasters that happened in Canada, in a community where the person was living at the time, and was significant enough to severely interrupt the individual's regular daily activities.

- 7 Emergency planning activities include: having an emergency exit plan, a household emergency supply kit, extra copies of important documents and an emergency contact list.
- 8 Precautionary measures include: having a wind-up or battery-operated radio, an alternate heat source such as a non-electric stove or heater or a wood-burning fireplace, a back-up generator and an alternative water source such as a well, tank or litres of stored water.
- 9 Unless otherwise specified, differences are statistically significant ( $p < 0.05$ ).
- 10 A 'strong sense of belonging to community' is rating one's own sense of belonging to their community as a 4 or a 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "very weak" and 5 "very strong".
- 11 A proportion (22%) of respondents were not asked questions regarding neighbourhood helpfulness in the event of an emergency and as such these cases are not included in the analysis on neighbourhood helpfulness in general or in the event of an emergency.
- 12 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were equal to 14% when respondents were asked about whether their neighbourhood is a place where neighbours would help each other if there is an emergency.
- 13 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% when respondents were asked about the number of people they could turn to for help if financial support is needed.



## Fact sheet Smaller communities of Alberta

---

In 2014, information on the emergency preparedness of people living in 'smaller communities' of Alberta was collected through the Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada (SEPR).<sup>1 2 3</sup> This fact sheet presents information on the risk awareness and level of emergency preparedness of the residents of Alberta's smaller communities, which could help improve the understanding of community resilience in the event of an emergency.<sup>4</sup>

### **Risk awareness and anticipated sources of help in an emergency or disaster**

- People living in the smaller communities of Alberta anticipated winter storms (including blizzards, ice storms and extreme cold) (89%), extended power outages lasting 24 hours or longer (72%) and wildfires (64%) as the events most likely to occur in their communities.
- Residents most commonly anticipated turning to a hospital, clinic, doctor or other medical professional as an initial source for help and information if they were faced with an outbreak of a serious or life-threatening disease (61%), to their utility company during an extended power outage (57%) and to police or law enforcement in the event of rioting or civil unrest (57%), an act of terrorism or terrorist threat (47%) or an industrial or transportation accident (25%) (Table 1.1).
- Residents also stated that they anticipated seeking out local government in the event of a contamination or shortage of water or food (42%), and news on the radio if they faced a weather-related emergency or natural disaster (29%).

### **Prior lifetime experience with a major emergency or disaster<sup>5</sup>**

- Nearly one-third (31%) of residents of the smaller communities of Alberta have faced a major emergency or disaster in Canada in a community they were living in at the time of the event, the majority (61%) of whom reported experiencing severe disruptions to their daily activities as a result of the event.
- Floods (36%<sup>E</sup>) and extended power outages lasting 24 hours or longer (17%<sup>E</sup>) were the most commonly experienced emergencies or disasters by residents of the smaller communities of Alberta.
- Common types of disruption to daily activities endured by residents who had experienced major emergencies or disasters included missing work or school (67%), missing an appointment or planned activity (59%) and having to boil drinking water or use bottled water for drinking (45%<sup>E</sup>). More severe disruptions experienced were an inability to use roads or transportation in the community (48%) and home evacuation (28%<sup>E</sup>).
- Seven in ten (71%) residents who experienced an emergency or disaster were able to resume their daily activities within one week of the event; one-half (35%<sup>E</sup>) within two days or less.
- More than half (56%) of residents who had experienced an emergency or disaster received help during or immediately following the event, most commonly from a family member (23%<sup>E</sup>) or local government (23%<sup>E</sup>).<sup>6</sup>
- Four in ten (39%<sup>E</sup>) residents of the smaller communities of Alberta who experienced a major emergency or disaster in Canada in a community where they were living at the time of the event and which was significant enough to disrupt their regular daily routine also endured a loss of property or financial impact.

### **Emergency planning, precautionary and fire safety behaviours**

- Seven out of ten (70%) people residing in the smaller communities of Alberta lived in households that were engaged in at least two emergency planning activities,<sup>7</sup> and approximately one-half (48%) lived in households with three or four such activities (Table 1.2). One in ten (11%<sup>E</sup>) people lived in a household that had not participated in any emergency planning activities.
- Approximately six in ten (62%) lived in a household with at least two precautionary measures<sup>8</sup> taken in case of an emergency, and four in ten (40%) lived in a household with three or four such measures. More than one in ten (13%) people lived in a household with no precautionary measures in place.
- Most (94%) residents reported living in a household with a working smoke detector, and the majority (73%) reported living in a household with a working fire extinguisher (Table 1.3). Seven in ten (69%) residents stated that they had a working carbon monoxide detector in their household. More than half (54%) of residents of the smaller communities of Alberta stated that they had implemented all three fire safety measures with their households.
- There were significant differences in the number of fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents of the smaller communities of Alberta compared with residents of Alberta and Canada's 10 provinces overall. For example, a larger proportion of residents of the smaller communities of Alberta reported that they had three or four precautionary measures in place (28% and 12%, respectively) compared to Albertans (18% and 6%, respectively) and Canadians (20% and 7%, respectively) in general. Residents of the smaller community of Alberta were also significantly more likely to have all three fire safety measures in place (54%) compared to those in Alberta in general and Canada more broadly (48% and 42%, respectively).<sup>9</sup>
- There were also differences in the types of activities and measures set in place by residents of smaller communities in Alberta when compared to Alberta and Canada overall. For instance, the proportion of residents of smaller communities in Alberta who had a vehicle emergency supply kit (75%), an alternate heat source (57%), a back-up generator (43%), an alternate water source (54%) and a working fire extinguisher (73%) was significantly higher than Albertans and Canadians in general.

## Social networks and sense of belonging

- Over half (54%) of residents of the smaller communities of Alberta had a strong sense of belonging<sup>10</sup> to their community.
- Most (87%) residents described the neighbourhood they lived in as a place where neighbours generally help each other.<sup>11</sup> Of those who did not describe their neighbourhood this way, most (82%) still described it as a place where neighbours would help each other in an emergency.
- Many individuals had a large network of support in the event of an emergency or disaster, with more than five people to turn to for help for emotional support (67%), if physically injured (64%), as well as in case of a home evacuation (61%). Three in ten residents had such a large support network if financial help was needed (29%). However, approximately one in ten (12%<sup>E</sup>) reported that they had no one to turn to for financial help.<sup>12</sup>
- High levels of sense of belonging, social support and neighbourhood trust, as well as political and civic engagement, were often associated with a higher level of emergency preparedness (Table 1.4).

## Data tables

**Table 1.1**  
Most commonly anticipated sources of initial help and information, by type of emergency or disaster, residents of smaller communities of Alberta, 2014

Most common sources of initial help and information by type of emergency or disaster	percent
<b>Weather-related emergency or natural disaster</b>	
News- Radio	29
News- Television	24
News- Internet	17
<b>Extended power outages<sup>1</sup></b>	
Utility company	57
Local government	9 <sup>E</sup>



News- Radio	9 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Outbreak of serious or life-threatening disease</b>	
Hospital, clinic, doctor or other medical professional	61
News- Radio	12 <sup>E</sup>
News- Television	11 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Industrial or transportation accident <sup>1</sup></b>	
Police/law enforcement	25
News- Radio	22
Local government	15 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Contamination or shortage of water or food <sup>1</sup></b>	
Local government	42
News- Radio	13 <sup>E</sup>
News- Television	10 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Act of terrorism or terrorist threat</b>	
Police/law enforcement	47
News- Radio	22 <sup>E</sup>
News- Television	15 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Rioting or civil unrest</b>	
Police/law enforcement	57
News- Radio	20 <sup>E</sup>
<sup>E</sup> use with caution	
<sup>1</sup> Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% when respondents were asked about their likely sources of initial help and information.	
<b>Note:</b> Respondents who perceived their community was at risk for any form of emergency or disaster were then asked where they would turn to first for information or assistance in the event of the perceived emergency or disaster. Respondents could provide more than one response. Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.	
<b>Source:</b> Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.	

**Table 1.2**  
**Number of emergency planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents, smaller communities of Alberta, 2014**

Number of planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents	Smaller communities of Alberta	Alberta	Canada
	percent		
<b>Number of emergency planning activities</b>			
None	11 <sup>E</sup>	8	8
1 activity	14	17	17
2 activities	22	25	25
3 activities	27	26	27
4 activities	21	20	19
<b>Number of precautionary measures</b>			
None	13 <sup>*</sup>	21	16
1 measure	22 <sup>***</sup>	27	27
2 measures	22 <sup>**</sup>	23	28
3 measures	28 <sup>***</sup>	18	20
4 measures	12 <sup>***</sup>	6	7
<b>Number of fire safety measures <sup>1 2 3</sup></b>			
None	F	1 <sup>E</sup>	1

1 measure	12 <sup>E</sup>	14	14
2 measures	28 **	31	38
3 measures	54 ***	48	42

<sup>E</sup> use with caution  
<sup>F</sup> too unreliable to be published

\* significantly different from provincial level estimate (p < 0.05)

\*\* significantly different from Canada level estimate (p < 0.05)

\*\*\* significantly different from both provincial and Canada level estimates (p < 0.05)

1 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Canada'.

2 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Alberta'.

3 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'smaller communities of Alberta'.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents. Emergency planning activities include: an emergency exit plan, an emergency supply kit, photocopies/electronic copies of important documents and a list of emergency contact numbers. Precautionary measures include: a battery-operated or wind-up radio, an alternative heat source, a back-up generator and an alternative water source. Fire safety measures include a working smoke detector, a working carbon monoxide detector and a working fire extinguisher.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

**Table 1.3**  
**Planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures residents engaged in, smaller communities of Alberta, 2014**

Residents whose households were involved in the following:	Smaller communities of Alberta	Alberta	Canada
	percent		
<b>Emergency planning activities</b>			
Emergency exit plan	64	63	60
Exit plan has been practised/reviewed in last 12 months <sup>1</sup>	51	45	46
Designated meeting place for household members <sup>2</sup>	37	33	33
Contact plan for household members <sup>2</sup>	53	55	55
Household emergency supply kit	46	43	47
Vehicle emergency supply kit <sup>3</sup>	75 ***	69	59
Extra copies of important documents	50	55	53
List of emergency contact numbers	70	68	69
Plan for meeting special health needs <sup>4</sup>	68	64	62
<b>Precautionary measures</b>			
Wind-up or battery-operated radio	50 **	49	58
Alternate heat source	57 ***	45	48
Back-up generator	43 ***	22	23
Alternate water source	54 ***	41	43
Other <sup>5</sup>	14 **	17	21
<b>Fire safety measures</b>			
Working smoke detector	94	96	98
Working carbon monoxide detector	69 **	65	60
Working fire extinguisher	73 ***	65	66

\*\* significantly different from Canada level estimate (p < 0.05)

\*\*\* significantly different from both provincial and Canada level estimates (p < 0.05)

1 Percentage based only on those indicating that they have an emergency exit plan.

2 Excludes Canadians living in single-person households.

3 Excludes those who reported that they lived in a household that did not have a vehicle.

4 Percentage based only on those indicating that they or someone in their household has special medical needs.

5 'Other precautionary measures' include having an escape/rescue plan for pets, extra supply of fuel, checking and replenishing emergency supplies, and keeping exits clear.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

**Table 1.4**

**High or moderately high levels of emergency planning, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents, by social and political involvement, smaller communities of Alberta, 2014**

Social and political involvement	Percentage of residents who had high or moderately high levels of...		
	Planning activities	Precautionary measures	Fire safety measures
	percent		
<b>Engagement in political activities <sup>1</sup></b>			
Yes †	55	45	58
No <sup>7</sup>	32 <sup>E *</sup>	29 <sup>E *</sup>	43 *
<b>High level of civic engagement <sup>2</sup></b>			
Yes †	57	49	66
No <sup>8</sup>	39 *	30 *	42 *
<b>High level of social support <sup>3</sup></b>			
Yes <sup>8 †</sup>	58	52	56
No	46	34 *	51
<b>Strong sense of belonging to community <sup>4</sup></b>			
Yes †	54	47	61
No <sup>8</sup>	43	34 *	47 *
<b>High neighbourhood trust <sup>5</sup></b>			
Yes †	58	46	65
No <sup>8 9</sup>	42 *	36	44 *
<b>High level of self-efficacy <sup>6</sup></b>			
Yes †	50	40	53
No <sup>8 9</sup>	46	40	54

<sup>E</sup> use with caution

\* significantly different from reference category ( $p < 0.05$ )

† reference category

- 1 Includes individuals over the age of 17 years who are eligible to vote, and who have participated in or volunteered for political parties or events in the past 12 months, including municipal, provincial, or federal elections, or expressed views on political or social issues through signing a petition, contacting news agencies or politicians, or attended a meeting involving social or community issues.
- 2 Civic engagement measures individuals over the age of 17 years who were involved in a recreational group or organization in the past 12 months, and includes engagement in political activities. A 'high level' is defined as having been involved in at least 4 activities in the past 12 months.
- 3 A 'high level of social support' is defined as having five or more people whom that individual could turn to for help in an emergency if they are physically injured, require emotional support, shelter, and/or financial assistance.
- 4 A 'strong sense of belonging to community' is rating one's own sense of belonging to their community as a 4 or a 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "very weak" and 5 "very strong".
- 5 'High neighbourhood trust' is rating one's own trust in the people in one's neighbourhood as 4 or 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "cannot be trusted at all" and 5 represents "can be trusted a lot", as well as having a response of "very likely" when asked about the likelihood of someone in their neighbourhood returning a lost wallet or purse containing two hundred dollars with the money still inside.
- 6 A 'high level of self-efficacy' is derived from having a high self-rating on a scale of 1 (poor) to 5 (excellent) for the following three categories: an ability to think clearly and solve day-to-day problems, to handle unexpected and difficult problems, and to figure out what to do if faced with an emergency situation.
- 7 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were equal to 16% for 'Fire safety measures'.
- 8 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Fire safety measures'.
- 9 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Planning activities'.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents. Households with 'moderately high' or 'high' levels of emergency planning engaged in 3 or 4 of the following: having an exit plan, an emergency supply kit, extra copies of important documents and an emergency contact list. 'Moderately high' or 'high' levels of precautionary measures include having 3 or 4 of the following: a wind-up or battery operated radio, a back-up generator, an alternate source of heat and additional water. 'Moderately high' or 'high' levels of fire safety measure include having all 3 of the following: a working smoke detector, a working fire extinguisher, and a working carbon monoxide detector.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

## Notes

<sup>E</sup> use with caution

- 1 A Census Metropolitan Area (CMA) or a Census Agglomeration (CA) is formed by one or more adjacent municipalities centred on a population centre (known as the core). A CMA must have a total population of at least 100,000 of which 50,000 or more must live in the core. A CA must have a core population of at least 10,000. To be included in the CMA or CA, other adjacent municipalities must have a high degree of integration with the core as measured by commuting flows derived from census data.
- 2 The target population for the SEPR included all persons 15 years of age or older, residing in households in Canada's 10 provinces, excluding full-time residents of institutions (e.g., nursing homes, group homes, hospitals).
- 3 The SEPR covers three types of communities: Census Metropolitan Areas (CMAs), Census Agglomerations (CAs) with population greater than 50,000, and 'smaller communities' which include CAs with population 50,000 or less and those areas that fall outside of CMAs and CAs. All CMAs and CAs (with population greater than 50,000) were included in the SEPR. A sample of households were selected from smaller communities within each province to represent all households within the province in similar communities. Additional information on the SEPR and its sampling methodology can be found in the 'Survey description' section.
- 4 Throughout this fact sheet, responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.
- 5 This section focuses on personal experiences with emergencies or disasters that happened in Canada, in a community where the person was living at the time, and was significant enough to severely interrupt the individual's regular daily activities.

- 6 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% when respondents were asked about the source of information or assistance they received during or immediately following the emergency they experienced.
- 7 Emergency planning activities include: having an emergency exit plan, a household emergency supply kit, extra copies of important documents and an emergency contact list.
- 8 Precautionary measures include: having a wind-up or battery-operated radio, an alternate heat source such as a non-electric stove or heater or a wood-burning fireplace, a back-up generator and an alternative water source such as a well, tank or litres of stored water.
- 9 Unless otherwise specified, differences are statistically significant ( $p < 0.05$ ).
- 10 A 'strong sense of belonging to community' is rating one's own sense of belonging to their community as a 4 or a 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "very weak" and 5 "very strong".
- 11 A proportion (15%) of respondents were not asked questions regarding neighbourhood helpfulness in the event of an emergency and as such these cases are not included in the analysis on neighbourhood helpfulness in general or in the event of an emergency.
- 12 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% when respondents were asked about the number of people they could turn to for help if financial support is needed.



## Fact sheet

Community of Kelowna (CMA), British Columbia

---

In 2014, information on the emergency preparedness of people living in the Census Metropolitan Area<sup>1</sup> of Kelowna was collected through the Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada (SEPR).<sup>2</sup> This fact sheet presents information on the risk awareness and level of emergency preparedness of the residents of Kelowna, which could help improve the understanding of community resilience in the event of an emergency.<sup>3,4</sup>

**Risk awareness and anticipated sources of help in an emergency or disaster**

- Wildfires (96%), heat waves (67%), extended power outages lasting 24 hours or longer (63%) and droughts (58%) were named by residents of Kelowna as the events most likely to occur in their community.
- Residents most commonly reported that they would anticipate turning to a hospital, clinic, doctor or other medical professional in the event of an outbreak of a serious or life-threatening disease (45%) and to their utility company in the event of an extended power outage (44%) (Table 1.1).
- Residents most commonly stated that they would anticipate turning to police or law enforcement in the event of rioting or civil unrest (39%) or an act of terrorism or terrorist threat (27%<sup>E</sup>). Residents also reported that they anticipated turning to local government if they faced a contamination or shortage of water or food (39%), to news on the Internet if they faced an industrial or transportation accident (29%), and to news on the radio if they faced a weather-related emergency or natural disaster (27%).

**Prior lifetime experience with a major emergency or disaster<sup>5</sup>**

- Over half (54%) of Kelowna residents have faced a major emergency or disaster in Canada in a community they were living in at the time of the event, nearly two-thirds (64%) of whom reported experiencing severe disruptions to their daily activities as a result of the event.
- Wildfires (75%) were the most commonly experienced emergency or disaster by residents of Kelowna, followed by winter storms (including blizzards and ice storms) (9%<sup>E</sup>) and extended power outages lasting 24 hours or longer (7%<sup>E</sup>).
- Common types of disruption to daily activities endured by residents who had experienced major emergencies or disasters included missing an appointment or planned activity (54%), missing work or school (46%), an inability to use electrical appliances at home (33%<sup>E</sup>), and an inability to heat or cool the home (29%<sup>E</sup>). More severe disruptions experienced were home evacuation (59%), an inability to use roads or transportation in the community (31%), and an inability to communicate outside the home (6%<sup>E</sup>).
- Six in ten (59%) residents who experienced an emergency or disaster were able to resume their daily activities within one week of the event: 10%<sup>E</sup> within 24 hours, 14%<sup>E</sup> within one to two days, 20%<sup>E</sup> within three to five days and 14%<sup>E</sup> within six to seven days.
- Nearly three-quarters (73%) of residents who had experienced an emergency or disaster received help during or immediately following the event, most commonly from family (32%<sup>E</sup>), first responders (28%<sup>E</sup>) or police (27%<sup>E</sup>).
- One in five (19%<sup>E</sup>) residents of Kelowna who experienced a major emergency or disaster in Canada in a community where they were living at the time of the event and which was significant enough to disrupt their regular daily routine

also endured a loss of property or financial impact. Long-term emotional or psychological consequences were experienced by one in ten (12%<sup>E</sup>) individuals affected by a major emergency or disaster.

## Emergency planning, precautionary and fire safety behaviours

- Nearly three-quarters (73%) of people residing in Kelowna lived in households that were engaged in at least two emergency planning activities,<sup>6</sup> and one-half (50%) lived in households with three or four such activities (Table 1.2). Nearly one in ten (8%<sup>E</sup>) people lived in a household that had not participated in any emergency planning activities.
- Half (51%) lived in a household with at least two precautionary measures<sup>7</sup> taken in case of an emergency, and one-quarter (25%) lived in a household with three or four such measures. One-fifth (20%) of people lived in a household with no precautionary measures in place.
- Nearly all (98%) residents reported living in a household with a working smoke detector, and three in four (74%) reported living in a household with a working fire extinguisher (Table 1.3). Two in three (65%) residents stated that they had a working carbon monoxide detector in their household. Overall, approximately one-half (52%) of residents of Kelowna stated that they had implemented all three fire safety measures in their household.
- In general, the number of emergency planning activities and precautionary measures residents of Kelowna engaged in did not differ significantly from residents in British Columbia and Canada's 10 provinces overall. There were a couple exceptions: for instance, residents of Kelowna were more likely to have no precautionary measures in place (20%) and less likely to have all four precautionary measures in place (4%<sup>E</sup>) compared to residents of British Columbia (13% and 8%, respectively) and Canada (16% and 7%, respectively). In terms of fire safety measures, residents of Kelowna were more likely to have all three fire safety measures in place (52%) compared to those on a provincial (38%) and national (42%) level.<sup>8</sup>
- There were some differences in the types of activities and measures in place by residents of Kelowna when compared to British Columbia and Canada in general. Kelowna residents were less likely to have a wind-up or battery-operated radio (50%) or a household emergency supply kit (42%) compared to those in British Columbia (59% and 55%, respectively) and Canada (58% and 47%, respectively).

## Social networks and sense of belonging

- Close to six in ten (57%) Kelowna residents had a strong sense of belonging<sup>9</sup> to their community.
- Most (84%) residents described the neighbourhood they lived in as a place where neighbours generally help each other.<sup>10</sup> Of those who did not describe their neighbourhood this way, most (80%) still described it as a place where neighbours would help each other in an emergency.<sup>11</sup>
- The majority of individuals had a large network of support in the event of an emergency or disaster, with more than five people to turn to for emotional support (70%), for help if physically injured (66%) and in the event of a home evacuation (64%). About three in ten (32%) residents had a large support network if financial help was needed, and one in ten (10%) reported that they had no one to turn to for financial help.<sup>12</sup>
- Generally, involvement in social or political activities did not have a significant impact on the level of emergency preparedness of the residents of Kelowna (Table 1.4).

## Data tables

Table 1.1

Most commonly anticipated sources of initial help and information, by type of emergency or disaster, residents of Kelowna, British Columbia, 2014

Most common sources of initial help and information by type of emergency or disaster	percent
<b>Weather-related emergency or natural disaster</b>	
News- Radio	27
News- Internet	26
News- Television	24
<b>Extended power outages</b>	

Utility company	44
News- Radio	17
Local government	11 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Outbreak of serious or life-threatening disease</b>	
Hospital, clinic, doctor or other medical professional	45
News- Internet	21
News- Radio	19
<b>Industrial or transportation accident</b>	
News- Internet	29
News- Radio	20
Police/law enforcement	19 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Contamination or shortage of water or food</b>	
Local government	39
News- Radio	21
News- Internet	19
<b>Act of terrorism or terrorist threat</b>	
Police/law enforcement	27 <sup>E</sup>
News- Internet	24 <sup>E</sup>
News- Television	19 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Rioting or civil unrest</b>	
Police/law enforcement	39
News- Internet	25 <sup>E</sup>
News- Television	19 <sup>E</sup>
<sup>E</sup> use with caution	
<b>Note:</b> Respondents who perceived their community was at risk for any form of emergency or disaster were then asked where they would turn to first for information or assistance in the event of the perceived emergency or disaster. Respondents could provide more than one response. Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.	
<b>Source:</b> Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.	

**Table 1.2**  
**Number of emergency planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents, community of Kelowna, British Columbia, 2014**

Number of planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents	Kelowna	British Columbia	Canada
	percent		
<b>Number of emergency planning activities</b>			
None	8 <sup>E</sup>	6	8
1 activity	17	15	17
2 activities	23	22	25
3 activities	31	29	27
4 activities	19 <sup>*</sup>	25	19
<b>Number of precautionary measures</b>			
None	20 <sup>***</sup>	13	16
1 measure	26	24	27
2 measures	26	27	28
3 measures	21	23	20
4 measures	4 <sup>E ***</sup>	8	7
<b>Number of fire safety measures</b> <sup>1 2 3</sup>			



None	F	1 <sup>E</sup>	1
1 measure	9 <sup>***</sup>	14	14
2 measures	32 <sup>***</sup>	40	38
3 measures	52 <sup>***</sup>	38	42
<sup>E</sup> use with caution <sup>F</sup> too unreliable to be published * significantly different from provincial level estimate (p < 0.05) *** significantly different from both provincial and Canada level estimates (p < 0.05) 1 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Canada'. 2 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'British Columbia'. 3 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Kelowna'. <b>Note:</b> Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents. Emergency planning activities include: an emergency exit plan, an emergency supply kit, photocopies/electronic copies of important documents and a list of emergency contact numbers. Precautionary measures include: a battery-operated or wind-up radio, an alternate heat source, a back-up generator and an alternative water source. Fire safety measures include a working smoke detector, a working carbon monoxide detector and a working fire extinguisher. <b>Source:</b> Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.			

**Table 1.3**  
**Planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures residents engaged in, community of Kelowna, British Columbia, 2014**

Residents whose households were involved in the following:	Kelowna	British Columbia	Canada
	percent		
<b>Emergency planning activities</b>			
Emergency exit plan	73 <sup>**</sup>	71	60
Exit plan has been practised/reviewed in last 12 months <sup>1</sup>	50	49	46
Designated meeting place for household members <sup>2</sup>	38	38	33
Contact plan for household members <sup>2</sup>	52	54	55
Household emergency supply kit	42 <sup>***</sup>	55	47
Vehicle emergency supply kit <sup>3</sup>	62	58	59
Extra copies of important documents	55	55	53
List of emergency contact numbers	65	68	69
Plan for meeting special health needs <sup>4</sup>	70	61	62
<b>Precautionary measures</b>			
Wind-up or battery-operated radio	50 <sup>***</sup>	59	58
Alternate heat source	48 <sup>*</sup>	55	48
Back-up generator	19	22	23
Alternate water source	41 <sup>*</sup>	48	43
Other <sup>5</sup>	23	21	21
<b>Fire safety measures</b>			
Working smoke detector	98 <sup>*</sup>	95	98
Working carbon monoxide detector <sup>6</sup>	65 <sup>*</sup>	52	60
Working fire extinguisher	74 <sup>**</sup>	69	66

\* significantly different from provincial level estimate (p < 0.05)

\*\* significantly different from Canada level estimate (p < 0.05)

\*\*\* significantly different from both provincial and Canada level estimates (p < 0.05)

1 Percentage based only on those indicating that they have an emergency exit plan.

2 Excludes Canadians living in single-person households.

3 Excludes those who reported that they lived in a household that did not have a vehicle.

4 Percentage based only on those indicating that they or someone in their household has special medical needs.

5 'Other precautionary measures' include having an escape/rescue plan for pets, extra supply of fuel, checking and replenishing emergency supplies, and keeping exits clear.

6 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'British Columbia'.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

**Table 1.4**

**High or moderately high levels of emergency planning, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents, by social and political involvement, community of Kelowna, British Columbia, 2014**

Social and political involvement	Percentage of residents who had high or moderately high levels of...		
	Planning activities	Precautionary measures	Fire safety measures
	percent		
<b>Engagement in political activities <sup>1</sup></b>			
Yes <sup>†</sup>	49	24	52
No	57	29 <sup>E</sup>	49
<b>High level of civic engagement <sup>2</sup></b>			
Yes <sup>7†</sup>	52	24	53
No	48	25	49
<b>High level of social support <sup>3</sup></b>			
Yes <sup>7†</sup>	60	29	55
No	47 <sup>*</sup>	23	50
<b>Strong sense of belonging to community <sup>4</sup></b>			
Yes <sup>7†</sup>	56	29	53
No	45	20 <sup>E</sup>	50
<b>High neighbourhood trust <sup>5</sup></b>			
Yes <sup>†</sup>	51	26	60
No <sup>7</sup>	51	24	46 <sup>*</sup>
<b>High level of self-efficacy <sup>6</sup></b>			
Yes <sup>7†</sup>	54	28	52
No	47	21 <sup>E</sup>	52

<sup>E</sup> use with caution

\* significantly different from reference category ( $p < 0.05$ )

† reference category

- 1 Includes individuals over the age of 17 years who are eligible to vote, and who have participated in or volunteered for political parties or events in the past 12 months, including municipal, provincial, or federal elections, or expressed views on political or social issues through signing a petition, contacting news agencies or politicians, or attended a meeting involving social or community issues.
- 2 Civic engagement measures individuals over the age of 17 years who were involved in a recreational group or organization in the past 12 months, and includes engagement in political activities. A 'high level' is defined as having been involved in at least 4 activities in the past 12 months.
- 3 A 'high level of social support' is defined as having five or more people whom that individual could turn to for help in an emergency if they are physically injured, require emotional support, shelter, and/or financial assistance.
- 4 A 'strong sense of belonging to community' is rating one's own sense of belonging to their community as a 4 or a 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "very weak" and 5 "very strong".
- 5 'High neighbourhood trust' is rating one's own trust in the people in one's neighbourhood as 4 or 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "cannot be trusted at all" and 5 represents "can be trusted a lot", as well as having a response of "very likely" when asked about the likelihood of someone in their neighbourhood returning a lost wallet or purse containing two hundred dollars with the money still inside.
- 6 A 'high level of self-efficacy' is derived from having a high self-rating on a scale of 1 (poor) to 5 (excellent) for the following three categories: an ability to think clearly and solve day-to-day problems, to handle unexpected and difficult problems, and to figure out what to do if faced with an emergency situation.
- 7 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Fire safety measures'.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents. Households with 'moderately high' or 'high' levels of emergency planning engaged in 3 or 4 of the following: having an exit plan, an emergency supply kit, extra copies of important documents and an emergency contact list. 'Moderately high' or 'high' levels of precautionary measures include having 3 or 4 of the following: a wind-up or battery operated radio, a back-up generator, an alternate source of heat and additional water. 'Moderately high' or 'high' levels of fire safety measure include having all 3 of the following: a working smoke detector, a working fire extinguisher, and a working carbon monoxide detector.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

## Notes

<sup>E</sup> use with caution

- 1 A Census Metropolitan Area (CMA) or a Census Agglomeration (CA) is formed by one or more adjacent municipalities centred on a population centre (known as the core). A CMA must have a total population of at least 100,000 of which 50,000 or more must live in the core. A CA must have a core population of at least 10,000. To be included in the CMA or CA, other adjacent municipalities must have a high degree of integration with the core as measured by commuting flows derived from census data.
- 2 The target population for the SEPR included all persons 15 years of age or older, residing in households in Canada's 10 provinces, excluding full-time residents of institutions (e.g. nursing homes, group homes, hospitals).
- 3 The SEPR covers three types of communities: Census Metropolitan Areas (CMAs), Census Agglomerations (CAs) with population greater than 50,000, and 'smaller communities' which include CAs with population 50,000 or less and those areas that fall outside of CMAs and CAs. All CMAs and CAs (with population greater than 50,000) were included in the SEPR. A sample of households were selected from smaller communities within each province to represent all households within the province in similar communities. Additional information on the SEPR and its sampling methodology can be found in the 'Survey description' section.
- 4 Throughout this fact sheet, responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.
- 5 This section focuses on personal experiences with emergencies or disasters that happened in Canada, in a community where the person was living at the time, and was significant enough to severely interrupt the individual's regular daily activities.

- 6 Emergency planning activities include: having an emergency exit plan, a household emergency supply kit, extra copies of important documents and an emergency contact list.
- 7 Precautionary measures include: having a wind-up or battery-operated radio, an alternate heat source such as a non-electric stove or heater or a wood-burning fireplace, a back-up generator and an alternative water source such as a well, tank or litres of stored water.
- 8 Unless otherwise specified, differences are statistically significant ( $p < 0.05$ ).
- 9 A 'strong sense of belonging to community' is rating one's own sense of belonging to their community as a 4 or a 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "very weak" and 5 "very strong".
- 10 A proportion (13%) of respondents were not asked questions regarding neighbourhood helpfulness in the event of an emergency and as such these cases are not included in the analysis on neighbourhood helpfulness in general or in the event of an emergency.
- 11 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% when respondents were asked about whether their neighbourhood is a place where neighbours would help each other if there is an emergency.
- 12 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% when respondents were asked about the number of people they could turn to for help if financial support is needed.



## Fact sheet Community of Vernon (CA), British Columbia

---

In 2014, information on the emergency preparedness of people living in the Census Agglomeration<sup>1</sup> of Vernon was collected through the Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada (SEPR).<sup>2</sup> This fact sheet presents information on the risk awareness and level of emergency preparedness of the residents of Vernon, which could help improve the understanding of community resilience in the event of an emergency.<sup>3,4</sup>

### **Risk awareness and anticipated sources of help in an emergency or disaster**

- Wildfires (88%), extended power outages lasting 24 hours or longer (64%) and heat waves (59%) were named by residents of Vernon as the events most likely to occur in their community.
- Residents most commonly reported that they would anticipate turning to a hospital, clinic, doctor or other medical professional in the event of an outbreak of a serious or life-threatening disease (59%), to their utility company in the event of an extended power outage (59%), and to police or law enforcement in the event of an act of terrorism or terrorist threat (50%<sup>E</sup>) or rioting or civil unrest (40%) (Table 1.1).
- Residents also stated that they would most commonly anticipate turning to local government if they faced a contamination or shortage of water or food (39%), and to news on the radio if they faced a weather-related emergency or natural disaster (37%) or an industrial or transportation accident (30%).

### **Prior lifetime experience with a major emergency or disaster<sup>5</sup>**

- One-quarter (25%) of Vernon residents have faced a major emergency or disaster in Canada in a community they were living in at the time of the event, two-thirds (68%) of whom reported experiencing severe disruptions to their daily activities as a result of the event.
- Wildfires (44%<sup>E</sup>) were the most commonly experienced emergency or disaster by residents of Vernon, followed by floods (25%<sup>E</sup>).
- The most common types of disruption to daily activities endured by residents who had experienced major emergencies or disasters included missing an appointment or planned activity (62%) or missing work or school (54%). More severe disruptions experienced were home evacuation (42%<sup>E</sup>) and an inability to use roads or transportation in the community (19%<sup>E</sup>).
- Nearly two-thirds (65%) of residents who experienced an emergency or disaster were able to resume their daily activities within one week of the event; approximately one-quarter (23%<sup>E</sup>) of whom were able to resume their activities within six to seven days.
- Nearly three-quarters (73%) of residents who had experienced an emergency or disaster received help during or immediately following the event, most commonly from first responders (28%<sup>E</sup>).
- One-third (33%<sup>E</sup>) of residents of Vernon who experienced a major emergency or disaster in Canada in a community where they were living at the time of the event and which was significant enough to disrupt their regular daily routine also endured a loss of property or financial impact.

### **Emergency planning, precautionary and fire safety behaviours**

- Three-quarters (75%) of people residing in Vernon lived in households that were engaged in at least two emergency planning activities,<sup>6</sup> and one-half (49%) lived in households with three or four such activities (Table 1.2). Approximately one in twenty (6%<sup>E</sup>) people lived in a household that had not participated in any emergency planning activities.
- Nearly six in ten (57%) lived in a household with at least two precautionary measures<sup>7</sup> taken in case of an emergency, and three in ten (30%) lived in a household with three or four such measures. Less than one-fifth (17%) of people lived in a household with no precautionary measures in place.
- Nearly all (97%) residents reported living in a household with a working smoke detector, and three-quarters (76%) reported living in a household with a working fire extinguisher (Table 1.3). Two-thirds (66%) of residents stated that they had a working carbon monoxide detector in their household. Just over one-half (54%) of residents of Vernon stated that they had implemented all three fire safety measures in their household.
- In general, the number of emergency planning activities and precautionary measures residents of Vernon engaged in did not differ significantly from residents in British Columbia and Canada's 10 provinces overall. In terms of fire safety measures, residents of Vernon were more likely to have all three fire safety measures in place (54%) compared to those on a provincial (38%) and national (42%) level.<sup>8</sup>
- Whenever significant differences existed in the types of activities and measures in place by residents of Vernon compared to British Columbia and Canada, Vernon residents were almost always more prepared. For example, Vernon residents were more likely to have a working fire extinguisher (76%) and a vehicle emergency supply kit (70%) than those in British Columbia (69% and 58%, respectively) and Canada (66% and 59%, respectively).

## Social networks and sense of belonging

- Six in ten (59%) residents of Vernon had a strong sense of belonging<sup>9</sup> to their community.
- The vast majority (89%) of residents described the neighbourhood they lived in as a place where neighbours generally help each other.<sup>10</sup> Of those who did not describe their neighbourhood this way, most (90%) still described it as a place where neighbours would help each other in an emergency.
- The majority of individuals had a large network of support in the event of an emergency or disaster, with more than five people to turn to for emotional support (65%), for help if physically injured (60%) and in the event of a home evacuation (58%). Three in ten (30%) residents had a large support network if financial help was needed, and one in ten (11%<sup>E</sup>) reported that they had no one to turn to for financial help.<sup>11</sup>
- High levels of sense of belonging, social support, self-efficacy and neighbourhood trust were often associated with a higher level of emergency preparedness (Table 1.4).

## Data tables

Table 1.1

Most commonly anticipated sources of initial help and information, by type of emergency or disaster, residents of Vernon, British Columbia, 2014

Most common sources of initial help and information by type of emergency or disaster	percent
<b>Weather-related emergency or natural disaster<sup>1</sup></b>	
News- Radio	37
News- Television	23
News- Internet	21
<b>Extended power outages</b>	
Utility company	59
News- Radio	12 <sup>E</sup>
Neighbours	5 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Outbreak of serious or life-threatening disease</b>	
Hospital, clinic, doctor or other medical professional	59
News- Internet	20 <sup>E</sup>

News- Radio	14 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Industrial or transportation accident</b>	
News- Radio	30
Police/law enforcement	20 <sup>E</sup>
News- Internet	18 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Contamination or shortage of water or food</b>	
Local government	39
News- Radio	18 <sup>E</sup>
News- Internet	15 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Act of terrorism or terrorist threat <sup>2</sup></b>	
Police/law enforcement	50 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Rioting or civil unrest</b>	
Police/law enforcement	40
News- Radio	29 <sup>E</sup>
<sup>E</sup> use with caution	
1 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% when respondents were asked about their likely sources of initial help and information.	
2 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were equal to 13% for sources of initial help and information.	
<b>Note:</b> Respondents who perceived their community was at risk for any form of emergency or disaster were then asked where they would turn to first for information or assistance in the event of the perceived emergency or disaster. Respondents could provide more than one response. Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.	
<b>Source:</b> Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.	

**Table 1.2**  
**Number of emergency planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents, community of Vernon, British Columbia, 2014**

Number of planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents	Vernon	British Columbia	Canada
	percent		
<b>Number of emergency planning activities</b>			
None	6 <sup>E</sup>	6	8
1 activity	16	15	17
2 activities	26	22	25
3 activities	30	29	27
4 activities	19 *	25	19
<b>Number of precautionary measures</b>			
None	17	13	16
1 measure	23	24	27
2 measures	27	27	28
3 measures	21	23	20
4 measures	9 <sup>E</sup>	8	7
<b>Number of fire safety measures <sup>1 2</sup></b>			
None	F	1 <sup>E</sup>	1
1 measure	9 <sup>E</sup> ***	14	14
2 measures	32 *	40	38
3 measures	54 ***	38	42

E use with caution  
 F too unreliable to be published

\* significantly different from provincial level estimate (p < 0.05)

\*\*\* significantly different from both provincial and Canada level estimates (p < 0.05)

1 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Canada'.

2 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'British Columbia'.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents. Emergency planning activities include: an emergency exit plan, an emergency supply kit, photocopies/electronic copies of important documents and a list of emergency contact numbers. Precautionary measures include: a battery-operated or wind-up radio, an alternative heat source, a back-up generator and an alternative water source. Fire safety measures include a working smoke detector, a working carbon monoxide detector and a working fire extinguisher.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

**Table 1.3**  
**Planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures residents engaged in, community of Vernon, British Columbia, 2014**

Residents whose households were involved in the following:	Vernon	British Columbia	Canada
	percent		
<b>Emergency planning activities</b>			
Emergency exit plan	70 **	71	60
Exit plan has been practised/reviewed in last 12 months <sup>1</sup>	51	49	46
Designated meeting place for household members <sup>2</sup>	39	38	33
Contact plan for household members <sup>2</sup>	51	54	55
Household emergency supply kit	46 <sup>†</sup>	55	47
Vehicle emergency supply kit <sup>3</sup>	70 ***	58	59
Extra copies of important documents	56	55	53
List of emergency contact numbers	66	68	69
Plan for meeting special health needs <sup>4</sup>	53	61	62
<b>Precautionary measures</b>			
Wind-up or battery-operated radio	53	59	58
Alternate heat source	56 **	55	48
Back-up generator	22	22	23
Alternate water source	46	48	43
Other <sup>5</sup>	23	21	21
<b>Fire safety measures</b>			
Working smoke detector	97	95	98
Working carbon monoxide detector <sup>6</sup>	66 <sup>†</sup>	52	60
Working fire extinguisher	76 ***	69	66



\* significantly different from provincial level estimate (p < 0.05)

\*\* significantly different from Canada level estimate (p < 0.05)

\*\*\* significantly different from both provincial and Canada level estimates (p < 0.05)

1 Percentage based only on those indicating that they have an emergency exit plan.

2 Excludes Canadians living in single-person households.

3 Excludes those who reported that they lived in a household that did not have a vehicle.

4 Percentage based only on those indicating that they or someone in their household has special medical needs.

5 'Other precautionary measures' include having an escape/rescue plan for pets, extra supply of fuel, checking and replenishing emergency supplies, and keeping exits clear.

6 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'British Columbia'.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

**Table 1.4**

**High or moderately high levels of emergency planning, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents, by social and political involvement, community of Vernon, British Columbia, 2014**

Social and political involvement	Percentage of residents who had high or moderately high levels of...		
	Planning activities	Precautionary measures	Fire safety measures
	percent		
<b>Engagement in political activities <sup>1</sup></b>			
Yes †	50	31	55
No	48 <sup>E</sup>	F	47 <sup>E</sup>
<b>High level of civic engagement <sup>2</sup></b>			
Yes †	52	33	55
No	43	22 <sup>E</sup>	50
<b>High level of social support <sup>3</sup></b>			
Yes †	61	36 <sup>E</sup>	69
No	44 *	28	48 *
<b>Strong sense of belonging to community <sup>4</sup></b>			
Yes †	53	34	62
No	45	24 <sup>E</sup>	43 *
<b>High neighbourhood trust <sup>5</sup></b>			
Yes †	59	39	58
No <sup>7</sup>	40 *	22 <sup>E</sup> *	52
<b>High level of self-efficacy <sup>6</sup></b>			
Yes †	57	35	60
No	40 *	23 <sup>E</sup> *	47

<sup>E</sup> use with caution

<sup>F</sup> too unreliable to be published

\* significantly different from reference category ( $p < 0.05$ )

† reference category

- 1 Includes individuals over the age of 17 years who are eligible to vote, and who have participated in or volunteered for political parties or events in the past 12 months, including municipal, provincial, or federal elections, or expressed views on political or social issues through signing a petition, contacting news agencies or politicians, or attended a meeting involving social or community issues.
- 2 Civic engagement measures individuals over the age of 17 years who were involved in a recreational group or organization in the past 12 months, and includes engagement in political activities. A 'high level' is defined as having been involved in at least 4 activities in the past 12 months.
- 3 A 'high level of social support' is defined as having five or more people whom that individual could turn to for help in an emergency if they are physically injured, require emotional support, shelter, and/or financial assistance.
- 4 A 'strong sense of belonging to community' is rating one's own sense of belonging to their community as a 4 or a 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "very weak" and 5 "very strong".
- 5 'High neighbourhood trust' is rating one's own trust in the people in one's neighbourhood as 4 or 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "cannot be trusted at all" and 5 represents "can be trusted a lot", as well as having a response of "very likely" when asked about the likelihood of someone in their neighbourhood returning a lost wallet or purse containing two hundred dollars with the money still inside.
- 6 A 'high level of self-efficacy' is derived from having a high self-rating on a scale of 1 (poor) to 5 (excellent) for the following three categories: an ability to think clearly and solve day-to-day problems, to handle unexpected and difficult problems, and to figure out what to do if faced with an emergency situation.
- 7 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Planning activities'.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents. Households with 'moderately high' or 'high' levels of emergency planning engaged in 3 or 4 of the following: having an exit plan, an emergency supply kit, extra copies of important documents and an emergency contact list. 'Moderately high' or 'high' levels of precautionary measures include having 3 or 4 of the following: a wind-up or battery operated radio, a back-up generator, an alternate source of heat and additional water. 'Moderately high' or 'high' levels of fire safety measure include having all 3 of the following: a working smoke detector, a working fire extinguisher, and a working carbon monoxide detector.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

## Notes

<sup>E</sup> use with caution

- 1 A Census Metropolitan Area (CMA) or a Census Agglomeration (CA) is formed by one or more adjacent municipalities centred on a population centre (known as the core). A CMA must have a total population of at least 100,000 of which 50,000 or more must live in the core. A CA must have a core population of at least 10,000. To be included in the CMA or CA, other adjacent municipalities must have a high degree of integration with the core as measured by commuting flows derived from census data.
- 2 The target population for the SEPR included all persons 15 years of age or older, residing in households in Canada's 10 provinces, excluding full-time residents of institutions (e.g. nursing homes, group homes, hospitals).
- 3 The SEPR covers three types of communities: Census Metropolitan Areas (CMAs), Census Agglomerations (CAs) with population greater than 50,000, and 'smaller communities' which include CAs with population 50,000 or less and those areas that fall outside of CMAs and CAs. All CMAs and CAs (with population greater than 50,000) were included in the SEPR. A sample of households were selected from smaller communities within each province to represent all households within the province in similar communities. Additional information on the SEPR and its sampling methodology can be found in the 'Survey description' section.
- 4 Throughout this fact sheet, responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.
- 5 This section focuses on personal experiences with emergencies or disasters that happened in Canada, in a community where the person was living at the time, and was significant enough to severely interrupt the individual's regular daily activities.

- 6 Emergency planning activities include: having an emergency exit plan, a household emergency supply kit, extra copies of important documents and an emergency contact list.
- 7 Precautionary measures include: having a wind-up or battery-operated radio, an alternate heat source such as a non-electric stove or heater or a wood-burning fireplace, a back-up generator and an alternative water source such as a well, tank or litres of stored water.
- 8 Unless otherwise specified, differences are statistically significant ( $p < 0.05$ ).
- 9 A 'strong sense of belonging to community' is rating one's own sense of belonging to their community as a 4 or a 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "very weak" and 5 "very strong".
- 10 A proportion (17%) of respondents were not asked questions regarding neighbourhood helpfulness in the event of an emergency and as such these cases are not included in the analysis on neighbourhood helpfulness in general or in the event of an emergency.
- 11 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% when respondents were asked about the number of people they could turn to for help if financial support is needed.



## Fact sheet

# Community of Kamloops (CA), British Columbia

---

In 2014, information on the emergency preparedness of people living in the Census Agglomeration<sup>1</sup> of Kamloops was collected through the Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada (SEPR).<sup>2</sup> This fact sheet presents information on the risk awareness and level of emergency preparedness of the residents of Kamloops, which could help improve the understanding of community resilience in the event of an emergency.<sup>3,4</sup>

### **Risk awareness and anticipated sources of help in an emergency or disaster**

- Wildfires (91%), industrial or transportation accidents (70%), or winter storms (including blizzards, ice storms and extreme cold) (65%) were named by residents of Kamloops as the events most likely to occur in their community.
- Residents most commonly reported that they would anticipate turning to a hospital, clinic, doctor or other medical professional in the event of an outbreak of a serious or life-threatening disease (60%), to their utility company in the event of an extended power outage lasting 24 hours or longer (59%), and to police or law enforcement in the event of rioting or civil unrest (45%<sup>E</sup>) (Table 1.1).
- Residents also most commonly stated that they would anticipate turning to local government if they faced a contamination or shortage of water or food (38%), and to news on the radio if they faced an act of terrorism or terrorist threat (35%<sup>E</sup>), a weather-related emergency or natural disaster (29%) or an industrial or transportation accident (29%).

### **Prior lifetime experience with a major emergency or disaster<sup>5</sup>**

- Approximately one-quarter (27%) of Kamloops residents have faced a major emergency or disaster in Canada in a community they were living in at the time of the event, six in ten (61%) of whom reported experiencing severe disruptions to their daily activities as a result of the event.
- Wildfires (70%) were the most commonly experienced emergency or disaster by residents of Kamloops.
- Common types of disruption to daily activities endured by residents who had experienced major emergencies or disasters included missing an appointment or planned activity (68%) and missing work or school (40%<sup>E</sup>). More severe disruptions experienced were home evacuation (55%) and an inability to use roads or transportation in the community (33%<sup>E</sup>).
- Nearly two-thirds (64%) of residents who experienced an emergency or disaster were able to resume their daily activities within one week of the event.
- Six in ten (61%) residents who had experienced an emergency or disaster received help during or immediately following the event, most commonly from a family member (38%<sup>E</sup>).
- One-quarter (24%<sup>E</sup>) of residents of Kamloops who experienced a major emergency or disaster in Canada in a community where they were living at the time of the event and which was significant enough to disrupt their regular daily routine also endured a loss of property or financial impact.

### **Emergency planning, precautionary and fire safety behaviours**

- Nearly three-quarters (73%) of people residing in Kamloops lived in households that were engaged in at least two emergency planning activities,<sup>6</sup> and more than half (54%) lived in households with three or four such activities (Table

- 1.2). One in twenty (5%<sup>E</sup>) people lived in a household that had not participated in any emergency planning activities.
- Nearly half (48%) lived in a household with at least two precautionary measures<sup>7</sup> taken in case of an emergency, and more than one in five (22%) lived in a household with three or four such measures. Less than one in five (18%) people lived in a household with no precautionary measures in place.
  - Nearly all (96%) residents reported living in a household with a working smoke detector, and nearly three-quarters (72%) reported living in a household with a working fire extinguisher (Table 1.3). Six in ten (59%) residents stated that they had a working carbon monoxide detector in their household. Almost one-half (45%) of residents of Kamloops stated that they had implemented all three fire safety measures in their household.
  - The number of emergency planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents of Kamloops sometimes differed from residents in British Columbia and Canada's 10 provinces overall. For instance, residents of Kamloops were less likely to have implemented all four precautionary measures (4%<sup>E</sup>) than those in British Columbia (8%) and Canada (7%).<sup>8</sup>
  - There were some differences in the types of activities and measures in place by residents of Kamloops when compared to British Columbia and Canada in general. For example, Kamloops residents were more likely to have a vehicle emergency supply kit (71%) but less likely to have a wind-up or battery-operated radio (51%) or an alternate water source (34%) compared to residents of British Columbia (58%, 59% and 48%, respectively) and Canada (59%, 58% and 43%, respectively).

## Social networks and sense of belonging

- Over half (56%) of residents of Kamloops had a strong sense of belonging<sup>9</sup> to their community.
- More than eight in ten (84%) residents described the neighbourhood they lived in as a place where neighbours generally help each other.<sup>10</sup> Of those who did not describe their neighbourhood this way, most (80%) still described it as a place where neighbours would help each other in an emergency.<sup>11</sup>
- Approximately six in ten individuals had a large network of support in the event of an emergency or disaster, with more than five people to turn to for emotional support (62%), for help if physically injured (61%) and in the event of a home evacuation (58%).<sup>12</sup> Nearly one-quarter (23%) of residents had a large support network if financial help was needed, and 11%<sup>E</sup> reported that they had no one to turn to for financial help.<sup>13</sup>
- High levels of sense of belonging, social support, self-efficacy and neighbourhood trust were sometimes associated with a higher level of emergency preparedness (Table 1.4).

## Data tables

Table 1.1

Most commonly anticipated sources of initial help and information, by type of emergency or disaster, residents of Kamloops, British Columbia, 2014

Most common sources of initial help and information by type of emergency or disaster	percent
<b>Weather-related emergency or natural disaster</b>	
News- Radio	29
News- Television	21
News- Internet	21
<b>Extended power outages</b>	
Utility company	59
News- Radio	12 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Outbreak of serious or life-threatening disease</b>	
Hospital, clinic, doctor or other medical professional	60
News- Internet	15 <sup>E</sup>
News- Radio	15 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Industrial or transportation accident</b>	

News- Radio	29
News- Television	21
Police/law enforcement	17 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Contamination or shortage of water or food <sup>1</sup></b>	
Local government	38
News- Radio	16 <sup>E</sup>
News- Television	12 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Act of terrorism or terrorist threat</b>	
News- Radio	35 <sup>E</sup>
News- Television	21 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Rioting or civil unrest <sup>1</sup></b>	
Police/law enforcement	45 <sup>E</sup>
<sup>E</sup> use with caution	
1 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% when respondents were asked about their likely sources of initial help and information.	
<b>Note:</b> Respondents who perceived their community was at risk for any form of emergency or disaster were then asked where they would turn to first for information or assistance in the event of the perceived emergency or disaster. Respondents could provide more than one response. Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.	
<b>Source:</b> Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.	

**Table 1.2**

**Number of emergency planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents, community of Kamloops, British Columbia, 2014**

Number of planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents	Kamloops	British Columbia	Canada
	percent		
<b>Number of emergency planning activities</b>			
None	5 <sup>E</sup> **	6	8
1 activity	20	15	17
2 activities	19 **	22	25
3 activities	33	29	27
4 activities	21	25	19
<b>Number of precautionary measures</b>			
None	18	13	16
1 measure	32 *	24	27
2 measures	26	27	28
3 measures	18 <sup>E</sup>	23	20
4 measures	4 <sup>E</sup> ***	8	7
<b>Number of fire safety measures <sup>1 2</sup></b>			
None	F	1 <sup>E</sup>	1
1 measure	9 <sup>E</sup> ***	14	14
2 measures	39	40	38
3 measures	45	38	42

<sup>E</sup> use with caution  
<sup>F</sup> too unreliable to be published

\* significantly different from provincial level estimate (p < 0.05)

\*\* significantly different from Canada level estimate (p < 0.05)

\*\*\* significantly different from both provincial and Canada level estimates (p < 0.05)

1 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Canada'.

2 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'British Columbia'.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents. Emergency planning activities include: an emergency exit plan, an emergency supply kit, photocopies/electronic copies of important documents and a list of emergency contact numbers. Precautionary measures include: a battery-operated or wind-up radio, an alternative heat source, a back-up generator and an alternative water source. Fire safety measures include a working smoke detector, a working carbon monoxide detector and a working fire extinguisher.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

**Table 1.3**  
**Planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures residents engaged in, community of Kamloops, British Columbia, 2014**

Residents whose households were involved in the following:	Kamloops	British Columbia	Canada
	percent		
<b>Emergency planning activities</b>			
Emergency exit plan	69 **	71	60
Exit plan has been practised/reviewed in last 12 months <sup>1</sup>	50	49	46
Designated meeting place for household members <sup>2</sup>	37	38	33
Contact plan for household members <sup>2</sup>	57	54	55
Household emergency supply kit	48	55	47
Vehicle emergency supply kit <sup>3</sup>	71 ***	58	59
Extra copies of important documents	59	55	53
List of emergency contact numbers	67	68	69
Plan for meeting special health needs <sup>4</sup>	71	61	62
<b>Precautionary measures</b>			
Wind-up or battery-operated radio	51 ***	59	58
Alternate heat source	51	55	48
Back-up generator	19	22	23
Alternate water source	34 ***	48	43
Other <sup>5</sup>	23	21	21
<b>Fire safety measures</b>			
Working smoke detector	96	95	98
Working carbon monoxide detector <sup>6</sup>	59	52	60
Working fire extinguisher	72	69	66

\*\* significantly different from Canada level estimate (p < 0.05)

\*\*\* significantly different from both provincial and Canada level estimates (p < 0.05)

1 Percentage based only on those indicating that they have an emergency exit plan.

2 Excludes Canadians living in single-person households.

3 Excludes those who reported that they lived in a household that did not have a vehicle.

4 Percentage based only on those indicating that they or someone in their household has special medical needs.

5 'Other precautionary measures' include having an escape/rescue plan for pets, extra supply of fuel, checking and replenishing emergency supplies, and keeping exits clear.

6 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'British Columbia'.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

**Table 1.4**  
**High or moderately high levels of emergency planning, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents, by social and political involvement, community of Kamloops, British Columbia, 2014**

Social and political involvement	Percentage of residents who had high or moderately high levels of...		
	Planning activities	Precautionary measures	Fire safety measures
	percent		
<b>Engagement in political activities <sup>1</sup></b>			
Yes †	54	25	48
No <sup>7</sup>	41 <sup>E</sup>	F	51 <sup>E</sup>
<b>High level of civic engagement <sup>2</sup></b>			
Yes †	55	26 <sup>E</sup>	46
No	46	17 <sup>E</sup>	53
<b>High level of social support <sup>3</sup></b>			
Yes <sup>8</sup> †	74	14 <sup>E</sup>	53
No	49 <sup>*</sup>	25	44
<b>Strong sense of belonging to community <sup>4</sup></b>			
Yes †	56	20	53
No	53	27 <sup>E</sup>	36 <sup>*</sup>
<b>High neighbourhood trust <sup>5</sup></b>			
Yes †	57	22 <sup>E</sup>	56
No	52	23 <sup>E</sup>	38 <sup>*</sup>
<b>High level of self-efficacy <sup>6</sup></b>			
Yes †	69	27	55
No	40 <sup>*</sup>	18 <sup>E</sup>	36 <sup>*</sup>



<sup>E</sup> use with caution

F too unreliable to be published

\* significantly different from reference category ( $p < 0.05$ )

† reference category

- 1 Includes individuals over the age of 17 years who are eligible to vote, and who have participated in or volunteered for political parties or events in the past 12 months, including municipal, provincial, or federal elections, or expressed views on political or social issues through signing a petition, contacting news agencies or politicians, or attended a meeting involving social or community issues.
- 2 Civic engagement measures individuals over the age of 17 years who were involved in a recreational group or organization in the past 12 months, and includes engagement in political activities. A 'high level' is defined as having been involved in at least 4 activities in the past 12 months.
- 3 A 'high level of social support' is defined as having five or more people whom that individual could turn to for help in an emergency if they are physically injured, require emotional support, shelter, and/or financial assistance.
- 4 A 'strong sense of belonging to community' is rating one's own sense of belonging to their community as a 4 or a 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "very weak" and 5 "very strong".
- 5 'High neighbourhood trust' is rating one's own trust in the people in one's neighbourhood as 4 or 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "cannot be trusted at all" and 5 represents "can be trusted a lot", as well as having a response of "very likely" when asked about the likelihood of someone in their neighbourhood returning a lost wallet or purse containing two hundred dollars with the money still inside.
- 6 A 'high level of self-efficacy' is derived from having a high self-rating on a scale of 1 (poor) to 5 (excellent) for the following three categories: an ability to think clearly and solve day-to-day problems, to handle unexpected and difficult problems, and to figure out what to do if faced with an emergency situation.
- 7 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Planning activities'.
- 8 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Fire safety measures'.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents. Households with 'moderately high' or 'high' levels of emergency planning engaged in 3 or 4 of the following: having an exit plan, an emergency supply kit, extra copies of important documents and an emergency contact list. 'Moderately high' or 'high' levels of precautionary measures include having 3 or 4 of the following: a wind-up or battery operated radio, a back-up generator, an alternate source of heat and additional water. 'Moderately high' or 'high' levels of fire safety measure include having all 3 of the following: a working smoke detector, a working fire extinguisher, and a working carbon monoxide detector.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

## Notes

<sup>E</sup> use with caution

- 1 A Census Metropolitan Area (CMA) or a Census Agglomeration (CA) is formed by one or more adjacent municipalities centred on a population centre (known as the core). A CMA must have a total population of at least 100,000 of which 50,000 or more must live in the core. A CA must have a core population of at least 10,000. To be included in the CMA or CA, other adjacent municipalities must have a high degree of integration with the core as measured by commuting flows derived from census data.
- 2 The target population for the SEPR included all persons 15 years of age or older, residing in households in Canada's 10 provinces, excluding full-time residents of institutions (e.g. nursing homes, group homes, hospitals).
- 3 The SEPR covers three types of communities: Census Metropolitan Areas (CMAs), Census Agglomerations (CAs) with population greater than 50,000, and 'smaller communities' which include CAs with population 50,000 or less and those areas that fall outside of CMAs and CAs. All CMAs and CAs (with population greater than 50,000) were included in the SEPR. A sample of households were selected from smaller communities within each province to represent all households within the province in similar communities. Additional information on the SEPR and its sampling methodology can be found in the 'Survey description' section.
- 4 Throughout this fact sheet, responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.
- 5 This section focuses on personal experiences with emergencies or disasters that happened in Canada, in a community where the person was living at the time, and was significant enough to severely interrupt the individual's regular daily activities.

- 6 Emergency planning activities include: having an emergency exit plan, a household emergency supply kit, extra copies of important documents and an emergency contact list.
- 7 Precautionary measures include: having a wind-up or battery-operated radio, an alternate heat source such as a non-electric stove or heater or a wood-burning fireplace, a back-up generator and an alternative water source such as a well, tank or litres of stored water.
- 8 Unless otherwise specified, differences are statistically significant ( $p < 0.05$ ).
- 9 A 'strong sense of belonging to community' is rating one's own sense of belonging to their community as a 4 or a 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "very weak" and 5 "very strong".
- 10 A proportion (22%) of respondents were not asked questions regarding neighbourhood helpfulness in the event of an emergency and as such these cases are not included in the analysis on neighbourhood helpfulness in general or in the event of an emergency.
- 11 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% when respondents were asked about whether their neighbourhood is a place where neighbours would help each other if there is an emergency.
- 12 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% when respondents were asked about the number of people they could turn to for help in case of home evacuation.
- 13 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% when respondents were asked about the number of people they could turn to for help if financial support is needed.



## Fact sheet

# Community of Chilliwack (CA), British Columbia

---

In 2014, information on the emergency preparedness of people living in the Census Agglomeration<sup>1</sup> of Chilliwack was collected through the Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada (SEPR).<sup>2</sup> This fact sheet presents information on the risk awareness and level of emergency preparedness of the residents of Chilliwack, which could help improve the understanding of community resilience in the event of an emergency.<sup>3,4</sup>

### Risk awareness and anticipated sources of help in an emergency or disaster

- Earthquakes (80%), floods (74%) and extended power outages lasting 24 hours or longer (68%) were named by residents of Chilliwack as the events most likely to occur in their community.
- Residents most commonly reported that they would anticipate turning to their utility company in the event of an extended power outage (62%), and to a hospital, clinic, doctor or other medical professional in the event of an outbreak of a serious or life-threatening disease (57%). Residents most commonly stated that they would turn to police or law enforcement if they faced rioting or civil unrest (51%<sup>E</sup>), or an act of terrorism or terrorist threat (30%<sup>E</sup>) (Table 1.1).
- Residents also stated that they anticipated turning to local government if they faced a contamination or shortage of water or food (34%), and to news on the radio if they faced a weather-related emergency or natural disaster (34%) or an industrial or transportation accident (21%<sup>E</sup>).

### Prior lifetime experience with a major emergency or disaster<sup>5</sup>

- Nearly one-quarter (23%) of Chilliwack residents have faced a major emergency or disaster in Canada in a community they were living in at the time of the event, six in ten (63%) of whom reported experiencing severe disruptions to their daily activities as a result of the event.
- Winter storms which include blizzards and ice storms (36%<sup>E</sup>) and floods (28%<sup>E</sup>) were the most commonly experienced emergency or disaster by residents of Chilliwack.
- The most common types of disruption to daily activities endured by residents who had experienced major emergencies or disasters included missing work or school (73%), missing an appointment or planned activity (62%), and an inability to use electrical appliances at home (53%<sup>E</sup>). A more severe disruption experienced was an inability to use roads or transportation in the community (52%<sup>E</sup>).
- Two-thirds (67%) of residents who experienced an emergency or disaster were able to resume their daily activities within one week of the event; nearly one-quarter (23%<sup>E</sup>) of whom were able to resume activities in one to two days.
- Six in ten (62%) residents who had experienced an emergency or disaster received help during or immediately following the event, most commonly from a family member (37%<sup>E</sup>) or a neighbour (30%<sup>E</sup>).
- One-third (33%<sup>E</sup>) of residents of Chilliwack who experienced a major emergency or disaster in Canada in a community where they were living at the time of the event and which was significant enough to disrupt their regular daily routine also endured a loss of property or financial impact.

### Emergency planning, precautionary and fire safety behaviours

- Three-quarters (75%) of people residing in Chilliwack lived in households that were engaged in at least two emergency planning activities,<sup>6</sup> and more than half (53%) lived in households with three or four such activities (Table 1.2). Less than one in ten (8%<sup>E</sup>) of people lived in a household that had not participated in any emergency planning activities.
- Two-thirds (66%) lived in a household with at least two precautionary measures<sup>7</sup> taken in case of an emergency, and more than one-third (38%) lived in a household with three or four such measures. One in ten (10%<sup>E</sup>) people lived in a household with no precautionary measures in place.
- Nearly all (99%) residents reported living in a household with a working smoke detector, and three-quarters (76%) reported living in a household with a working fire extinguisher (Table 1.3). Six in ten (61%) residents stated that they had a working carbon monoxide detector in their household. Almost one-half (48%) of Chilliwack residents stated that they had implemented all three fire safety measures in their household.
- The number of emergency planning activities and precautionary measures residents of Chilliwack engaged in did not often differ from residents in British Columbia and Canada's 10 provinces overall. Residents (26%) were, however, more likely to have all four emergency planning activities in place and less likely to have taken no precautionary measures (10%<sup>E</sup>) compared to Canadians (19% and 16%, respectively). In terms of fire safety measures, residents of Chilliwack were more likely than those in British Columbia to have all three measures in place (48% versus 38%).<sup>8</sup>
- There were some differences in the types of activities and measures in place by residents of Chilliwack when compared to Canada in general; when significant differences existed, Chilliwack residents were always more likely to have engaged in the activity or measure. For example, Chilliwack residents were more likely to have an emergency exit plan (68%), an alternate heat source (59%), a household emergency supply kit (56%), and an alternate water source (53%) compared to residents of Canada overall (60%, 48%, 47% and 43%, respectively).

## Social networks and sense of belonging

- Six in ten (60%) residents of Chilliwack had a strong sense of belonging<sup>9</sup> to their community.
- More than eight in ten (85%) residents described the neighbourhood they lived in as a place where neighbours generally help each other.<sup>10</sup> Of those who did not describe their neighbourhood this way, most (90%) still described it as a place where neighbours would help each other in an emergency.
- The majority of individuals had a large network of support in the event of an emergency or disaster, with more than five people to turn to for emotional support (67%), for help if physically injured (63%) and in the event of a home evacuation (61%). Approximately one-third (35%) of residents had a large support network if financial help was needed, and close to one in ten (7%<sup>E</sup>) reported that they had no one to turn to for financial help.
- High levels of social support, self-efficacy and civic engagement were often associated with a higher level of emergency preparedness (Table 1.4).

## Data tables

Table 1.1

Most commonly anticipated sources of initial help and information, by type of emergency or disaster, residents of Chilliwack, British Columbia, 2014

Most common sources of initial help and information by type of emergency or disaster	percent
<b>Weather-related emergency or natural disaster<sup>1</sup></b>	
News- Radio	34
News- Internet	18
Police/law enforcement	17
<b>Extended power outages</b>	
Utility company	62
News- Radio	15 <sup>E</sup>
Local government	8 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Outbreak of serious or life-threatening disease</b>	

Hospital, clinic, doctor or other medical professional	57
News- Radio	16 <sup>E</sup>
News- Internet	11 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Industrial or transportation accident <sup>1</sup></b>	
News- Radio	21 <sup>E</sup>
Police/law enforcement	19 <sup>E</sup>
News- Television	17 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Contamination or shortage of water or food <sup>2</sup></b>	
Local government	34
News- Radio	23 <sup>E</sup>
News- Television	12 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Act of terrorism or terrorist threat <sup>1</sup></b>	
Police/law enforcement	30 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Rioting or civil unrest</b>	
Police/law enforcement	51 <sup>E</sup>
<sup>E</sup> use with caution	
1 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% when respondents were asked about their likely sources of initial help and information.	
2 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were equal to 11% for sources of initial help and information.	
<b>Note:</b> Respondents who perceived their community was at risk for any form of emergency or disaster were then asked where they would turn to first for information or assistance in the event of the perceived emergency or disaster. Respondents could provide more than one response. Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.	
<b>Source:</b> Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.	

**Table 1.2**  
**Number of emergency planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents, community of Chilliwack, British Columbia, 2014**

Number of planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents	Chilliwack	British Columbia	Canada
	percent		
<b>Number of emergency planning activities</b>			
None	8 <sup>E</sup>	6	8
1 activity	16	15	17
2 activities	22	22	25
3 activities	27	29	27
4 activities	26 **	25	19
<b>Number of precautionary measures</b>			
None	10 <sup>E</sup> **	13	16
1 measure	22	24	27
2 measures	28	27	28
3 measures	27 **	23	20
4 measures	11 <sup>E</sup>	8	7
<b>Number of fire safety measures <sup>1 2</sup></b>			
None	F	1 <sup>E</sup>	1
1 measure	10 <sup>E</sup> ***	14	14
2 measures	37	40	38
3 measures	48 *	38	42

E use with caution  
 F too unreliable to be published

\* significantly different from provincial level estimate (p < 0.05)

\*\* significantly different from Canada level estimate (p < 0.05)

\*\*\* significantly different from both provincial and Canada level estimates (p < 0.05)

1 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Canada'.

2 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'British Columbia'.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents. Emergency planning activities include: an emergency exit plan, an emergency supply kit, photocopies/electronic copies of important documents and a list of emergency contact numbers. Precautionary measures include: a battery-operated or wind-up radio, an alternative heat source, a back-up generator and an alternative water source. Fire safety measures include a working smoke detector, a working carbon monoxide detector and a working fire extinguisher.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

**Table 1.3**  
**Planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures residents engaged in, community of Chilliwack, British Columbia, 2014**

Residents whose households were involved in the following:	Chilliwack	British Columbia	Canada
	percent		
<b>Emergency planning activities</b>			
Emergency exit plan	68 **	71	60
Exit plan has been practised/reviewed in last 12 months <sup>1</sup>	48	49	46
Designated meeting place for household members <sup>2</sup>	35	38	33
Contact plan for household members <sup>2</sup>	51	54	55
Household emergency supply kit	56 **	55	47
Vehicle emergency supply kit <sup>3</sup>	61	58	59
Extra copies of important documents	53	55	53
List of emergency contact numbers	71	68	69
Plan for meeting special health needs <sup>4</sup>	70	61	62
<b>Precautionary measures</b>			
Wind-up or battery-operated radio	64	59	58
Alternate heat source	59 **	55	48
Back-up generator	29 ***	22	23
Alternate water source	53 **	48	43
Other <sup>5</sup>	20	21	21
<b>Fire safety measures</b>			
Working smoke detector	99 *	95	98
Working carbon monoxide detector <sup>6</sup>	61 *	52	60
Working fire extinguisher	76 ***	69	66

\* significantly different from provincial level estimate (p < 0.05)

\*\* significantly different from Canada level estimate (p < 0.05)

\*\*\* significantly different from both provincial and Canada level estimates (p < 0.05)

1 Percentage based only on those indicating that they have an emergency exit plan.

2 Excludes Canadians living in single-person households.

3 Excludes those who reported that they lived in a household that did not have a vehicle.

4 Percentage based only on those indicating that they or someone in their household has special medical needs.

5 'Other precautionary measures' include having an escape/rescue plan for pets, extra supply of fuel, checking and replenishing emergency supplies, and keeping exits clear.

6 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'British Columbia'.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

**Table 1.4**

**High or moderately high levels of emergency planning, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents, by social and political involvement, community of Chilliwack, British Columbia, 2014**

Social and political involvement	Percentage of residents who had high or moderately high levels of...		
	Planning activities	Precautionary measures	Fire safety measures
	percent		
<b>Engagement in political activities <sup>1</sup></b>			
Yes <sup>†</sup>	51	37	49
No	35 <sup>E</sup>	F	31 <sup>E</sup>
<b>High level of civic engagement <sup>2</sup></b>			
Yes <sup>†</sup>	57	42	52
No	36 <sup>*</sup>	23 <sup>*</sup>	38
<b>High level of social support <sup>3</sup></b>			
Yes <sup>†</sup>	64	49	60
No	47 <sup>*</sup>	33 <sup>*</sup>	43 <sup>*</sup>
<b>Strong sense of belonging to community <sup>4</sup></b>			
Yes <sup>†</sup>	57	42	51
No <sup>7</sup>	44	30 <sup>E</sup>	40
<b>High neighbourhood trust <sup>5</sup></b>			
Yes <sup>†</sup>	55	45	50
No	52	33	44
<b>High level of self-efficacy <sup>6</sup></b>			
Yes <sup>†</sup>	59	40	52
No <sup>7</sup>	44 <sup>*</sup>	32	42

<sup>E</sup> use with caution

<sup>F</sup> too unreliable to be published

\* significantly different from reference category ( $p < 0.05$ )

† reference category

- 1 Includes individuals over the age of 17 years who are eligible to vote, and who have participated in or volunteered for political parties or events in the past 12 months, including municipal, provincial, or federal elections, or expressed views on political or social issues through signing a petition, contacting news agencies or politicians, or attended a meeting involving social or community issues.
- 2 Civic engagement measures individuals over the age of 17 years who were involved in a recreational group or organization in the past 12 months, and includes engagement in political activities. A 'high level' is defined as having been involved in at least 4 activities in the past 12 months.
- 3 A 'high level of social support' is defined as having five or more people whom that individual could turn to for help in an emergency if they are physically injured, require emotional support, shelter, and/or financial assistance.
- 4 A 'strong sense of belonging to community' is rating one's own sense of belonging to their community as a 4 or a 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "very weak" and 5 "very strong".
- 5 'High neighbourhood trust' is rating one's own trust in the people in one's neighbourhood as 4 or 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "cannot be trusted at all" and 5 represents "can be trusted a lot", as well as having a response of "very likely" when asked about the likelihood of someone in their neighbourhood returning a lost wallet or purse containing two hundred dollars with the money still inside.
- 6 A 'high level of self-efficacy' is derived from having a high self-rating on a scale of 1 (poor) to 5 (excellent) for the following three categories: an ability to think clearly and solve day-to-day problems, to handle unexpected and difficult problems, and to figure out what to do if faced with an emergency situation.
- 7 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Fire safety measures'.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents. Households with 'moderately high' or 'high' levels of emergency planning engaged in 3 or 4 of the following: having an exit plan, an emergency supply kit, extra copies of important documents and an emergency contact list. 'Moderately high' or 'high' levels of precautionary measures include having 3 or 4 of the following: a wind-up or battery operated radio, a back-up generator, an alternate source of heat and additional water. 'Moderately high' or 'high' levels of fire safety measure include having all 3 of the following: a working smoke detector, a working fire extinguisher, and a working carbon monoxide detector.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

## Notes

<sup>E</sup> use with caution

- 1 A Census Metropolitan Area (CMA) or a Census Agglomeration (CA) is formed by one or more adjacent municipalities centred on a population centre (known as the core). A CMA must have a total population of at least 100,000 of which 50,000 or more must live in the core. A CA must have a core population of at least 10,000. To be included in the CMA or CA, other adjacent municipalities must have a high degree of integration with the core as measured by commuting flows derived from census data.
- 2 The target population for the SEPR included all persons 15 years of age or older, residing in households in Canada's 10 provinces, excluding full-time residents of institutions (e.g. nursing homes, group homes, hospitals).
- 3 The SEPR covers three types of communities: Census Metropolitan Areas (CMAs), Census Agglomerations (CAs) with population greater than 50,000, and 'smaller communities' which include CAs with population 50,000 or less and those areas that fall outside of CMAs and CAs. All CMAs and CAs (with population greater than 50,000) were included in the SEPR. A sample of households were selected from smaller communities within each province to represent all households within the province in similar communities. Additional information on the SEPR and its sampling methodology can be found in the 'Survey description' section.
- 4 Throughout this fact sheet, responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.
- 5 This section focuses on personal experiences with emergencies or disasters that happened in Canada, in a community where the person was living at the time, and was significant enough to severely interrupt the individual's regular daily activities.



- 6 Emergency planning activities include: having an emergency exit plan, a household emergency supply kit, extra copies of important documents and an emergency contact list.
- 7 Precautionary measures include: having a wind-up or battery-operated radio, an alternate heat source such as a non-electric stove or heater or a wood-burning fireplace, a back-up generator and an alternative water source such as a well, tank or litres of stored water.
- 8 Unless otherwise specified, differences are statistically significant ( $p < 0.05$ ).
- 9 A 'strong sense of belonging to community' is rating one's own sense of belonging to their community as a 4 or a 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "very weak" and 5 "very strong".
- 10 A proportion (9%) of respondents were not asked questions regarding neighbourhood helpfulness in the event of an emergency and as such these cases are not included in the analysis on neighbourhood helpfulness in general or in the event of an emergency.



## Fact sheet

# Community of Abbotsford–Mission (CMA), British Columbia

---

In 2014, information on the emergency preparedness of people living in the Census Metropolitan Area<sup>1</sup> of Abbotsford–Mission was collected through the Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada (SEPR).<sup>2</sup> This fact sheet presents information on the risk awareness and level of emergency preparedness of the residents of Abbotsford–Mission, which could help improve the understanding of community resilience in the event of an emergency.<sup>3,4</sup>

### Risk awareness and anticipated sources of help in an emergency or disaster

- Earthquakes (84%), extended power outages lasting 24 hours or longer (62%), outbreaks of serious or life-threatening diseases (58%) and wildfires (55%) were named by residents of Abbotsford–Mission as the emergencies or disasters most likely to occur in their community.
- Residents most commonly reported that they would anticipate turning to their utility company in the event of an extended power outage (59%), and to a hospital, clinic, doctor or other medical professional in the event of an outbreak of a serious or life-threatening disease (51%). Residents most commonly stated that they would turn to police or law enforcement if they faced rioting or civil unrest (44%), or an act of terrorism or terrorist threat (29%<sup>E</sup>) (Table 1.1).
- Residents also stated that they would anticipate turning to news on the radio if they faced an industrial or transportation accident (31%) or a weather-related emergency or natural disaster (30%), and to local government if they faced a contamination or shortage of water or food (30%).

### Prior lifetime experience with a major emergency or disaster<sup>5</sup>

- One in five (19%) Abbotsford–Mission residents have faced a major emergency or disaster in Canada in a community they were living in at the time of the event, two-thirds (65%) of whom reported experiencing severe disruptions to their daily activities as a result of the event.
- Winter storms which include blizzards and ice storms (28%<sup>E</sup>) were the most commonly experienced emergency or disaster by residents of Abbotsford–Mission.
- The most common types of disruption to daily activities endured by residents who had experienced major emergencies or disasters included missing work or school (66%) and missing an appointment or planned activity (44%<sup>E</sup>). More severe disruptions experienced were an inability to use roads or transportation in the community (40%<sup>E</sup>) and home evacuation (18%<sup>E</sup>).
- Three-quarters (75%) of residents who experienced an emergency or disaster were able to resume their daily activities within one week of the event; close to one-third (31%<sup>E</sup>) of whom returned to their activities in three to five days.
- Just over six in ten (63%) residents who had experienced an emergency or disaster received help during or immediately following the event, most commonly from a family member (51%<sup>E</sup>).
- Approximately one in five (22%<sup>E</sup>) residents of Abbotsford–Mission who experienced a major emergency or disaster in Canada in a community where they were living at the time of the event and which was significant enough to disrupt their regular daily routine also endured a loss of property or financial impact.

### Emergency planning, precautionary and fire safety behaviours

- Three-quarters (74%) of people residing in Abbotsford–Mission lived in households that were engaged in at least two emergency planning activities,<sup>6</sup> and nearly half (47%) lived in households with three or four such activities (Table 1.2). One in twenty (5%<sup>E</sup>) people lived in a household that had not participated in any emergency planning activities.
- Nearly two-thirds (64%) lived in a household with at least two precautionary measures<sup>7</sup> taken in case of an emergency, and one-third (33%) lived in a household with three or four such measures. Just over one in ten (13%<sup>E</sup>) people lived in a household with no precautionary measures in place.
- Nearly all (99%) residents reported living in a household with a working smoke detector, and nearly two-thirds (64%) reported living in a household with a working fire extinguisher (Table 1.3). More than half (54%) of residents stated that they had a working carbon monoxide detector in their household. More than one-third (36%) of residents of Abbotsford–Mission stated that they had implemented all three fire safety measures in their household.
- The number of emergency planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents of Abbotsford–Mission did not significantly differ from residents in British Columbia. Residents were, however, less likely to have no emergency planning activities (5%<sup>E</sup>) and more likely to have three precautionary measures in place (26%) compared to residents of Canada’s 10 provinces overall (8% and 20%, respectively). In terms of fire safety measures, residents of Abbotsford–Mission were less likely than those in Canada overall to have all three measures in place (36% versus 42%).<sup>8</sup>
- There were some differences in the types of activities and measures in place by residents of Abbotsford–Mission when compared to British Columbia and Canada in general. For example, Abbotsford–Mission residents were more likely to have an emergency exit plan (68%), an alternate heat source (54%) and an alternate water source (53%) compared to Canadians (60%, 48% and 43%, respectively). Residents (54%) were, however, less likely to have a working carbon monoxide detector compared to residents of Canada (60%). In addition, Abbotsford–Mission residents (99%) were more likely to have a working smoke detector compared to residents of British Columbia (95%), but less likely to have extra copies of important documents (47% versus 55%).

## Social networks and sense of belonging

- Approximately half (48%) of residents of Abbotsford–Mission had a strong sense of belonging<sup>9</sup> to their community.<sup>10</sup>
- More than eight in ten (85%) residents described the neighbourhood they lived in as a place where neighbours generally help each other.<sup>11</sup> Of those who did not describe their neighbourhood this way, most (78%) still described it as a place where neighbours would help each other in an emergency.<sup>12</sup>
- The majority of individuals had a large network of support in the event of an emergency or disaster, with more than five people to turn to for emotional support (67%),<sup>13</sup> for help if physically injured (62%)<sup>14</sup> and in the event of a home evacuation (51%).<sup>15</sup> One-quarter (24%) of residents had a large support network if financial help was needed, and one in ten (9%) reported that they had no one to turn to for financial help.<sup>16</sup>
- High levels of self-efficacy and neighbourhood trust, as well as involvement in political activities, were sometimes associated with a higher level of emergency preparedness (Table 1.4).

## Data tables

**Table 1.1**

**Most commonly anticipated sources of initial help and information, by type of emergency or disaster, residents of Abbotsford–Mission, British Columbia, 2014**

Most common sources of initial help and information by type of emergency or disaster	percent
<b>Weather-related emergency or natural disaster<sup>1</sup></b>	
News- Radio	30
News- Television	20
Family	19
<b>Extended power outages</b>	
Utility company	59
News- Radio	13 <sup>E</sup>

Family	9 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Outbreak of serious or life-threatening disease</b>	
Hospital, clinic, doctor or other medical professional	51
News- Television	16
News- Radio	15 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Industrial or transportation accident</b>	
News- Radio	31
Police/law enforcement	22
News- Television	22
<b>Contamination or shortage of water or food <sup>2</sup></b>	
Local government	30
News- Radio	21 <sup>E</sup>
News- Television	19 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Act of terrorism or terrorist threat</b>	
Police/law enforcement	29 <sup>E</sup>
News- Television	27 <sup>E</sup>
News- Radio	25 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Rioting or civil unrest</b>	
Police/law enforcement	44
News- Radio	15 <sup>E</sup>
News- Television	14 <sup>E</sup>
<sup>E</sup> use with caution	
1 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% when respondents were asked about their likely sources of initial help and information.	
2 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were equal to 13% for sources of initial help and information.	
<b>Note:</b> Respondents who perceived their community was at risk for any form of emergency or disaster were then asked where they would turn to first for information or assistance in the event of the perceived emergency or disaster. Respondents could provide more than one response. Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.	
<b>Source:</b> Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.	

**Table 1.2**  
**Number of emergency planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents, community of Abbotsford–Mission, British Columbia, 2014**

Number of planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents	Abbotsford–Mission	British Columbia	Canada
	percent		
<b>Number of emergency planning activities</b>			
None	5 <sup>E</sup> **	6	8
1 activity	20	15	17
2 activities	27	22	25
3 activities	26	29	27
4 activities	21	25	19
<b>Number of precautionary measures</b>			
None	13 <sup>E</sup>	13	16
1 measure	21 **	24	27
2 measures	31	27	28
3 measures	26 **	23	20
4 measures	7 <sup>E</sup>	8	7

Number of fire safety measures <sup>1 2 3</sup>			
None	F	1 <sup>E</sup>	1
1 measure	15	14	14
2 measures	42	40	38
3 measures	36 <sup>**</sup>	38	42

<sup>E</sup> use with caution  
<sup>F</sup> too unreliable to be published  
<sup>\*\*</sup> significantly different from Canada level estimate (p < 0.05)

1 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Canada'.  
2 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'British Columbia'.  
3 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Abbotsford–Mission'.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents. Emergency planning activities include: an emergency exit plan, an emergency supply kit, photocopies/electronic copies of important documents and a list of emergency contact numbers. Precautionary measures include: a battery-operated or wind-up radio, an alternative heat source, a back-up generator and an alternative water source. Fire safety measures include a working smoke detector, a working carbon monoxide detector and a working fire extinguisher.  
**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

**Table 1.3**  
**Planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures residents engaged in, community of Abbotsford–Mission, British Columbia, 2014**

Residents whose households were involved in the following:	Abbotsford–Mission	British Columbia	Canada
	percent		
<b>Emergency planning activities</b>			
Emergency exit plan	68 <sup>**</sup>	71	60
Exit plan has been practised/reviewed in last 12 months <sup>1</sup>	49	49	46
Designated meeting place for household members <sup>2</sup>	38	38	33
Contact plan for household members <sup>2</sup>	56	54	55
Household emergency supply kit	52	55	47
Vehicle emergency supply kit <sup>3</sup>	57	58	59
Extra copies of important documents	47 <sup>*</sup>	55	53
List of emergency contact numbers	70	68	69
Plan for meeting special health needs <sup>4</sup>	55	61	62
<b>Precautionary measures</b>			
Wind-up or battery-operated radio	56	59	58
Alternate heat source	54 <sup>**</sup>	55	48
Back-up generator	26	22	23
Alternate water source	53 <sup>**</sup>	48	43
Other <sup>5</sup>	19	21	21
<b>Fire safety measures</b>			
Working smoke detector	99 <sup>*</sup>	95	98
Working carbon monoxide detector <sup>6 7</sup>	54 <sup>**</sup>	52	60
Working fire extinguisher	64	69	66

\* significantly different from provincial level estimate (p < 0.05)

\*\* significantly different from Canada level estimate (p < 0.05)

1 Percentage based only on those indicating that they have an emergency exit plan.

2 Excludes Canadians living in single-person households.

3 Excludes those who reported that they lived in a household that did not have a vehicle.

4 Percentage based only on those indicating that they or someone in their household has special medical needs.

5 'Other precautionary measures' include having an escape/rescue plan for pets, extra supply of fuel, checking and replenishing emergency supplies, and keeping exits clear.

6 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'British Columbia'.

7 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Abbotsford–Mission'.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

**Table 1.4**

**High or moderately high levels of emergency planning, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents, by social and political involvement, community of Abbotsford–Mission, British Columbia, 2014**

Social and political involvement	Percentage of residents who had high or moderately high levels of...		
	Planning activities	Precautionary measures	Fire safety measures
	percent		
<b>Engagement in political activities <sup>1</sup></b>			
Yes <sup>†</sup>	48	37	37
No <sup>7</sup>	36 <sup>E</sup>	17 <sup>E *</sup>	40 <sup>E</sup>
<b>High level of civic engagement <sup>2</sup></b>			
Yes <sup>†</sup>	51	36	34
No <sup>7</sup>	40	30	42
<b>High level of social support <sup>3</sup></b>			
Yes <sup>7 †</sup>	56	43	47
No	43	30	33
<b>Strong sense of belonging to community <sup>4</sup></b>			
Yes <sup>7 †</sup>	51	34	41
No	42	33	32
<b>High neighbourhood trust <sup>5</sup></b>			
Yes <sup>†</sup>	52	33	45
No <sup>7</sup>	43	34	33 <sup>*</sup>
<b>High level of self-efficacy <sup>6</sup></b>			
Yes <sup>†</sup>	56	41	47
No <sup>7</sup>	39 <sup>*</sup>	29	30 <sup>*</sup>

E	use with caution
*	significantly different from reference category ( $p < 0.05$ )
†	reference category
1	Includes individuals over the age of 17 years who are eligible to vote, and who have participated in or volunteered for political parties or events in the past 12 months, including municipal, provincial, or federal elections, or expressed views on political or social issues through signing a petition, contacting news agencies or politicians, or attended a meeting involving social or community issues.
2	Civic engagement measures individuals over the age of 17 years who were involved in a recreational group or organization in the past 12 months, and includes engagement in political activities. A 'high level' is defined as having been involved in at least 4 activities in the past 12 months.
3	A 'high level of social support' is defined as having five or more people whom that individual could turn to for help in an emergency if they are physically injured, require emotional support, shelter, and/or financial assistance.
4	A 'strong sense of belonging to community' is rating one's own sense of belonging to their community as a 4 or a 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "very weak" and 5 "very strong".
5	'High neighbourhood trust' is rating one's own trust in the people in one's neighbourhood as 4 or 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "cannot be trusted at all" and 5 represents "can be trusted a lot", as well as having a response of "very likely" when asked about the likelihood of someone in their neighbourhood returning a lost wallet or purse containing two hundred dollars with the money still inside.
6	A 'high level of self-efficacy' is derived from having a high self-rating on a scale of 1 (poor) to 5 (excellent) for the following three categories: an ability to think clearly and solve day-to-day problems, to handle unexpected and difficult problems, and to figure out what to do if faced with an emergency situation.
7	Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Fire safety measures'.
<p><b>Note:</b> Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents. Households with 'moderately high' or 'high' levels of emergency planning engaged in 3 or 4 of the following: having an exit plan, an emergency supply kit, extra copies of important documents and an emergency contact list. 'Moderately high' or 'high' levels of precautionary measures include having 3 or 4 of the following: a wind-up or battery operated radio, a back-up generator, an alternate source of heat and additional water. 'Moderately high' or 'high' levels of fire safety measure include having all 3 of the following: a working smoke detector, a working fire extinguisher, and a working carbon monoxide detector.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.</p>	

## Notes

E use with caution

- 1 A Census Metropolitan Area (CMA) or a Census Agglomeration (CA) is formed by one or more adjacent municipalities centred on a population centre (known as the core). A CMA must have a total population of at least 100,000 of which 50,000 or more must live in the core. A CA must have a core population of at least 10,000. To be included in the CMA or CA, other adjacent municipalities must have a high degree of integration with the core as measured by commuting flows derived from census data.
- 2 The target population for the SEPR included all persons 15 years of age or older, residing in households in Canada's 10 provinces, excluding full-time residents of institutions (e.g. nursing homes, group homes, hospitals).
- 3 The SEPR covers three types of communities: Census Metropolitan Areas (CMAs), Census Agglomerations (CAs) with population greater than 50,000, and 'smaller communities' which include CAs with population 50,000 or less and those areas that fall outside of CMAs and CAs. All CMAs and CAs (with population greater than 50,000) were included in the SEPR. A sample of households were selected from smaller communities within each province to represent all households within the province in similar communities. Additional information on the SEPR and its sampling methodology can be found in the 'Survey description' section.
- 4 Throughout this fact sheet, responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.
- 5 This section focuses on personal experiences with emergencies or disasters that happened in Canada, in a community where the person was living at the time, and was significant enough to severely interrupt the individual's regular daily activities.

- 6 Emergency planning activities include: having an emergency exit plan, a household emergency supply kit, extra copies of important documents and an emergency contact list.
- 7 Precautionary measures include: having a wind-up or battery-operated radio, an alternate heat source such as a non-electric stove or heater or a wood-burning fireplace, a back-up generator and an alternative water source such as a well, tank or litres of stored water.
- 8 Unless otherwise specified, differences are statistically significant ( $p < 0.05$ ).
- 9 A 'strong sense of belonging to community' is rating one's own sense of belonging to their community as a 4 or a 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "very weak" and 5 "very strong".
- 10 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% when respondents were asked about their sense of belonging to their community.
- 11 A proportion (30%) of respondents were not asked questions regarding neighbourhood helpfulness in the event of an emergency and as such these cases are not included in the analysis on neighbourhood helpfulness in general or in the event of an emergency.
- 12 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were equal to 14% when respondents were asked about whether their neighbourhood is a place where neighbours would help each other if there is an emergency.
- 13 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% when respondents were asked about the number of people they could turn to for emotional support.
- 14 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% when respondents were asked about the number of people they could turn to for help if they were physically injured.
- 15 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% when respondents were asked about the number of people they could turn to for help in case of home evacuation.
- 16 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% when respondents were asked about the number of people they could turn to for help if financial support is needed.





## Fact sheet

## Community of Vancouver (CMA), British Columbia

In 2014, information on the emergency preparedness of people living in the Census Metropolitan Area<sup>1</sup> of Vancouver was collected through the Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada (SEPR).<sup>2</sup> This fact sheet presents information on the risk awareness and level of emergency preparedness of the residents of Vancouver, which could help improve the understanding of community resilience in the event of an emergency.<sup>3,4</sup>

**Risk awareness and anticipated sources of help in an emergency or disaster**

- Earthquakes (85%), extended power outages lasting 24 hours or longer (61%), outbreaks of serious or life-threatening diseases (53%), or industrial or transportation accidents (52%) were named by residents of Vancouver as the events most likely to occur in their community.
- Residents most commonly reported that they would anticipate turning to their utility company in the event of an extended power outage (46%) and to a hospital, clinic, doctor or other medical professional in the event of an outbreak of a serious or life-threatening disease (38%) (Table 1.1).
- Residents most commonly stated that they would turn to news on the radio if they faced a weather-related emergency or natural disaster (32%) or an industrial or transportation accident (31%). If faced with rioting or civil unrest (32%) or an act of terrorism or terrorist threat (30%), residents most frequently stated that they would turn to police or law enforcement. In the event of a contamination or shortage of water or food, residents anticipated turning to local government (26%).

**Prior lifetime experience with a major emergency or disaster<sup>5</sup>**

- Nearly one-fifth (18%) of Vancouver residents have faced a major emergency or disaster in Canada in a community they were living in at the time of the event, with nearly one-half (47%) reporting that they experienced severe disruptions to their daily activities as a result of the event.
- Winter storms which include blizzards and ice storms (29%<sup>E</sup>) and extended power outages lasting 24 hours or longer (26%<sup>E</sup>) were the most commonly experienced emergency or disaster by residents of Vancouver.
- The most common types of disruption to daily activities endured by residents who had experienced major emergencies or disasters included missing an appointment or planned activity (62%), an inability to use electrical appliances at home (58%<sup>E</sup>), missing work or school (49%<sup>E</sup>) and having to boil water for drinking or drink bottled water (42%<sup>E</sup>). More severe disruptions experienced were an inability to use roads or transportation in the community (36%<sup>E</sup>) and home evacuation (28%<sup>E</sup>).
- Approximately two-thirds (68%) of residents who experienced an emergency or disaster were able to resume their daily activities within one week of the event, with close to half (44%<sup>E</sup>) resuming activities within two days.
- More than half (54%) of residents who had experienced an emergency or disaster received help during or immediately following the event.
- One-quarter (26%<sup>E</sup>) of residents of Vancouver who experienced a major emergency or disaster in Canada in a community where they were living at the time of the event and which was significant enough to disrupt their regular daily routine also endured a loss of property or financial impact.<sup>6</sup>

**Emergency planning, precautionary and fire safety behaviours**

- Three-quarters (76%) of people residing in Vancouver lived in households that were engaged in at least two emergency planning activities,<sup>7</sup> and more than half (53%) lived in households with three or four such activities (Table 1.2). One in twenty (5%<sup>E</sup>) people lived in a household that had not participated in any emergency planning activities.
- More than half (54%) lived in a household with at least two precautionary measures<sup>8</sup> taken in case of an emergency, and one in four (25%) lived in a household with three or four such measures. Less than one in five (15%) people lived in a household with no precautionary measures in place.
- The majority (94%) of residents reported living in a household with a working smoke detector, and nearly two-thirds (64%) reported living in a household with a working fire extinguisher (Table 1.3). One-half (51%) of residents stated that they had a working carbon monoxide detector in their household. One-third (34%) of Vancouver residents stated that they had implemented all three fire safety measures in their household.
- The number of emergency planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents of Vancouver did not often differ from residents in British Columbia or Canada's 10 provinces overall. However, residents of Vancouver were more likely than Canadians to have participated in all four emergency planning activities (24% versus 19%), but they were less likely to have implemented all four precautionary measures (3%<sup>E</sup>) and fire safety measures (34%) than residents of British Columbia (8% and 38%, respectively) and Canada (7% and 42%, respectively) overall.<sup>9</sup>
- When significant differences in the types of activities and measures put in place existed among those in Vancouver and residents of British Columbia or Canada overall, Vancouver residents were almost always less likely to have implemented the measure or activity. For example, Vancouver residents were less likely to have a vehicle emergency supply kit (53%) or a back-up generator (15%) compared to residents of British Columbia (58% and 22%, respectively) and Canada (59% and 23%, respectively). Vancouver residents were, however, more likely to have an emergency exit plan (71%) and a household emergency supply kit (54%) than Canadians (60% and 47%, respectively).

## Social networks and sense of belonging

- Half (52%) of residents of Vancouver had a strong sense of belonging<sup>10</sup> to their community.<sup>11</sup>
- More than eight in ten (85%) residents described the neighbourhood they lived in as a place where neighbours generally help each other.<sup>12</sup> Of those who did not describe their neighbourhood this way, most (72%) still described it as a place where neighbours would help each other in an emergency.<sup>13</sup>
- Six in ten individuals had a large network of support in the event of an emergency or disaster, with more than five people to turn to for emotional support (61%)<sup>14</sup> and for help if physically injured (58%),<sup>15</sup> while one-half (50%) had the same level of support in the event of a home evacuation.<sup>16</sup> More than one-quarter (28%) of residents had a large support network if financial help was needed, and one in ten (9%) residents reported that they had no one to turn to for financial help.<sup>17</sup>
- High levels of sense of belonging, social support and self-efficacy were sometimes associated with a higher level of emergency preparedness (Table 1.4).

## Data tables

**Table 1.1**  
Most commonly anticipated sources of initial help and information, by type of emergency or disaster, residents of Vancouver, British Columbia, 2014

Most common sources of initial help and information by type of emergency or disaster	percent
<b>Weather-related emergency or natural disaster</b>	
News- Radio	32
News- Television	22
News- Internet	22
<b>Extended power outages</b>	
Utility company	46
News- Radio	20

Family	12 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Outbreak of serious or life-threatening disease</b>	
Hospital, clinic, doctor or other medical professional	38
News- Internet	24
News- Television	20
<b>Industrial or transportation accident</b>	
News- Radio	31
News- Television	21
News- Internet	20
<b>Contamination or shortage of water or food</b>	
Local government	26
News- Television	21
News- Radio	20
<b>Act of terrorism or terrorist threat <sup>1</sup></b>	
Police/law enforcement	30
News- Radio	26
News- Internet	22 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Rioting or civil unrest</b>	
Police/law enforcement	32
News- Television	28
News- Radio	26
<sup>E</sup> use with caution	
<sup>1</sup> Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% when respondents were asked about their likely sources of initial help and information.	
<b>Note:</b> Respondents who perceived their community was at risk for any form of emergency or disaster were then asked where they would turn to first for information or assistance in the event of the perceived emergency or disaster. Respondents could provide more than one response. Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.	
<b>Source:</b> Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.	

**Table 1.2**  
**Number of emergency planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents, community of Vancouver, British Columbia, 2014**

Number of planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents	Vancouver	British Columbia	Canada
	percent		
<b>Number of emergency planning activities</b>			
None	5 <sup>E</sup> **	6	8
1 activity	15	15	17
2 activities	23	22	25
3 activities	29	29	27
4 activities	24 **	25	19
<b>Number of precautionary measures</b>			
None	15	13	16
1 measure	26	24	27
2 measures	29	27	28
3 measures	22	23	20
4 measures	3 <sup>E</sup> ***	8	7
<b>Number of fire safety measures <sup>1 2 3</sup></b>			

None	F	1 <sup>E</sup>	1
1 measure	16 *	14	14
2 measures	40	40	38
3 measures	34 ***	38	42

<sup>E</sup> use with caution  
<sup>F</sup> too unreliable to be published

\* significantly different from provincial level estimate (p < 0.05)

\*\* significantly different from Canada level estimate (p < 0.05)

\*\*\* significantly different from both provincial and Canada level estimates (p < 0.05)

1 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Canada'.

2 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'British Columbia'.

3 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Vancouver'.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents. Emergency planning activities include: an emergency exit plan, an emergency supply kit, photocopies/electronic copies of important documents and a list of emergency contact numbers. Precautionary measures include: a battery-operated or wind-up radio, an alternative heat source, a back-up generator and an alternative water source. Fire safety measures include a working smoke detector, a working carbon monoxide detector and a working fire extinguisher.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

**Table 1.3**  
**Planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures residents engaged in, community of Vancouver, British Columbia, 2014**

Residents whose households were involved in the following:	Vancouver	British Columbia	Canada
	percent		
<b>Emergency planning activities</b>			
Emergency exit plan	71 **	71	60
Exit plan has been practised/reviewed in last 12 months <sup>1</sup>	47	49	46
Designated meeting place for household members <sup>2</sup>	36	38	33
Contact plan for household members <sup>2</sup>	53	54	55
Household emergency supply kit	54 **	55	47
Vehicle emergency supply kit <sup>3</sup>	53 ***	58	59
Extra copies of important documents	57	55	53
List of emergency contact numbers	68	68	69
Plan for meeting special health needs <sup>4</sup>	57	61	62
<b>Precautionary measures</b>			
Wind-up or battery-operated radio	57	59	58
Alternate heat source	51 *	55	48
Back-up generator	15 ***	22	23
Alternate water source	44 *	48	43
Other <sup>5</sup>	21	21	21
<b>Fire safety measures</b>			
Working smoke detector	94 **	95	98
Working carbon monoxide detector <sup>6 7</sup>	51 **	52	60
Working fire extinguisher	64 *	69	66

\* significantly different from provincial level estimate (p < 0.05)

\*\* significantly different from Canada level estimate (p < 0.05)

\*\*\* significantly different from both provincial and Canada level estimates (p < 0.05)

1 Percentage based only on those indicating that they have an emergency exit plan.

2 Excludes Canadians living in single-person households.

3 Excludes those who reported that they lived in a household that did not have a vehicle.

4 Percentage based only on those indicating that they or someone in their household has special medical needs.

5 'Other precautionary measures' include having an escape/rescue plan for pets, extra supply of fuel, checking and replenishing emergency supplies, and keeping exits clear.

6 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'British Columbia'.

7 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Vancouver'.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

**Table 1.4**

**High or moderately high levels of emergency planning, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents, by social and political involvement, community of Vancouver, British Columbia, 2014**

Social and political involvement	Percentage of residents who had high or moderately high levels of...		
	Planning activities	Precautionary measures	Fire safety measures
	percent		
<b>Engagement in political activities <sup>1</sup></b>			
Yes <sup>†</sup>	51	26	34
No <sup>7</sup>	53	26 <sup>E</sup>	31 <sup>E</sup>
<b>High level of civic engagement <sup>2</sup></b>			
Yes <sup>†</sup>	54	28	31
No <sup>8</sup>	48	24 <sup>E</sup>	37
<b>High level of social support <sup>3</sup></b>			
Yes <sup>9 10 †</sup>	57	41	42
No	53	23 <sup>*</sup>	32
<b>Strong sense of belonging to community <sup>4</sup></b>			
Yes <sup>11 †</sup>	57	30	39
No <sup>11</sup>	51	24	28 <sup>*</sup>
<b>High neighbourhood trust <sup>5</sup></b>			
Yes <sup>†</sup>	55	34	35
No <sup>11</sup>	55	25	34
<b>High level of self-efficacy <sup>6</sup></b>			
Yes <sup>11 †</sup>	60	33	38
No <sup>11</sup>	49 <sup>*</sup>	22 <sup>*</sup>	30

<sup>E</sup> use with caution

\* significantly different from reference category ( $p < 0.05$ )

† reference category

- 1 Includes individuals over the age of 17 years who are eligible to vote, and who have participated in or volunteered for political parties or events in the past 12 months, including municipal, provincial, or federal elections, or expressed views on political or social issues through signing a petition, contacting news agencies or politicians, or attended a meeting involving social or community issues.
- 2 Civic engagement measures individuals over the age of 17 years who were involved in a recreational group or organization in the past 12 months, and includes engagement in political activities. A 'high level' is defined as having been involved in at least 4 activities in the past 12 months.
- 3 A 'high level of social support' is defined as having five or more people whom that individual could turn to for help in an emergency if they are physically injured, require emotional support, shelter, and/or financial assistance.
- 4 A 'strong sense of belonging to community' is rating one's own sense of belonging to their community as a 4 or a 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "very weak" and 5 "very strong".
- 5 'High neighbourhood trust' is rating one's own trust in the people in one's neighbourhood as 4 or 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "cannot be trusted at all" and 5 represents "can be trusted a lot", as well as having a response of "very likely" when asked about the likelihood of someone in their neighbourhood returning a lost wallet or purse containing two hundred dollars with the money still inside.
- 6 A 'high level of self-efficacy' is derived from having a high self-rating on a scale of 1 (poor) to 5 (excellent) for the following three categories: an ability to think clearly and solve day-to-day problems, to handle unexpected and difficult problems, and to figure out what to do if faced with an emergency situation.
- 7 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were equal to 18% for 'Fire safety measures'.
- 8 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were equal to 14% for 'Fire safety measures'.
- 9 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Planning activities'.
- 10 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were equal to 11% for 'Fire safety measures'.
- 11 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Fire safety measures'.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents. Households with 'moderately high' or 'high' levels of emergency planning engaged in 3 or 4 of the following: having an exit plan, an emergency supply kit, extra copies of important documents and an emergency contact list. 'Moderately high' or 'high' levels of precautionary measures include having 3 or 4 of the following: a wind-up or battery operated radio, a back-up generator, an alternate source of heat and additional water. 'Moderately high' or 'high' levels of fire safety measure include having all 3 of the following: a working smoke detector, a working fire extinguisher, and a working carbon monoxide detector.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

## Notes

<sup>E</sup> use with caution

- 1 A Census Metropolitan Area (CMA) or a Census Agglomeration (CA) is formed by one or more adjacent municipalities centred on a population centre (known as the core). A CMA must have a total population of at least 100,000 of which 50,000 or more must live in the core. A CA must have a core population of at least 10,000. To be included in the CMA or CA, other adjacent municipalities must have a high degree of integration with the core as measured by commuting flows derived from census data.
- 2 The target population for the SEPR included all persons 15 years of age or older, residing in households in Canada's 10 provinces, excluding full-time residents of institutions (e.g. nursing homes, group homes, hospitals).
- 3 The SEPR covers three types of communities: Census Metropolitan Areas (CMAs), Census Agglomerations (CAs) with population greater than 50,000, and 'smaller communities' which include CAs with population 50,000 or less and those areas that fall outside of CMAs and CAs. All CMAs and CAs (with population greater than 50,000) were included in the SEPR. A sample of households were selected from smaller communities within each province to represent all households within the province in similar communities. Additional information on the SEPR and its sampling methodology can be found in the 'Survey description' section.
- 4 Throughout this fact sheet, responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.

- 5 This section focuses on personal experiences with emergencies or disasters that happened in Canada, in a community where the person was living at the time, and was significant enough to severely interrupt the individual's regular daily activities.
- 6 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were equal to 11% when respondents were asked about whether the emergency they experienced caused them to suffer loss of property or financial impacts.
- 7 Emergency planning activities include: having an emergency exit plan, a household emergency supply kit, extra copies of important documents and an emergency contact list.
- 8 Precautionary measures include: having a wind-up or battery-operated radio, an alternate heat source such as a non-electric stove or heater or a wood-burning fireplace, a back-up generator and an alternative water source such as a well, tank or litres of stored water.
- 9 Unless otherwise specified, differences are statistically significant ( $p < 0.05$ ).
- 10 A 'strong sense of belonging to community' is rating one's own sense of belonging to their community as a 4 or a 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "very weak" and 5 "very strong".
- 11 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% when respondents were asked about their sense of belonging to their community.
- 12 A proportion (29%) of respondents were not asked questions regarding neighbourhood helpfulness in the event of an emergency and as such these cases are not included in the analysis on neighbourhood helpfulness in general or in the event of an emergency.
- 13 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were equal to 19% when respondents were asked about whether their neighbourhood is a place where neighbours would help each other if there is an emergency.
- 14 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% when respondents were asked about the number of people they could turn to for emotional support.
- 15 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% when respondents were asked about the number of people they could turn to for help if they were physically injured.
- 16 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% when respondents were asked about the number of people they could turn to for help in case of home evacuation.
- 17 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% when respondents were asked about the number of people they could turn to for help if financial support is needed.



## Fact sheet

Community of Victoria (CMA), British Columbia

---

In 2014, information on the emergency preparedness of people living in the Census Metropolitan Area<sup>1</sup> of Victoria was collected through the Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada (SEPR).<sup>2</sup> This fact sheet presents information on the risk awareness and level of emergency preparedness of the residents of Victoria, which could help improve the understanding of community resilience in the event of an emergency.<sup>3,4</sup>

**Risk awareness and anticipated sources of help in an emergency or disaster**

- Earthquakes (93%), extended power outages lasting 24 hours or longer (69%) and storm surges or tsunamis (67%) were named by residents of Victoria as the events most likely to occur in their community.
- Residents most commonly reported that they would anticipate turning to their utility company in the event of an extended power outage (48%) and to a hospital, clinic, doctor or other medical professional in the event of an outbreak of a serious or life-threatening disease (47%). If faced with rioting or civil unrest, residents most commonly anticipated turning to police or law enforcement (41%) (Table 1.1).
- Residents most frequently anticipated turning to news on the radio in the event of a weather-related emergency or natural disaster (41%), an act of terrorism or terrorist threat (32%) or an industrial or transportation accident (31%). If they faced a contamination or shortage of water or food, residents anticipated turning to local government first (27%).

**Prior lifetime experience with a major emergency or disaster<sup>5</sup>**

- Approximately one-quarter (27%) of Victoria residents have faced a major emergency or disaster in Canada in a community they were living in at the time of the event, three-quarters (74%) of whom reported experiencing severe disruptions to their daily activities as a result of the event.
- Winter storms (including blizzards and ice storms) (71%) were the most commonly experienced emergency or disaster by residents of Victoria, followed by extended power outages lasting 24 hours or longer (19%<sup>E</sup>).
- The most common types of disruption to daily activities endured by residents who had experienced major emergencies or disasters included missing school or work (78%) and missing an appointment or planned activity (69%). More severe disruptions experienced were an inability to use roads or transportation in the community (66%), home evacuation (22%<sup>E</sup>) and an inability to communicate outside the home (14%<sup>E</sup>).
- Three-quarters (76%) of residents who experienced an emergency or disaster were able to resume their daily activities within one week of the event: 15%<sup>E</sup> within 24 hours, 19%<sup>E</sup> within one to two days, 28%<sup>E</sup> within three to five days and 14%<sup>E</sup> within six to seven days.
- Nearly one-half (47%) of residents who had experienced an emergency or disaster received help or information during or immediately following the event, most commonly from a neighbour (42%<sup>E</sup>) or news media (19%<sup>E</sup>).
- One-quarter (24%<sup>E</sup>) of residents of Victoria who experienced a major emergency or disaster in Canada in a community where they were living at the time of the event and which was significant enough to disrupt their regular daily routine also endured a loss of property or financial impact.

**Emergency planning, precautionary and fire safety behaviours**

- Three-quarters (77%) of people residing in Victoria lived in households that were engaged in at least two emergency planning activities,<sup>6</sup> and over half (54%) lived in households with three or four such activities (Table 1.2). One in twenty (5%<sup>E</sup>) people lived in a household that had not participated in any emergency planning activities.



- Two-thirds (66%) lived in a household with at least two precautionary measures<sup>7</sup> taken in case of an emergency, and over one-third (36%) lived in a household with three or four such measures. One-tenth (9%) of people lived in a household with no precautionary measures in place.
- Almost all (98%) residents reported living in a household with a working smoke detector, and three in four (74%) reported living in a household with a working fire extinguisher (Table 1.3). Nearly one-half (47%) of residents stated that they had a working carbon monoxide detector in their household. Overall, four in ten (38%) residents of Victoria stated that they had implemented all three fire safety measures in their household.
- The number of emergency planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures residents of Victoria engaged in did not generally differ from residents in British Columbia; however, there were some differences when compared to residents of Canada's 10 provinces overall. For example, Victoria residents were more likely to have participated in all four emergency planning activities (29%) and have all four precautionary measures in place (11%) compared to Canadians in general (19% and 7%, respectively).<sup>8</sup>
- There were differences in the types of activities and measures in place by residents of Victoria when compared to British Columbia and Canada in general. Furthermore, when significant differences did exist, residents of Victoria were almost always more likely to have engaged in the activity or measure than residents of British Columbia and Canada overall. For example, Victoria residents were more likely to have a wind-up or battery-operated radio (68%), a household emergency supply kit (63%) and an alternate water source (56%) compared to those in British Columbia (59%, 55% and 48%, respectively) and Canada (58%, 47% and 43%, respectively). In addition, residents of Victoria were more likely to have an emergency exit plan (74%), a working fire extinguisher (74%) and an alternate heat source (60%) compared to Canadians in general.

## Social networks and sense of belonging

- More than half (54%) of Victoria's residents had a strong sense of belonging<sup>9</sup> to their community.<sup>10</sup>
- More than eight in ten (84%) residents described the neighbourhood they lived in as a place where neighbours generally help each other.<sup>11</sup> Of those who did not describe their neighbourhood this way, most (81%) still described it as a place where neighbours would help each other in an emergency.<sup>12</sup>
- The majority of individuals had a large network of support in the event of an emergency or disaster, with more than five people to turn to for emotional support (66%), for help if physically injured (63%)<sup>13</sup> and in the event of a home evacuation (57%).<sup>14</sup> One-quarter (26%) of residents had a large support network if financial help was needed, and one in ten (11%) reported that they had no one to turn to for financial help.<sup>15</sup>
- High levels of sense of belonging, social support, self-efficacy and neighbourhood trust, as well as civic and political engagement, were sometimes associated with a higher level of emergency preparedness (Table 1.4).

## Data tables

Table 1.1

Most commonly anticipated sources of initial help and information, by type of emergency or disaster, residents of Victoria, British Columbia, 2014

Most common sources of initial help and information by type of emergency or disaster	percent
<b>Weather-related emergency or natural disaster</b>	
News- Radio	41
News- Internet	17
News- Television	14
<b>Extended power outages</b>	
Utility company	48
News- Radio	27
News- Internet	7 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Outbreak of serious or life-threatening disease</b>	
Hospital, clinic, doctor or other medical professional	47
News- Radio	23
News- Television	22
<b>Industrial or transportation accident</b>	

News- Radio	31
News- Television	18
Police/law enforcement	17 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Contamination or shortage of water or food <sup>1</sup></b>	
Local government	27
News- Radio	24
News- Television	16 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Act of terrorism or terrorist threat</b>	
News- Radio	32
Police/law enforcement	29
News- Television	24
<b>Rioting or civil unrest</b>	
Police/law enforcement	41
News- Television	29 <sup>E</sup>
News- Radio	28 <sup>E</sup>
<sup>E</sup> use with caution	
1 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% when respondents were asked about their likely sources of initial help and information.	
<b>Note:</b> Respondents who perceived their community was at risk for any form of emergency or disaster were then asked where they would turn to first for information or assistance in the event of the perceived emergency or disaster. Respondents could provide more than one response. Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.	
<b>Source:</b> Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.	

**Table 1.2**  
**Number of emergency planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents, community of Victoria, British Columbia, 2014**

Number of planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents	Victoria	British Columbia	Canada
	percent		
<b>Number of emergency planning activities</b>			
None	5 <sup>E</sup> **	6	8
1 activity	16	15	17
2 activities	23	22	25
3 activities	25	29	27
4 activities	29 **	25	19
<b>Number of precautionary measures</b>			
None	9 ***	13	16
1 measure	22 **	24	27
2 measures	30	27	28
3 measures	25 **	23	20
4 measures	11 **	8	7
<b>Number of fire safety measures <sup>1 2 3</sup></b>			
None	F	1 <sup>E</sup>	1
1 measure	12	14	14
2 measures	39	40	38
3 measures	38	38	42

<sup>E</sup> use with caution  
<sup>F</sup> too unreliable to be published

\*\* significantly different from Canada level estimate (p < 0.05)

\*\*\* significantly different from both provincial and Canada level estimates (p < 0.05)

1 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Canada'.

2 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'British Columbia'.

3 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Victoria'.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents. Emergency planning activities include: an emergency exit plan, an emergency supply kit, photocopies/electronic copies of important documents and a list of emergency contact numbers. Precautionary measures include: a battery-operated or wind-up radio, an alternative heat source, a back-up generator and an alternative water source. Fire safety measures include a working smoke detector, a working carbon monoxide detector and a working fire extinguisher.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

**Table 1.3**  
**Planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures residents engaged in, community of Victoria, British Columbia, 2014**

Residents whose households were involved in the following:	Victoria	British Columbia	Canada
	percent		
<b>Emergency planning activities</b>			
Emergency exit plan	74 **	71	60
Exit plan has been practised/reviewed in last 12 months <sup>1</sup>	49	49	46
Designated meeting place for household members <sup>2</sup>	38	38	33
Contact plan for household members <sup>2</sup>	60 *	54	55
Household emergency supply kit	63 ***	55	47
Vehicle emergency supply kit <sup>3</sup>	58	58	59
Extra copies of important documents	55	55	53
List of emergency contact numbers	65	68	69
Plan for meeting special health needs <sup>4</sup>	67	61	62
<b>Precautionary measures</b>			
Wind-up or battery-operated radio	68 ***	59	58
Alternate heat source	60 **	55	48
Back-up generator	19	22	23
Alternate water source	56 ***	48	43
Other <sup>5</sup>	25	21	21
<b>Fire safety measures</b>			
Working smoke detector	98 *	95	98
Working carbon monoxide detector <sup>6 7</sup>	47 **	52	60
Working fire extinguisher	74 **	69	66

\* significantly different from provincial level estimate (p < 0.05)

\*\* significantly different from Canada level estimate (p < 0.05)

\*\*\* significantly different from both provincial and Canada level estimates (p < 0.05)

1 Percentage based only on those indicating that they have an emergency exit plan.

2 Excludes Canadians living in single-person households.

3 Excludes those who reported that they lived in a household that did not have a vehicle.

4 Percentage based only on those indicating that they or someone in their household has special medical needs.

5 'Other precautionary measures' include having an escape/rescue plan for pets, extra supply of fuel, checking and replenishing emergency supplies, and keeping exits clear.

6 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'British Columbia'.

7 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Victoria'.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

**Table 1.4**  
**High or moderately high levels of emergency planning, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents, by social and political involvement, community of Victoria, British Columbia, 2014**

Social and political involvement	Percentage of residents who had high or moderately high levels of...		
	Planning activities	Precautionary measures	Fire safety measures
	percent		
<b>Engagement in political activities <sup>1</sup></b>			
Yes <sup>7 †</sup>	54	41	38
No <sup>8 9</sup>	46	16 <sup>E</sup> *	37 <sup>E</sup>
<b>High level of civic engagement <sup>2</sup></b>			
Yes <sup>†</sup>	59	46	42
No <sup>7</sup>	41 * *	19 <sup>E</sup> *	31 *
<b>High level of social support <sup>3</sup></b>			
Yes <sup>7 †</sup>	59	41	48
No <sup>10</sup>	53	36	36 *
<b>Strong sense of belonging to community <sup>4</sup></b>			
Yes <sup>7 †</sup>	63	41	40
No <sup>7</sup>	42 *	32	37
<b>High neighbourhood trust <sup>5</sup></b>			
Yes <sup>10 †</sup>	58	44	41
No <sup>7</sup>	51	32 *	38
<b>High level of self-efficacy <sup>6</sup></b>			
Yes <sup>10 †</sup>	57	43	39
No <sup>7</sup>	50	30 *	39

<sup>E</sup> use with caution

\* significantly different from reference category ( $p < 0.05$ )

† reference category

- 1 Includes individuals over the age of 17 years who are eligible to vote, and who have participated in or volunteered for political parties or events in the past 12 months, including municipal, provincial, or federal elections, or expressed views on political or social issues through signing a petition, contacting news agencies or politicians, or attended a meeting involving social or community issues.
- 2 Civic engagement measures individuals over the age of 17 years who were involved in a recreational group or organization in the past 12 months, and includes engagement in political activities. A 'high level' is defined as having been involved in at least 4 activities in the past 12 months.
- 3 A 'high level of social support' is defined as having five or more people whom that individual could turn to for help in an emergency if they are physically injured, require emotional support, shelter, and/or financial assistance.
- 4 A 'strong sense of belonging to community' is rating one's own sense of belonging to their community as a 4 or a 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "very weak" and 5 "very strong".
- 5 'High neighbourhood trust' is rating one's own trust in the people in one's neighbourhood as 4 or 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "cannot be trusted at all" and 5 represents "can be trusted a lot", as well as having a response of "very likely" when asked about the likelihood of someone in their neighbourhood returning a lost wallet or purse containing two hundred dollars with the money still inside.
- 6 A 'high level of self-efficacy' is derived from having a high self-rating on a scale of 1 (poor) to 5 (excellent) for the following three categories: an ability to think clearly and solve day-to-day problems, to handle unexpected and difficult problems, and to figure out what to do if faced with an emergency situation.
- 7 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Fire safety measures'.
- 8 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Precautionary measures'.
- 9 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were equal to 12% for 'Fire safety measures'.
- 10 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were equal to 11% for 'Fire safety measures'.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents. Households with 'moderately high' or 'high' levels of emergency planning engaged in 3 or 4 of the following: having an exit plan, an emergency supply kit, extra copies of important documents and an emergency contact list. 'Moderately high' or 'high' levels of precautionary measures include having 3 or 4 of the following: a wind-up or battery operated radio, a back-up generator, an alternate source of heat and additional water. 'Moderately high' or 'high' levels of fire safety measure include having all 3 of the following: a working smoke detector, a working fire extinguisher, and a working carbon monoxide detector.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

## Notes

<sup>E</sup> use with caution

- 1 A Census Metropolitan Area (CMA) or a Census Agglomeration (CA) is formed by one or more adjacent municipalities centred on a population centre (known as the core). A CMA must have a total population of at least 100,000 of which 50,000 or more must live in the core. A CA must have a core population of at least 10,000. To be included in the CMA or CA, other adjacent municipalities must have a high degree of integration with the core as measured by commuting flows derived from census data.
- 2 The target population for the SEPR included all persons 15 years of age or older, residing in households in Canada's 10 provinces, excluding full-time residents of institutions (e.g. nursing homes, group homes, hospitals).
- 3 The SEPR covers three types of communities: Census Metropolitan Areas (CMAs), Census Agglomerations (CAs) with population greater than 50,000, and 'smaller communities' which include CAs with population 50,000 or less and those areas that fall outside of CMAs and CAs. All CMAs and CAs (with population greater than 50,000) were included in the SEPR. A sample of households were selected from smaller communities within each province to represent all households within the province in similar communities. Additional information on the SEPR and its sampling methodology can be found in the 'Survey description' section.
- 4 Throughout this fact sheet, responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.

- 5 This section focuses on personal experiences with emergencies or disasters that happened in Canada, in a community where the person was living at the time, and was significant enough to severely interrupt the individual's regular daily activities.
- 6 Emergency planning activities include: having an emergency exit plan, a household emergency supply kit, extra copies of important documents and an emergency contact list.
- 7 Precautionary measures include: having a wind-up or battery-operated radio, an alternate heat source such as a non-electric stove or heater or a wood-burning fireplace, a back-up generator and an alternative water source such as a well, tank or litres of stored water.
- 8 Unless otherwise specified, differences are statistically significant ( $p < 0.05$ ).
- 9 A 'strong sense of belonging to community' is rating one's own sense of belonging to their community as a 4 or a 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "very weak" and 5 "very strong".
- 10 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% when respondents were asked about their sense of belonging to their community.
- 11 A proportion (24%) of respondents were not asked questions regarding neighbourhood helpfulness in the event of an emergency and as such these cases are not included in the analysis on neighbourhood helpfulness in general or in the event of an emergency.
- 12 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% when respondents were asked about whether their neighbourhood is a place where neighbours would help each other if there is an emergency.
- 13 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% when respondents were asked about the number of people they could turn to for help if they were physically injured.
- 14 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% when respondents were asked about the number of people they could turn to for help in case of home evacuation.
- 15 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% when respondents were asked about the number of people they could turn to for help if financial support is needed.



## Fact sheet

# Community of Nanaimo (CA), British Columbia

---

In 2014, information on the emergency preparedness of people living in the Census Agglomeration<sup>1</sup> of Nanaimo was collected through the Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada (SEPR).<sup>2</sup> This fact sheet presents information on the risk awareness and level of emergency preparedness of the residents of Nanaimo, which could help improve the understanding of community resilience in the event of an emergency.<sup>3,4</sup>

### **Risk awareness and anticipated sources of help in an emergency or disaster**

- Earthquakes (88%), wildfires (67%) and extended power outages lasting 24 hours or longer (62%) were named by residents of Nanaimo as the events most likely to occur in their community.
- Residents most commonly reported that they would anticipate turning to a hospital, clinic, doctor or other medical professional in the event of an outbreak of a serious or life-threatening disease (58%), to their utility company in the event of an extended power outage (55%), and to local government in the event of a contamination or shortage of water or food (40%) (Table 1.1).
- Residents also stated that they would anticipate turning to news on the radio if they faced a weather-related emergency or natural disaster (39%) or an industrial or transportation accident (24%<sup>E</sup>). In addition to police or law enforcement (25%<sup>E</sup>), news on the radio (25%<sup>E</sup>) was also the most commonly anticipated source of initial help and information in the event of rioting or civil unrest. In the event of an act of terrorism or terrorist threat, residents commonly anticipated turning to news on the Internet (29%<sup>E</sup>).

### **Prior lifetime experience with a major emergency or disaster<sup>5</sup>**

- One in five (21%) Nanaimo residents have faced a major emergency or disaster in Canada in a community they were living in at the time of the event, with six in ten (58%) reporting that they had experienced severe disruptions to their daily activities as a result of the event.
- The most common types of disruption to daily activities endured by residents who had experienced major emergencies or disasters included an inability to use electrical appliances at home (51%<sup>E</sup>), missing an appointment or planned activity (45%<sup>E</sup>) and missing work or school (42%<sup>E</sup>). A more severe disruption experienced was an inability to use roads or transportation in the community (31%<sup>E</sup>).
- Most (83%) residents who experienced an emergency or disaster were able to resume their daily activities within one week of the event; one in three (32%<sup>E</sup>) of whom were able to resume activities within three to five days.
- Seven in ten (71%) residents who had experienced an emergency or disaster received help during or immediately following the event.
- Three in ten (31%<sup>E</sup>) residents of Nanaimo who experienced a major emergency or disaster in Canada in a community where they were living at the time of the event and which was significant enough to disrupt their regular daily routine also endured a loss of property or financial impact.<sup>6</sup>

### **Emergency planning, precautionary and fire safety behaviours**

- Eight in ten (79%) people residing in Nanaimo lived in households that were engaged in at least two emergency planning activities,<sup>7</sup> and more than half (55%) lived in households with three or four such activities (Table 1.2).

- Nearly two-thirds (63%) lived in a household with at least two precautionary measures<sup>8</sup> taken in case of an emergency, and one-third (32%) lived in a household with three or four such measures. More than one in ten (13%<sup>E</sup>) people lived in a household with no precautionary measures in place.
- Almost all (96%) residents reported living in a household with a working smoke detector, and nearly three-quarters (73%) reported living in a household with a working fire extinguisher (Table 1.3). Nearly one-half (48%) of residents stated that they had a working carbon monoxide detector in their household. Four in ten (39%) residents of Nanaimo stated that they had implemented all three fire safety measures in their household.
- For the most part, the number of emergency planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents of Nanaimo did not differ significantly from residents in British Columbia and Canada's 10 provinces overall.<sup>9</sup>
- There were a few significant differences in the types of activities and measures in place by residents of Nanaimo when compared to residents of Canada in general, with Nanaimo residents almost always being more prepared. For example, Nanaimo residents were more likely to have a working fire extinguisher (73%), an emergency exit plan (71%), a household emergency supply kit (61%), an alternate water source (52%) and a working carbon monoxide detector (48%) than Canadians overall.

## Social networks and sense of belonging

- Over half (55%) of residents of Nanaimo had a strong sense of belonging<sup>10</sup> to their community.<sup>11</sup>
- Close to nine in ten (87%) residents described the neighbourhood they lived in as a place where neighbours generally help each other.<sup>12</sup> Of those who did not describe their neighbourhood this way, most (86%) still described it as a place where neighbours would help each other in an emergency.<sup>13</sup>
- Many individuals had a large network of support in the event of an emergency or disaster, with more than five people to turn to for emotional support (58%),<sup>14</sup> for help if physically injured (48%)<sup>15</sup> and in the event of a home evacuation (48%).<sup>16</sup> One-quarter (24%) of residents had a large support network if financial help was needed, and more than one in ten (13%) residents reported that they had no one to turn to for financial help.<sup>17</sup>
- High levels of social support, self-efficacy and neighbourhood trust were sometimes associated with a higher level of emergency preparedness (Table 1.4).

## Data tables

**Table 1.1**

**Most commonly anticipated sources of initial help and information, by type of emergency or disaster, residents of Nanaimo, British Columbia, 2014**

Most common sources of initial help and information by type of emergency or disaster	percent
<b>Weather-related emergency or natural disaster</b>	
News- Radio	39
News- Television	15
Family	14 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Extended power outages<sup>1</sup></b>	
Utility company	55
News- Radio	13 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Outbreak of serious or life-threatening disease</b>	
Hospital, clinic, doctor or other medical professional	58
News- Radio	16 <sup>E</sup>
News- Internet	15 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Industrial or transportation accident<sup>1</sup></b>	
News- Radio	24 <sup>E</sup>
News- Television	19 <sup>E</sup>
News- Internet	19 <sup>E</sup>



<b>Contamination or shortage of water or food <sup>1</sup></b>	
Local government	40
News- Radio	20 <sup>E</sup>
News- Internet	14 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Act of terrorism or terrorist threat <sup>1</sup></b>	
News- Internet	29 <sup>E</sup>
News- Radio	27 <sup>E</sup>
News- Television	25 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Rioting or civil unrest</b>	
News- Radio	25 <sup>E</sup>
Police/law enforcement	25 <sup>E</sup>
News- Television	24 <sup>E</sup>
<sup>E</sup> use with caution	
1 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% when respondents were asked about their likely sources of initial help and information.	
<b>Note:</b> Respondents who perceived their community was at risk for any form of emergency or disaster were then asked where they would turn to first for information or assistance in the event of the perceived emergency or disaster. Respondents could provide more than one response. Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.	
<b>Source:</b> Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.	

**Table 1.2**

**Number of emergency planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents, community of Nanaimo, British Columbia, 2014**

Number of planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents	Nanaimo	British Columbia	Canada
	percent		
<b>Number of emergency planning activities</b>			
None	F	6	8
1 activity	13	15	17
2 activities	24	22	25
3 activities	30	29	27
4 activities	25	25	19
<b>Number of precautionary measures</b>			
None	13 <sup>E</sup>	13	16
1 measure	21 **	24	27
2 measures	31	27	28
3 measures	25	23	20
4 measures	7 <sup>E</sup>	8	7
<b>Number of fire safety measures <sup>1 2</sup></b>			
None	F	1 <sup>E</sup>	1
1 measure	15 <sup>E</sup>	14	14
2 measures	41	40	38
3 measures	39	38	42

<sup>E</sup> use with caution  
<sup>F</sup> too unreliable to be published

\*\* significantly different from Canada level estimate (p < 0.05)

1 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Canada'.

2 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'British Columbia'.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents. Emergency planning activities include: an emergency exit plan, an emergency supply kit, photocopies/electronic copies of important documents and a list of emergency contact numbers. Precautionary measures include: a battery-operated or wind-up radio, an alternate heat source, a back-up generator and an alternative water source. Fire safety measures include a working smoke detector, a working carbon monoxide detector and a working fire extinguisher.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

**Table 1.3**  
**Planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures residents engaged in, community of Nanaimo, British Columbia, 2014**

Residents whose households were involved in the following:	Nanaimo	British Columbia	Canada
	percent		
<b>Emergency planning activities</b>			
Emergency exit plan	71 **	71	60
Exit plan has been practised/reviewed in last 12 months <sup>1</sup>	47	49	46
Designated meeting place for household members <sup>2</sup>	38	38	33
Contact plan for household members <sup>2</sup>	53	54	55
Household emergency supply kit	61 **	55	47
Vehicle emergency supply kit <sup>3</sup>	58	58	59
Extra copies of important documents	51	55	53
List of emergency contact numbers	69	68	69
Plan for meeting special health needs <sup>4</sup>	55	61	62
<b>Precautionary measures</b>			
Wind-up or battery-operated radio	62	59	58
Alternate heat source	54	55	48
Back-up generator	21	22	23
Alternate water source	52 **	48	43
Other <sup>5</sup>	22	21	21
<b>Fire safety measures</b>			
Working smoke detector	96	95	98
Working carbon monoxide detector <sup>6</sup>	48 **	52	60
Working fire extinguisher	73 **	69	66

\*\* significantly different from Canada level estimate (p < 0.05)

1 Percentage based only on those indicating that they have an emergency exit plan.

2 Excludes Canadians living in single-person households.

3 Excludes those who reported that they lived in a household that did not have a vehicle.

4 Percentage based only on those indicating that they or someone in their household has special medical needs.

5 'Other precautionary measures' include having an escape/rescue plan for pets, extra supply of fuel, checking and replenishing emergency supplies, and keeping exits clear.

6 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'British Columbia'.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

**Table 1.4**

**High or moderately high levels of emergency planning, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents, by social and political involvement, community of Nanaimo, British Columbia, 2014**

Social and political involvement	Percentage of residents who had high or moderately high levels of...		
	Planning activities	Precautionary measures	Fire safety measures
	percent		
<b>Engagement in political activities <sup>1</sup></b>			
Yes †	56	33	40
No <sup>7</sup>	56 <sup>E</sup>	F	F
<b>High level of civic engagement <sup>2</sup></b>			
Yes †	57	35	40
No	55	31 <sup>E</sup>	39 <sup>E</sup>
<b>High level of social support <sup>3</sup></b>			
Yes †	72	49 <sup>E</sup>	42 <sup>E</sup>
No	53 <sup>*</sup>	29 <sup>*</sup>	37
<b>Strong sense of belonging to community <sup>4</sup></b>			
Yes †	58	37	42
No	56	29 <sup>E</sup>	35
<b>High neighbourhood trust <sup>5</sup></b>			
Yes †	60	34	46
No	57	35	32 <sup>*</sup>
<b>High level of self-efficacy <sup>6</sup></b>			
Yes †	61	35	47
No	53	33	30 <sup>*</sup>

<sup>E</sup> use with caution

F too unreliable to be published

\* significantly different from reference category ( $p < 0.05$ )

† reference category

1 Includes individuals over the age of 17 years who are eligible to vote, and who have participated in or volunteered for political parties or events in the past 12 months, including municipal, provincial, or federal elections, or expressed views on political or social issues through signing a petition, contacting news agencies or politicians, or attended a meeting involving social or community issues.

2 Civic engagement measures individuals over the age of 17 years who were involved in a recreational group or organization in the past 12 months, and includes engagement in political activities. A 'high level' is defined as having been involved in at least 4 activities in the past 12 months.

3 A 'high level of social support' is defined as having five or more people whom that individual could turn to for help in an emergency if they are physically injured, require emotional support, shelter, and/or financial assistance.

4 A 'strong sense of belonging to community' is rating one's own sense of belonging to their community as a 4 or a 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "very weak" and 5 "very strong".

5 'High neighbourhood trust' is rating one's own trust in the people in one's neighbourhood as 4 or 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "cannot be trusted at all" and 5 represents "can be trusted a lot", as well as having a response of "very likely" when asked about the likelihood of someone in their neighbourhood returning a lost wallet or purse containing two hundred dollars with the money still inside.

6 A 'high level of self-efficacy' is derived from having a high self-rating on a scale of 1 (poor) to 5 (excellent) for the following three categories: an ability to think clearly and solve day-to-day problems, to handle unexpected and difficult problems, and to figure out what to do if faced with an emergency situation.

7 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Fire safety measures'.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents. Households with 'moderately high' or 'high' levels of emergency planning engaged in 3 or 4 of the following: having an exit plan, an emergency supply kit, extra copies of important documents and an emergency contact list. 'Moderately high' or 'high' levels of precautionary measures include having 3 or 4 of the following: a wind-up or battery operated radio, a back-up generator, an alternate source of heat and additional water. 'Moderately high' or 'high' levels of fire safety measure include having all 3 of the following: a working smoke detector, a working fire extinguisher, and a working carbon monoxide detector.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

## Notes

<sup>E</sup> use with caution

- 1 A Census Metropolitan Area (CMA) or a Census Agglomeration (CA) is formed by one or more adjacent municipalities centred on a population centre (known as the core). A CMA must have a total population of at least 100,000 of which 50,000 or more must live in the core. A CA must have a core population of at least 10,000. To be included in the CMA or CA, other adjacent municipalities must have a high degree of integration with the core as measured by commuting flows derived from census data.
- 2 The target population for the SEPR included all persons 15 years of age or older, residing in households in Canada's 10 provinces, excluding full-time residents of institutions (e.g. nursing homes, group homes, hospitals).
- 3 The SEPR covers three types of communities: Census Metropolitan Areas (CMAs), Census Agglomerations (CAs) with population greater than 50,000, and 'smaller communities' which include CAs with population 50,000 or less and those areas that fall outside of CMAs and CAs. All CMAs and CAs (with population greater than 50,000) were included in the SEPR. A sample of households were selected from smaller communities within each province to represent all households within the province in similar communities. Additional information on the SEPR and its sampling methodology can be found in the 'Survey description' section.
- 4 Throughout this fact sheet, responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.
- 5 This section focuses on personal experiences with emergencies or disasters that happened in Canada, in a community where the person was living at the time, and was significant enough to severely interrupt the individual's regular daily activities.
- 6 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% when respondents were asked about whether the emergency they experienced caused them to suffer loss of property or financial impacts.
- 7 Emergency planning activities include: having an emergency exit plan, a household emergency supply kit, extra copies of important documents and an emergency contact list.
- 8 Precautionary measures include: having a wind-up or battery-operated radio, an alternate heat source such as a non-electric stove or heater or a wood-burning fireplace, a back-up generator and an alternative water source such as a well, tank or litres of stored water.
- 9 Unless otherwise specified, differences are statistically significant ( $p < 0.05$ ).
- 10 A 'strong sense of belonging to community' is rating one's own sense of belonging to their community as a 4 or a 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "very weak" and 5 "very strong".
- 11 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% when respondents were asked about their sense of belonging to their community.
- 12 A proportion (28%) of respondents were not asked questions regarding neighbourhood helpfulness in the event of an emergency and as such these cases are not included in the analysis on neighbourhood helpfulness in general or in the event of an emergency.
- 13 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were equal to 11% when respondents were asked about whether their neighbourhood is a place where neighbours would help each other if there is an emergency.

- 14 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% when respondents were asked about the number of people they could turn to for emotional support.
- 15 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% when respondents were asked about the number of people they could turn to for help if they were physically injured.
- 16 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% when respondents were asked about the number of people they could turn to for help in case of home evacuation.
- 17 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were equal to 11% when respondents were asked about the number of people they could turn to for help if financial support is needed.



## Fact sheet

# Community of Courtenay (CA), British Columbia

---

In 2014, information on the emergency preparedness of people living in the Census Agglomeration<sup>1</sup> of Courtenay was collected through the Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada (SEPR).<sup>2</sup> This fact sheet presents information on the risk awareness and level of emergency preparedness of the residents of Courtenay, which could help improve the understanding of community resilience in the event of an emergency.<sup>3,4</sup>

### **Risk awareness and anticipated sources of help in an emergency or disaster**

- Earthquakes (88%), extended power outages lasting 24 hours or longer (65%) and wildfires (59%) were named by residents of Courtenay as the events most likely to occur in their community.
- Residents most commonly reported that they would anticipate turning to their utility company in the event of an extended power outage (57%), to a hospital, clinic, doctor or other medical professional in the event of an outbreak of a serious or life-threatening disease (54%), and to police or law enforcement in the event of rioting or civil unrest (52%<sup>E</sup>) (Table 1.1).
- Residents also stated that they would anticipate turning to local government if they faced a contamination or shortage of water or food (38%), and to news on the radio if they faced a weather-related emergency or natural disaster (35%), an act of terrorism or terrorist threat (35%<sup>E</sup>) or an industrial or transportation accident (32%<sup>E</sup>).

### **Prior lifetime experience with a major emergency or disaster<sup>5</sup>**

- Three in ten (29%) Courtenay residents have faced a major emergency or disaster in Canada in a community they were living in at the time of the event, about six in ten (63%) of whom reported experiencing severe disruptions to their daily activities as a result of the event.
- Extended power outages lasting 24 hours or longer (32%<sup>E</sup>), floods (24%<sup>E</sup>) and winter storms which include blizzards and ice storms (23%<sup>E</sup>) were the most commonly experienced emergency or disaster by residents of Courtenay.
- The most common types of disruption to daily activities endured by residents who had experienced major emergencies or disasters included an inability to use electrical appliances at home (61%), missing an appointment or planned activity (56%) and missing work or school (52%). More severe disruptions experienced were an inability to use roads or transportation in the community (32%<sup>E</sup>) and home evacuation (28%<sup>E</sup>).
- Eight in ten (79%) residents who experienced an emergency or disaster were able to resume their daily activities within one week of the event: 24%<sup>E</sup> within 24 hours, 26%<sup>E</sup> within one to two days and 22%<sup>E</sup> within three to five days.
- Nearly half (46%) of residents who had experienced an emergency or disaster received help during or immediately following the event.
- Approximately one in five (22%<sup>E</sup>) residents of Courtenay who experienced a major emergency or disaster in Canada in a community where they were living at the time of the event and which was significant enough to disrupt their regular daily routine also endured a loss of property or financial impact.

### **Emergency planning, precautionary and fire safety behaviours**

- Three-quarters (76%) of people residing in Courtenay lived in households that were engaged in at least two emergency planning activities,<sup>6</sup> and more than half (56%) lived in households with three or four such activities (Table

- 1.2). One in twenty (6%<sup>E</sup>) people lived in a household that had not participated in any emergency planning activities.
- Seven in ten (68%) lived in a household with at least two precautionary measures<sup>7</sup> taken in case of an emergency, and four in ten (41%) lived in a household with three or four such measures. One in ten (10%<sup>E</sup>) people lived in a household with no precautionary measures in place.
  - Almost all (99%) residents reported living in a household with a working smoke detector, and three-quarters (76%) reported living in a household with a working fire extinguisher (Table 1.3). One-half (52%) of residents stated that they had a working carbon monoxide detector in their household. Four in ten (41%) residents of Courtenay stated that they had implemented all three fire safety measures in their household.
  - In general, the number of emergency planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents of Courtenay did not differ significantly from residents in British Columbia and Canada's 10 provinces overall. One exception included residents of Courtenay (17%) being more likely to have all four precautionary measures in place compared to those in British Columbia (8%) and Canada in general (7%). In addition, Courtenay residents were also more likely to have implemented all four emergency planning activities than residents of Canada (25% versus 19%).<sup>8</sup>
  - There were some significant differences in the types of activities and measures in place by residents of Courtenay when compared to British Columbia and Canada in general, with Courtenay residents typically being more likely to have implemented the activity or measure. For instance, Courtenay residents were more likely to have an alternate heat source (65%), a household emergency supply kit (63%) and an alternate water source (59%) than residents of British Columbia (55%, 55% and 48%, respectively) and Canada (48%, 47% and 43%, respectively).

## Social networks and sense of belonging

- Over half (57%) of residents of Courtenay had a strong sense of belonging<sup>9</sup> to their community.
- Nine in ten (90%) residents described the neighbourhood they lived in as a place where neighbours generally help each other.<sup>10</sup> Of those who did not describe their neighbourhood this way, almost all (95%) still described it as a place where neighbours would help each other in an emergency.
- The majority of individuals had a large network of support in the event of an emergency or disaster, with more than five people to turn to for emotional support (62%), for help if physically injured (57%) and in the event of a home evacuation (54%). One-quarter (25%) of residents had a large support network if financial help was needed, and 13% reported that they had no one to turn to for financial help.<sup>11</sup>
- High levels of social support, self-efficacy and neighbourhood trust, as well as political engagement, were sometimes associated with a higher level of emergency preparedness (Table 1.4).

## Data tables

**Table 1.1**

**Most commonly anticipated sources of initial help and information, by type of emergency or disaster, residents of Courtenay, British Columbia, 2014**

Most common sources of initial help and information by type of emergency or disaster	percent
<b>Weather-related emergency or natural disaster</b>	
News- Radio	35
News- Internet	16 <sup>E</sup>
First responders	16
<b>Extended power outages</b>	
Utility company	57
News- Radio	15 <sup>E</sup>
Family	7 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Outbreak of serious or life-threatening disease</b>	
Hospital, clinic, doctor or other medical professional	54
News- Radio	18 <sup>E</sup>
News- Internet	15 <sup>E</sup>

<b>Industrial or transportation accident <sup>1</sup></b>	
News- Radio	32 <sup>E</sup>
News- Internet	22 <sup>E</sup>
Police/law enforcement	20 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Contamination or shortage of water or food <sup>1</sup></b>	
Local government	38
News- Radio	21 <sup>E</sup>
News- Television	13 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Act of terrorism or terrorist threat</b>	
News- Radio	35 <sup>E</sup>
Police/law enforcement	33 <sup>E</sup>
News- Internet	24 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Rioting or civil unrest <sup>1</sup></b>	
Police/law enforcement	52 <sup>E</sup>
<sup>E</sup> use with caution	
1 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% when respondents were asked about their likely sources of initial help and information.	
<b>Note:</b> Respondents who perceived their community was at risk for any form of emergency or disaster were then asked where they would turn to first for information or assistance in the event of the perceived emergency or disaster. Respondents could provide more than one response. Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.	
<b>Source:</b> Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.	

**Table 1.2**  
**Number of emergency planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents, community of Courtenay, British Columbia, 2014**

Number of planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents	Courtenay	British Columbia	Canada
	percent		
<b>Number of emergency planning activities</b>			
None	6 <sup>E</sup>	6	8
1 activity	16	15	17
2 activities	20	22	25
3 activities	31	29	27
4 activities	25 **	25	19
<b>Number of precautionary measures</b>			
None	10 <sup>E</sup> **	13	16
1 measure	21	24	27
2 measures	27	27	28
3 measures	24	23	20
4 measures	17 ***	8	7
<b>Number of fire safety measures <sup>1 2</sup></b>			
None	F	1 <sup>E</sup>	1
1 measure	12	14	14
2 measures	42	40	38
3 measures	41	38	42



<sup>E</sup> use with caution  
<sup>F</sup> too unreliable to be published

\*\* significantly different from Canada level estimate (p < 0.05)

\*\*\* significantly different from both provincial and Canada level estimates (p < 0.05)

1 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Canada'.

2 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'British Columbia'.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents. Emergency planning activities include: an emergency exit plan, an emergency supply kit, photocopies/electronic copies of important documents and a list of emergency contact numbers. Precautionary measures include: a battery-operated or wind-up radio, an alternative heat source, a back-up generator and an alternative water source. Fire safety measures include a working smoke detector, a working carbon monoxide detector and a working fire extinguisher.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

**Table 1.3**  
**Planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures residents engaged in, community of Courtenay, British Columbia, 2014**

Residents whose households were involved in the following:	Courtenay	British Columbia	Canada
	percent		
<b>Emergency planning activities</b>			
Emergency exit plan	71 **	71	60
Exit plan has been practised/reviewed in last 12 months <sup>1</sup>	48	49	46
Designated meeting place for household members <sup>2</sup>	36	38	33
Contact plan for household members <sup>2</sup>	51	54	55
Household emergency supply kit	63 ***	55	47
Vehicle emergency supply kit <sup>3</sup>	61	58	59
Extra copies of important documents	55	55	53
List of emergency contact numbers	62 **	68	69
Plan for meeting special health needs <sup>4</sup>	54	61	62
<b>Precautionary measures</b>			
Wind-up or battery-operated radio	64	59	58
Alternate heat source	65 ***	55	48
Back-up generator	26	22	23
Alternate water source	59 ***	48	43
Other <sup>5</sup>	24	21	21
<b>Fire safety measures</b>			
Working smoke detector	99 ***	95	98
Working carbon monoxide detector <sup>6</sup>	52 **	52	60
Working fire extinguisher	76 ***	69	66

\*\* significantly different from Canada level estimate (p < 0.05)

\*\*\* significantly different from both provincial and Canada level estimates (p < 0.05)

1 Percentage based only on those indicating that they have an emergency exit plan.

2 Excludes Canadians living in single-person households.

3 Excludes those who reported that they lived in a household that did not have a vehicle.

4 Percentage based only on those indicating that they or someone in their household has special medical needs.

5 'Other precautionary measures' include having an escape/rescue plan for pets, extra supply of fuel, checking and replenishing emergency supplies, and keeping exits clear.

6 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'British Columbia'.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

**Table 1.4**

**High or moderately high levels of emergency planning, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents, by social and political involvement, community of Courtenay, British Columbia, 2014**

Social and political involvement	Percentage of residents who had high or moderately high levels of...		
	Planning activities	Precautionary measures	Fire safety measures
	percent		
<b>Engagement in political activities <sup>1</sup></b>			
Yes †	60	43	45
No <sup>7 8</sup>	39 <sup>E *</sup>	33 <sup>E</sup>	F
<b>High level of civic engagement <sup>2</sup></b>			
Yes †	60	43	42
No	48	40	42
<b>High level of social support <sup>3</sup></b>			
Yes †	61	55	45
No	56	38 <sup>*</sup>	42
<b>Strong sense of belonging to community <sup>4</sup></b>			
Yes †	60	44	43
No	51	37	39
<b>High neighbourhood trust <sup>5</sup></b>			
Yes †	61	52	43
No	51	28 <sup>*</sup>	39
<b>High level of self-efficacy <sup>6</sup></b>			
Yes †	63	45	44
No <sup>8</sup>	45 <sup>*</sup>	35	37

<sup>E</sup> use with caution

<sup>F</sup> too unreliable to be published

\* significantly different from reference category ( $p < 0.05$ )

† reference category

- 1 Includes individuals over the age of 17 years who are eligible to vote, and who have participated in or volunteered for political parties or events in the past 12 months, including municipal, provincial, or federal elections, or expressed views on political or social issues through signing a petition, contacting news agencies or politicians, or attended a meeting involving social or community issues.
- 2 Civic engagement measures individuals over the age of 17 years who were involved in a recreational group or organization in the past 12 months, and includes engagement in political activities. A 'high level' is defined as having been involved in at least 4 activities in the past 12 months.
- 3 A 'high level of social support' is defined as having five or more people whom that individual could turn to for help in an emergency if they are physically injured, require emotional support, shelter, and/or financial assistance.
- 4 A 'strong sense of belonging to community' is rating one's own sense of belonging to their community as a 4 or a 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "very weak" and 5 "very strong".
- 5 'High neighbourhood trust' is rating one's own trust in the people in one's neighbourhood as 4 or 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "cannot be trusted at all" and 5 represents "can be trusted a lot", as well as having a response of "very likely" when asked about the likelihood of someone in their neighbourhood returning a lost wallet or purse containing two hundred dollars with the money still inside.
- 6 A 'high level of self-efficacy' is derived from having a high self-rating on a scale of 1 (poor) to 5 (excellent) for the following three categories: an ability to think clearly and solve day-to-day problems, to handle unexpected and difficult problems, and to figure out what to do if faced with an emergency situation.
- 7 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Planning activities'.
- 8 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Fire safety measures'.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents. Households with 'moderately high' or 'high' levels of emergency planning engaged in 3 or 4 of the following: having an exit plan, an emergency supply kit, extra copies of important documents and an emergency contact list. 'Moderately high' or 'high' levels of precautionary measures include having 3 or 4 of the following: a wind-up or battery operated radio, a back-up generator, an alternate source of heat and additional water. 'Moderately high' or 'high' levels of fire safety measure include having all 3 of the following: a working smoke detector, a working fire extinguisher, and a working carbon monoxide detector.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

## Notes

<sup>E</sup> use with caution

- 1 A Census Metropolitan Area (CMA) or a Census Agglomeration (CA) is formed by one or more adjacent municipalities centred on a population centre (known as the core). A CMA must have a total population of at least 100,000 of which 50,000 or more must live in the core. A CA must have a core population of at least 10,000. To be included in the CMA or CA, other adjacent municipalities must have a high degree of integration with the core as measured by commuting flows derived from census data.
- 2 The target population for the SEPR included all persons 15 years of age or older, residing in households in Canada's 10 provinces, excluding full-time residents of institutions (e.g. nursing homes, group homes, hospitals).
- 3 The SEPR covers three types of communities: Census Metropolitan Areas (CMAs), Census Agglomerations (CAs) with population greater than 50,000, and 'smaller communities' which include CAs with population 50,000 or less and those areas that fall outside of CMAs and CAs. All CMAs and CAs (with population greater than 50,000) were included in the SEPR. A sample of households were selected from smaller communities within each province to represent all households within the province in similar communities. Additional information on the SEPR and its sampling methodology can be found in the 'Survey description' section.
- 4 Throughout this fact sheet, responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.
- 5 This section focuses on personal experiences with emergencies or disasters that happened in Canada, in a community where the person was living at the time, and was significant enough to severely interrupt the individual's regular daily activities.

- 6 Emergency planning activities include: having an emergency exit plan, a household emergency supply kit, extra copies of important documents and an emergency contact list.
- 7 Precautionary measures include: having a wind-up or battery-operated radio, an alternate heat source such as a non-electric stove or heater or a wood-burning fireplace, a back-up generator and an alternative water source such as a well, tank or litres of stored water.
- 8 Unless otherwise specified, differences are statistically significant ( $p < 0.05$ ).
- 9 A 'strong sense of belonging to community' is rating one's own sense of belonging to their community as a 4 or a 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "very weak" and 5 "very strong".
- 10 A proportion (27%) of respondents were not asked questions regarding neighbourhood helpfulness in the event of an emergency and as such these cases are not included in the analysis on neighbourhood helpfulness in general or in the event of an emergency.
- 11 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% when respondents were asked about the number of people they could turn to for help if financial support is needed.



## Fact sheet

# Community of Prince George (CA), British Columbia

---

In 2014, information on the emergency preparedness of people living in the Census Agglomeration<sup>1</sup> of Prince George was collected through the Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada (SEPR).<sup>2</sup> This fact sheet presents information on the risk awareness and level of emergency preparedness of the residents of Prince George, which could help improve the understanding of community resilience in the event of an emergency.<sup>3,4</sup>

### **Risk awareness and anticipated sources of help in an emergency or disaster**

- Wildfires (92%), winter storms (including blizzards, ice storms and extreme cold) (87%), extended power outages lasting 24 hours or longer (78%) and industrial or transportation accidents (76%) were named by residents of Prince George as the events most likely to occur in their community.
- Residents most commonly reported that they would anticipate turning to their utility company in the event of an extended power outage (62%) and to a hospital, clinic, doctor or other medical professional in the event of an outbreak of a serious or life-threatening disease (60%). Residents frequently stated that they would turn to police or law enforcement if they faced rioting or civil unrest (50%<sup>E</sup>) or an act of terrorism or terrorist threat (36%<sup>E</sup>) (Table 1.1).
- Residents most commonly anticipated turning to news on the radio in the event of a weather-related emergency or natural disaster (33%) or an industrial or transportation accident (33%), and to local government if they faced a contamination or shortage of water or food (31%).

### **Prior lifetime experience with a major emergency or disaster<sup>5</sup>**

- Three in ten (29%) Prince George residents have faced a major emergency or disaster in Canada in a community they were living in at the time of the event, close to six in ten (57%) of whom reported experiencing severe disruptions to their daily activities as a result of the event.
- Extended power outages lasting 24 hours or longer (35%<sup>E</sup>) were the most commonly experienced emergency or disaster by residents of Prince George.
- The most common types of disruption to daily activities endured by residents who had experienced major emergencies or disasters included missing school or work (63%) and missing an appointment or planned activity (61%). More severe disruptions experienced were an inability to use roads or transportation in the community (34%<sup>E</sup>) and home evacuation (25%<sup>E</sup>).
- Eight in ten (80%) residents who experienced an emergency or disaster were able to resume their daily activities within one week of the event: 25%<sup>E</sup> within 24 hours, 32%<sup>E</sup> within one to two days and 18%<sup>E</sup> within three to five days.
- Six in ten (60%) residents who had experienced an emergency or disaster received help during or immediately following the event.
- One in five (18%<sup>E</sup>) residents of Prince George who experienced a major emergency or disaster in Canada in a community where they were living at the time of the event and which was significant enough to disrupt their regular daily routine also endured a loss of property or financial impact.

### **Emergency planning, precautionary and fire safety behaviours**

- Three-quarters (73%) of people residing in Prince George lived in households that were engaged in at least two emergency planning activities,<sup>6</sup> and nearly half (47%) lived in households with three or four such activities (Table 1.2). One in twenty (6%<sup>E</sup>) people lived in a household that had not participated in any emergency planning activities.
- Close to six in ten (57%) lived in a household with at least two precautionary measures<sup>7</sup> taken in case of an emergency, and three in ten (29%) lived in a household with three or four such measures. Around one in six (15%<sup>E</sup>) people lived in a household with no precautionary measures in place.
- Almost all (98%) residents reported living in a household with a working smoke detector, and seven in ten (71%) reported living in a household with a working fire extinguisher (Table 1.3). Six in ten (59%) residents stated that they had a working carbon monoxide detector in their household. Almost one-half (46%) of residents of Prince George stated that they had implemented all three fire safety measures in their household.
- The number of emergency planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures residents of Prince George engaged in did not differ significantly from residents in British Columbia and Canada's 10 provinces overall. There was one exception: residents of Prince George (46%) were more likely to have all three fire safety measures in place compared to those in British Columbia (38%).<sup>8</sup>
- There were a few differences in the types of activities and measures in place by residents of Prince George when compared to British Columbia and Canada in general; when significant differences existed, Prince George residents were always more likely to have engaged in the activity or measure. For instance, Prince George residents were more likely to have a vehicle emergency supply kit (67%) and a back-up generator (29%) compared to residents of British Columbia (58% and 22%, respectively) and Canada (59% and 23%, respectively).

## Social networks and sense of belonging

- Six in ten (59%) residents of Prince George had a strong sense of belonging<sup>9</sup> to their community.
- A large majority (84%) of residents described the neighbourhood they lived in as a place where neighbours generally help each other.<sup>10</sup> Of those who did not describe their neighbourhood this way, most (76%) still described it as a place where neighbours would help each other in an emergency.<sup>11</sup>
- Approximately two-thirds of individuals had a large network of support in the event of an emergency or disaster, with more than five people to turn to for help if physically injured (68%), for emotional support (66%) and in the event of a home evacuation (63%). One-third (32%) of residents had a large support network if financial help was needed, and close to one in ten (8%<sup>E</sup>) residents reported that they had no one to turn to for financial help.
- High levels of sense of belonging, social support and self-efficacy, as well as civic and political engagement, were not associated with a higher level of emergency preparedness (Table 1.4).

## Data tables

Table 1.1

Most commonly anticipated sources of initial help and information, by type of emergency or disaster, residents of Prince George, British Columbia, 2014

Most common sources of initial help and information by type of emergency or disaster	percent
<b>Weather-related emergency or natural disaster</b>	
News- Radio	33
News- Television	24
News- Internet	22
<b>Extended power outages<sup>1</sup></b>	
Utility company	62
News- Radio	10 <sup>E</sup>
News- Internet	9 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Outbreak of serious or life-threatening disease</b>	
Hospital, clinic, doctor or other medical professional	60
News- Radio	23 <sup>E</sup>

News- Television	17 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Industrial or transportation accident</b>	
News- Radio	33
News- Television	23
News- Internet	20
<b>Contamination or shortage of water or food <sup>1</sup></b>	
Local government	31
News- Radio	21 <sup>E</sup>
News- Television	14 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Act of terrorism or terrorist threat <sup>1</sup></b>	
Police/law enforcement	36 <sup>E</sup>
News- Television	33 <sup>E</sup>
News- Radio	28 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Rioting or civil unrest</b>	
Police/law enforcement	50 <sup>E</sup>
News- Radio	22 <sup>E</sup>
<sup>E</sup> use with caution	
1 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% when respondents were asked about their likely sources of initial help and information.	
<b>Note:</b> Respondents who perceived their community was at risk for any form of emergency or disaster were then asked where they would turn to first for information or assistance in the event of the perceived emergency or disaster. Respondents could provide more than one response. Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.	
<b>Source:</b> Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.	

**Table 1.2**  
**Number of emergency planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents, community of Prince George, British Columbia, 2014**

Number of planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents	Prince George	British Columbia	Canada
	percent		
<b>Number of emergency planning activities</b>			
None	6 <sup>E</sup>	6	8
1 activity	20	15	17
2 activities	26	22	25
3 activities	26	29	27
4 activities	21	25	19
<b>Number of precautionary measures</b>			
None	15 <sup>E</sup>	13	16
1 measure	27	24	27
2 measures	28	27	28
3 measures	19	23	20
4 measures	10 <sup>E</sup>	8	7
<b>Number of fire safety measures <sup>1 2</sup></b>			
None	F	1 <sup>E</sup>	1
1 measure	15	14	14
2 measures	35	40	38
3 measures	46 *	38	42

E use with caution  
 F too unreliable to be published

\* significantly different from provincial level estimate ( $p < 0.05$ )

1 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Canada'.

2 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'British Columbia'.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents. Emergency planning activities include: an emergency exit plan, an emergency supply kit, photocopies/electronic copies of important documents and a list of emergency contact numbers. Precautionary measures include: a battery-operated or wind-up radio, an alternate heat source, a back-up generator and an alternate water source. Fire safety measures include a working smoke detector, a working carbon monoxide detector and a working fire extinguisher.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

**Table 1.3**  
**Planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures residents engaged in, community of Prince George, British Columbia, 2014**

Residents whose households were involved in the following:	Prince George	British Columbia	Canada
	percent		
<b>Emergency planning activities</b>			
Emergency exit plan	67 **	71	60
Exit plan has been practised/reviewed in last 12 months <sup>1</sup>	51	49	46
Designated meeting place for household members <sup>2</sup>	40	38	33
Contact plan for household members <sup>2</sup>	53	54	55
Household emergency supply kit	50	55	47
Vehicle emergency supply kit <sup>3</sup>	67 ***	58	59
Extra copies of important documents	54	55	53
List of emergency contact numbers	66	68	69
Plan for meeting special health needs <sup>4</sup>	56	61	62
<b>Precautionary measures</b>			
Wind-up or battery-operated radio	53	59	58
Alternate heat source	51	55	48
Back-up generator	29 ***	22	23
Alternate water source	47	48	43
Other <sup>5</sup>	21	21	21
<b>Fire safety measures</b>			
Working smoke detector	98 *	95	98
Working carbon monoxide detector <sup>6</sup>	59	52	60
Working fire extinguisher	71	69	66



\* significantly different from provincial level estimate (p < 0.05)

\*\* significantly different from Canada level estimate (p < 0.05)

\*\*\* significantly different from both provincial and Canada level estimates (p < 0.05)

1 Percentage based only on those indicating that they have an emergency exit plan.

2 Excludes Canadians living in single-person households.

3 Excludes those who reported that they lived in a household that did not have a vehicle.

4 Percentage based only on those indicating that they or someone in their household has special medical needs.

5 'Other precautionary measures' include having an escape/rescue plan for pets, extra supply of fuel, checking and replenishing emergency supplies, and keeping exits clear.

6 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'British Columbia'.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

**Table 1.4**

**High or moderately high levels of emergency planning, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents, by social and political involvement, community of Prince George, British Columbia, 2014**

Social and political involvement	Percentage of residents who had high or moderately high levels of...		
	Planning activities	Precautionary measures	Fire safety measures
	percent		
<b>Engagement in political activities <sup>1</sup></b>			
Yes †	47	31	50
No	46	30 <sup>E</sup>	37 <sup>E</sup>
<b>High level of civic engagement <sup>2</sup></b>			
Yes †	50	33	49
No	44	28 <sup>E</sup>	46
<b>High level of social support <sup>3</sup></b>			
Yes †	49	26 <sup>E</sup>	54
No	47	32	43
<b>Strong sense of belonging to community <sup>4</sup></b>			
Yes †	52	31	52
No	43	27 <sup>E</sup>	39
<b>High neighbourhood trust <sup>5</sup></b>			
Yes †	57	34	53
No	43 †	27	43
<b>High level of self-efficacy <sup>6</sup></b>			
Yes †	53	31	51
No	41	25 <sup>E</sup>	42

<sup>E</sup> use with caution

\* significantly different from reference category ( $p < 0.05$ )

† reference category

- 1 Includes individuals over the age of 17 years who are eligible to vote, and who have participated in or volunteered for political parties or events in the past 12 months, including municipal, provincial, or federal elections, or expressed views on political or social issues through signing a petition, contacting news agencies or politicians, or attended a meeting involving social or community issues.
- 2 Civic engagement measures individuals over the age of 17 years who were involved in a recreational group or organization in the past 12 months, and includes engagement in political activities. A 'high level' is defined as having been involved in at least 4 activities in the past 12 months.
- 3 A 'high level of social support' is defined as having five or more people whom that individual could turn to for help in an emergency if they are physically injured, require emotional support, shelter, and/or financial assistance.
- 4 A 'strong sense of belonging to community' is rating one's own sense of belonging to their community as a 4 or a 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "very weak" and 5 "very strong".
- 5 'High neighbourhood trust' is rating one's own trust in the people in one's neighbourhood as 4 or 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "cannot be trusted at all" and 5 represents "can be trusted a lot", as well as having a response of "very likely" when asked about the likelihood of someone in their neighbourhood returning a lost wallet or purse containing two hundred dollars with the money still inside.
- 6 A 'high level of self-efficacy' is derived from having a high self-rating on a scale of 1 (poor) to 5 (excellent) for the following three categories: an ability to think clearly and solve day-to-day problems, to handle unexpected and difficult problems, and to figure out what to do if faced with an emergency situation.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents. Households with 'moderately high' or 'high' levels of emergency planning engaged in 3 or 4 of the following: having an exit plan, an emergency supply kit, extra copies of important documents and an emergency contact list. 'Moderately high' or 'high' levels of precautionary measures include having 3 or 4 of the following: a wind-up or battery operated radio, a back-up generator, an alternate source of heat and additional water. 'Moderately high' or 'high' levels of fire safety measure include having all 3 of the following: a working smoke detector, a working fire extinguisher, and a working carbon monoxide detector.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

## Notes

<sup>E</sup> use with caution

- 1 A Census Metropolitan Area (CMA) or a Census Agglomeration (CA) is formed by one or more adjacent municipalities centred on a population centre (known as the core). A CMA must have a total population of at least 100,000 of which 50,000 or more must live in the core. A CA must have a core population of at least 10,000. To be included in the CMA or CA, other adjacent municipalities must have a high degree of integration with the core as measured by commuting flows derived from census data.
- 2 The target population for the SEPR included all persons 15 years of age or older, residing in households in Canada's 10 provinces, excluding full-time residents of institutions (e.g., nursing homes, group homes, hospitals).
- 3 The SEPR covers three types of communities: Census Metropolitan Areas (CMAs), Census Agglomerations (CAs) with population greater than 50,000, and 'smaller communities' which include CAs with population 50,000 or less and those areas that fall outside of CMAs and CAs. All CMAs and CAs (with population greater than 50,000) were included in the SEPR. A sample of households were selected from smaller communities within each province to represent all households within the province in similar communities. Additional information on the SEPR and its sampling methodology can be found in the 'Survey description' section.
- 4 Throughout this fact sheet, responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.
- 5 This section focuses on personal experiences with emergencies or disasters that happened in Canada, in a community where the person was living at the time, and was significant enough to severely interrupt the individual's regular daily activities.
- 6 Emergency planning activities include: having an emergency exit plan, a household emergency supply kit, extra copies of important documents and an emergency contact list.

- 7 Precautionary measures include: having a wind-up or battery-operated radio, an alternate heat source such as a non-electric stove or heater or a wood-burning fireplace, a back-up generator and an alternative water source such as a well, tank or litres of stored water.
- 8 Unless otherwise specified, differences are statistically significant ( $p < 0.05$ ).
- 9 A 'strong sense of belonging to community' is rating one's own sense of belonging to their community as a 4 or a 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "very weak" and 5 "very strong".
- 10 A proportion (11%) of respondents were not asked questions regarding neighbourhood helpfulness in the event of an emergency and as such these cases are not included in the analysis on neighbourhood helpfulness in general or in the event of an emergency.
- 11 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were equal to 15% when respondents were asked about whether their neighbourhood is a place where neighbours would help each other if there is an emergency.



## Fact sheet Smaller communities of British Columbia

---

In 2014, information on the emergency preparedness of people living in 'smaller communities' of British Columbia was collected through the Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada (SEPR).<sup>1 2 3</sup> This fact sheet presents information on the risk awareness and level of emergency preparedness of the residents of British Columbia's smaller communities, which could help improve the understanding of community resilience in the event of an emergency.<sup>4</sup>

### Risk awareness and anticipated sources of help in an emergency or disaster

- People living in the smaller communities of British Columbia anticipated wildfires (86%), extended power outages lasting 24 hours or longer (77%), winter storms (including blizzards, ice storms and extreme cold) (60%) and earthquakes (59%) as the events most likely to occur in their communities.
- Residents most commonly anticipated turning to a hospital, clinic, doctor or other medical professional in the event of an outbreak of a serious or life-threatening disease (62%), and to their utility company in the event of an extended power outage (60%). They most commonly anticipated turning to police or law enforcement if faced with an act of terrorism or terrorist threat (51%<sup>E</sup>), rioting or civil unrest (42%<sup>E</sup>), or an industrial or transportation accident (23%) (Table 1.1).
- Residents also anticipated that they would seek out local government in the event of a contamination or shortage of water or food (39%), or news on the radio if they faced a weather-related emergency or natural disaster (26%).

### Prior lifetime experience with a major emergency or disaster<sup>5</sup>

- One-third (33%) of residents of the smaller communities of British Columbia have faced a major emergency or disaster in Canada in a community they were living in at the time of the event, less than two-thirds (62%) of whom reported experiencing severe disruptions to their daily activities as a result of the event.
- Floods (31%<sup>E</sup>), extended power outages lasting 24 hours or longer (29%<sup>E</sup>) and wildfires (21%<sup>E</sup>) were the most commonly experienced emergencies or disasters by residents of the smaller communities of British Columbia.
- The most common types of disruption to daily activities endured by residents who had experienced major emergencies or disasters included missing work or school (63%), missing an appointment or planned activity (63%), an inability to use electrical appliances (56%) and having to boil water for drinking or drink bottled water (52%). More severe disruptions experienced were an inability to use roads or transportation in the community (42%), home evacuation (39%) and an inability to communicate outside the household (11%<sup>E</sup>).
- Nearly three-quarters (73%) of residents who experienced an emergency or disaster were able to resume their daily activities within one week of the event: 24%<sup>E</sup> within 24 hours, 17%<sup>E</sup> within one to two days, 20%<sup>E</sup> within three to five days and 12%<sup>E</sup> within six to seven days.
- More than six in ten (63%) residents who had experienced an emergency or disaster received help during or immediately following the event, most commonly from a neighbour (31%<sup>E</sup>), a family member (27%<sup>E</sup>) or a friend (22%<sup>E</sup>).<sup>6</sup>
- Nearly three in ten (27%<sup>E</sup>) of residents of the smaller communities of British Columbia who experienced a major emergency or disaster in Canada in a community where they were living at the time of the event and which was significant enough to disrupt their regular daily routine also endured a loss of property or financial impact.

## Emergency planning, precautionary and fire safety behaviours

- Three-quarters (75%) of people residing in the smaller communities of British Columbia lived in households that were engaged in at least two emergency planning activities,<sup>7</sup> and more than half (55%) lived in households with three or four such activities (Table 1.2). Less than one in ten (7%<sup>E</sup>) people lived in a household that had not participated in any emergency planning activities.
- Two-thirds (68%) lived in a household with at least two precautionary measures<sup>8</sup> taken in case of an emergency, and nearly half (46%) lived in a household with three or four such measures. One in ten (9%<sup>E</sup>) people lived in a household with no precautionary measures in place.
- The vast majority (94%) of residents reported living in a household with a working smoke detector, and most (77%) reported living in a household with a working fire extinguisher (Table 1.3). Half (51%) of residents stated that they had a working carbon monoxide detector in their household. However, approximately four in ten (43%) residents of the smaller communities of British Columbia stated that they had implemented all three fire safety measures within their households.
- There were significant differences between the number of precautionary measures taken by residents of the smaller communities of British Columbia and residents of British Columbia in general and Canada's 10 provinces overall. For example, residents of the smaller communities of British Columbia reported less often that they had no precautionary measures in place (9%<sup>E</sup>) compared to residents of British Columbia (13%) and Canada (16%). Inversely, residents of the smaller communities were more likely to have all four precautionary measures in place (20%) than those provincially (8%) and nationally (7%). In addition, residents of the smaller communities of British Columbia (28%) were significantly more likely to have participated in all four emergency planning activities compared to Canadians overall (19%).<sup>9</sup>
- There were some differences in the types of activities and measures residents of smaller communities in British Columbia engaged in when compared to those in British Columbia and Canada overall. For instance, in terms of precautionary measures, the proportion of residents of smaller communities in British Columbia who had an alternate heat source (64%), an alternate water source (56%) or a back-up generator (41%) was higher than those provincially (55%, 48% and 22%, respectively) and nationally (48%, 43% and 23%, respectively). In terms of emergency planning activities, residents of the smaller communities were more likely to have an emergency exit plan (69%), a household emergency supply kit (57%), a recently practiced exit plan (55%) and a designated meeting place for household members (43%) than Canadians in general.

## Social networks and sense of belonging

- Over half (55%) of residents of the smaller communities of British Columbia had a strong sense of belonging<sup>10</sup> to their community.
- Almost all (92%) residents described the neighbourhood they lived in as a place where neighbours generally help each other.<sup>11</sup> Of those who did not describe their neighbourhood this way, most (84%) still described it as a place where neighbours would help each other in an emergency.<sup>12</sup>
- Six in ten individuals had a large network of support in the event of an emergency or disaster, with more than five people to turn to for emotional support (62%), for help if physically injured (61%), as well as in case of a home evacuation (60%). Nearly one-quarter of residents had a large support network if financial help was needed (23%). However, one in ten (11%<sup>E</sup>) residents reported that they had no one to turn to for financial help.<sup>13</sup>
- High levels of sense of belonging, social support and self-efficacy were sometimes associated with a higher level of emergency preparedness (Table 1.4).

## Data tables

Table 1.1

Most commonly anticipated sources of initial help and information, by type of emergency or disaster, residents of smaller communities of British Columbia, 2014

Most common sources of initial help and information by type of emergency or disaster	percent
Weather-related emergency or natural disaster <sup>1</sup>	

News- Radio	26
News- Internet	16
Police/law enforcement	15
<b>Extended power outages</b>	
Utility company	60
Family	9 <sup>E</sup>
Local government	8 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Outbreak of serious or life-threatening disease</b>	
Hospital, clinic, doctor or other medical professional	62
News- Radio	17 <sup>E</sup>
News- Internet	12 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Industrial or transportation accident</b>	
Police/law enforcement	23
News- Radio	21
Local government	18
<b>Contamination or shortage of water or food <sup>1</sup></b>	
Local government	39
News- Radio	11 <sup>E</sup>
Family	9 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Act of terrorism or terrorist threat</b>	
Police/law enforcement	51 <sup>E</sup>
News- Radio	26 <sup>E</sup>
<b>Rioting or civil unrest <sup>1</sup></b>	
Police/law enforcement	42 <sup>E</sup>
<sup>E</sup> use with caution	
1 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% when respondents were asked about their likely sources of initial help and information.	
<b>Note:</b> Respondents who perceived their community was at risk for any form of emergency or disaster were then asked where they would turn to first for information or assistance in the event of the perceived emergency or disaster. Respondents could provide more than one response. Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.	
<b>Source:</b> Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.	

**Table 1.2**  
**Number of emergency planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents, smaller communities of British Columbia, 2014**

Number of planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents	Smaller communities of British Columbia	British Columbia	Canada
	percent		
<b>Number of emergency planning activities</b>			
None	7 <sup>E</sup>	6	8
1 activity	14	15	17
2 activities	20 **	22	25
3 activities	27	29	27
4 activities	28 **	25	19
<b>Number of precautionary measures</b>			
None	9 <sup>E</sup> ***	13	16
1 measure	19 ***	24	27
2 measures	22 ***	27	28

3 measures	26 **	23	20
4 measures	20 ***	8	7
<b>Number of fire safety measures <sup>1 2</sup></b>			
None	F	1 <sup>E</sup>	1
1 measure	11 <sup>E</sup>	14	14
2 measures	39	40	38
3 measures	43	38	42
<sup>E</sup> use with caution <sup>F</sup> too unreliable to be published ** significantly different from Canada level estimate (p < 0.05) *** significantly different from both provincial and Canada level estimates (p < 0.05) 1 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'Canada'. 2 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'British Columbia'.  <b>Note:</b> Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents. Emergency planning activities include: an emergency exit plan, an emergency supply kit, photocopies/electronic copies of important documents and a list of emergency contact numbers. Precautionary measures include: a battery-operated or wind-up radio, an alternate heat source, a back-up generator and an alternative water source. Fire safety measures include a working smoke detector, a working carbon monoxide detector and a working fire extinguisher. <b>Source:</b> Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.			

**Table 1.3**  
**Planning activities, fire safety and precautionary measures residents engaged in, smaller communities of British Columbia, 2014**

Residents whose households were involved in the following:	Smaller communities of British Columbia	British Columbia	Canada
	percent		
<b>Emergency planning activities</b>			
Emergency exit plan	69 **	71	60
Exit plan has been practised/reviewed in last 12 months <sup>1</sup>	55 **	49	46
Designated meeting place for household members <sup>2</sup>	43 **	38	33
Contact plan for household members <sup>2</sup>	53	54	55
Household emergency supply kit	57 **	55	47
Vehicle emergency supply kit <sup>3</sup>	64 *	58	59
Extra copies of important documents	53	55	53
List of emergency contact numbers	69	68	69
Plan for meeting special health needs <sup>4</sup>	67	61	62
<b>Precautionary measures</b>			
Wind-up or battery-operated radio	63	59	58
Alternate heat source	64 ***	55	48
Back-up generator	41 ***	22	23
Alternate water source	56 ***	48	43
Other <sup>5</sup>	21	21	21
<b>Fire safety measures</b>			
Working smoke detector	94	95	98
Working carbon monoxide detector <sup>6</sup>	51 **	52	60
Working fire extinguisher	77 ***	69	66

\* significantly different from provincial level estimate (p < 0.05)

\*\* significantly different from Canada level estimate (p < 0.05)

\*\*\* significantly different from both provincial and Canada level estimates (p < 0.05)

1 Percentage based only on those indicating that they have an emergency exit plan.

2 Excludes Canadians living in single-person households.

3 Excludes those who reported that they lived in a household that did not have a vehicle.

4 Percentage based only on those indicating that they or someone in their household has special medical needs.

5 'Other precautionary measures' include having an escape/rescue plan for pets, extra supply of fuel, checking and replenishing emergency supplies, and keeping exits clear.

6 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% for 'British Columbia'.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

**Table 1.4**

**High or moderately high levels of emergency planning, fire safety and precautionary measures taken by residents, by social and political involvement, smaller communities of British Columbia, 2014**

Social and political involvement	Percentage of residents who had high or moderately high levels of...		
	Planning activities	Precautionary measures	Fire safety measures
	percent		
<b>Engagement in political activities <sup>1</sup></b>			
Yes †	56	47	44
No	44 <sup>E</sup>	35 <sup>E</sup>	42 <sup>E</sup>
<b>High level of civic engagement <sup>2</sup></b>			
Yes †	59	47	42
No	48	44	47
<b>High level of social support <sup>3</sup></b>			
Yes †	67	45	33 <sup>E</sup>
No	54 <sup>*</sup>	48	48 <sup>*</sup>
<b>Strong sense of belonging to community <sup>4</sup></b>			
Yes †	63	47	47
No	48 <sup>*</sup>	47	41
<b>High neighbourhood trust <sup>5</sup></b>			
Yes †	60	48	46
No	52	45	42
<b>High level of self-efficacy <sup>6</sup></b>			
Yes †	61	55	49
No	50	37 <sup>*</sup>	37



<sup>E</sup> use with caution

\* significantly different from reference category ( $p < 0.05$ )

† reference category

- 1 Includes individuals over the age of 17 years who are eligible to vote, and who have participated in or volunteered for political parties or events in the past 12 months, including municipal, provincial, or federal elections, or expressed views on political or social issues through signing a petition, contacting news agencies or politicians, or attended a meeting involving social or community issues.
- 2 Civic engagement measures individuals over the age of 17 years who were involved in a recreational group or organization in the past 12 months, and includes engagement in political activities. A 'high level' is defined as having been involved in at least 4 activities in the past 12 months.
- 3 A 'high level of social support' is defined as having five or more people whom that individual could turn to for help in an emergency if they are physically injured, require emotional support, shelter, and/or financial assistance.
- 4 A 'strong sense of belonging to community' is rating one's own sense of belonging to their community as a 4 or a 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "very weak" and 5 "very strong".
- 5 'High neighbourhood trust' is rating one's own trust in the people in one's neighbourhood as 4 or 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "cannot be trusted at all" and 5 represents "can be trusted a lot", as well as having a response of "very likely" when asked about the likelihood of someone in their neighbourhood returning a lost wallet or purse containing two hundred dollars with the money still inside.
- 6 A 'high level of self-efficacy' is derived from having a high self-rating on a scale of 1 (poor) to 5 (excellent) for the following three categories: an ability to think clearly and solve day-to-day problems, to handle unexpected and difficult problems, and to figure out what to do if faced with an emergency situation.

**Note:** Responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents. Households with 'moderately high' or 'high' levels of emergency planning engaged in 3 or 4 of the following: having an exit plan, an emergency supply kit, extra copies of important documents and an emergency contact list. 'Moderately high' or 'high' levels of precautionary measures include having 3 or 4 of the following: a wind-up or battery operated radio, a back-up generator, an alternate source of heat and additional water. 'Moderately high' or 'high' levels of fire safety measure include having all 3 of the following: a working smoke detector, a working fire extinguisher, and a working carbon monoxide detector.

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada, 2014.

## Notes

<sup>E</sup> use with caution

- 1 A Census Metropolitan Area (CMA) or a Census Agglomeration (CA) is formed by one or more adjacent municipalities centred on a population centre (known as the core). A CMA must have a total population of at least 100,000 of which 50,000 or more must live in the core. A CA must have a core population of at least 10,000. To be included in the CMA or CA, other adjacent municipalities must have a high degree of integration with the core as measured by commuting flows derived from census data.
- 2 The target population for the SEPR included all persons 15 years of age or older, residing in households in Canada's 10 provinces, excluding full-time residents of institutions (e.g. nursing homes, group homes, hospitals).
- 3 The SEPR covers three types of communities: Census Metropolitan Areas (CMAs), Census Agglomerations (CAs) with population greater than 50,000, and 'smaller communities' which include CAs with population 50,000 or less and those areas that fall outside of CMAs and CAs. All CMAs and CAs (with population greater than 50,000) were included in the SEPR. A sample of households were selected from smaller communities within each province to represent all households within the province in similar communities. Additional information on the SEPR and its sampling methodology can be found in the 'Survey description' section.
- 4 Throughout this fact sheet, responses of 'don't know/not stated' are included in the total for the percentage calculation but are not footnoted when representing 5% or less of respondents.
- 5 This section focuses on personal experiences with emergencies or disasters that happened in Canada, in a community where the person was living at the time, and was significant enough to severely interrupt the individual's regular daily activities.
- 6 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% when respondents were asked about the source of information or assistance they received during or immediately following the emergency they experienced.

- 7 Emergency planning activities include: having an emergency exit plan, a household emergency supply kit, extra copies of important documents and an emergency contact list.
- 8 Precautionary measures include: having a wind-up or battery-operated radio, an alternate heat source such as a non-electric stove or heater or a wood-burning fireplace, a back-up generator and an alternative water source such as a well, tank or litres of stored water.
- 9 Unless otherwise specified, differences are statistically significant ( $p < 0.05$ ).
- 10 A 'strong sense of belonging to community' is rating one's own sense of belonging to their community as a 4 or a 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents "very weak" and 5 "very strong".
- 11 A proportion (32%) of respondents were not asked questions regarding neighbourhood helpfulness in the event of an emergency and as such these cases are not included in the analysis on neighbourhood helpfulness in general or in the event of an emergency.
- 12 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% when respondents were asked about whether their neighbourhood is a place where neighbours would help each other if there is an emergency.
- 13 Responses of 'don't know/not stated' were greater than 5% but not above 10% when respondents were asked about the number of people they could turn to for help if financial support is needed.



## Survey description

---

This report is based on the Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience in Canada (SEPR). The SEPR is a new survey that was conducted by Statistics Canada for the first time from January to June 2014. Developed in partnership with Defence Research and Development Canada's Centre for Security Science and Public Safety Canada, and in consultation with experts in the field of emergency management and community resilience, the purpose of the SEPR is to improve the understanding of community resilience across Canada's provinces. Data were collected on factors that affect how well individuals and communities are able to prepare for, prevent, respond to and recover from major emergencies or disasters. The main objective of the survey is to provide estimates of emergency preparedness and resilience at the community, provincial and national levels.

### Survey methodology

The target population for the SEPR included all persons 15 years of age or older, residing in Canada's 10 provinces, excluding full-time residents of institutions. This voluntary survey was conducted via the telephone, using a Computer-Assisted Telephone Interviewing (CATI) system. Therefore, persons living in households without telephone service (approximately 1%), were also excluded. One individual per household, 15 years of age or older was randomly selected to complete the survey. The overall response rate for the SEPR was 53%. The sample size for the SEPR was 72,953 with a total of 32,171 completed surveys. Respondents in the sample were weighted so that their responses represent the non-institutionalized Canadian population aged 15 years or over, in the 10 provinces.

### Data limitations

Data for SEPR were collected only from Canadians living in the 10 provinces, and therefore, results are not representative of the Canadian territories. However, a separate feasibility study was undertaken in 2014 to help determine the appropriate content and best method of collecting information on emergency preparedness and community resilience in the territories. The SEPR also does not include Canadians who do not have a working telephone, or full-time residents of institutions. In addition, certain populations which may be considered vulnerable or in greater need of support in emergency or disaster situations, are not included. Such populations include the homeless, residents of nursing homes and long-term care facilities.

The SEPR is a sample survey. Consequently, due to the nature of sampling surveys, the results produced are subject to sampling error. Somewhat different results might have been obtained if the entire population had been surveyed. This report uses the coefficient of variation (CV) as a measure of the sampling error. Any estimate that has a high CV (over 33.3%) has not been published because the estimate is too unreliable. In these cases, the symbol 'F' is used in place of an estimate in the figures and data tables. An estimate that has a CV between 16.6% and 33.3% should be used with caution and the symbol 'E' is referenced with the estimate. Where descriptive statistics and cross-tabular analysis were used, statistically significant differences were determined using hypothesis tests with a 5% significance level (i.e., the probability of incorrectly concluding that the estimates are different is at most 5%).