

City of Langley

Social Plan

December 3, 2007

Submitted by SPARC BC



Written by Nick Istvanffy and Jill Atkey

Table of Contents

<u>Executive Summary</u>	<u>i</u>
<u>Introduction</u>	<u>1</u>
<u>Process and Participation</u>	<u>1</u>
<u>City of Langley Current Social Planning Initiatives</u>	<u>5</u>
<u>Priorities, Gaps & Actions</u>	<u>6</u>
A. Green Spaces	6
B. Homelessness	8
C. Affordable Housing	10
D. Second Stage Housing	12
E. Detox and Residential Treatment	13
G. Connecting Diverse Communities	16
H. Education and Awareness of all Elements of Safety	17
I. Public Education about Social Service Issues	18
J. Building Capacity of Community Social Service Agencies	19
Global Recommendations	21
<u>SUMMARY OF SOCIAL PLAN RECOMMENDATIONS</u>	<u>22</u>
<u>Implementation</u>	<u>24</u>
<u>Conclusion</u>	<u>26</u>
<u>Appendix A: Literature Review</u>	<u>27</u>
<u>Appendix B: Key Informant Interview Participants</u>	<u>41</u>
<u>Appendix C: Prioritization Workshop Attendees</u>	<u>43</u>
<u>Appendix D: Outcomes of Prioritization Workshop</u>	<u>45</u>
<u>Appendix E: Inventory of Social Services</u>	<u>52</u>

<u>Appendix F: Gaps and Actions Workshop Attendees</u>	<u>59</u>
<u>Appendix G: Outcomes of Gaps and Actions Workshop</u>	<u>61</u>
<u>Appendix H: 2007 Community Grant Recipients</u>	<u>70</u>
<u>Appendix I: Permissive Tax Exemptions</u>	<u>72</u>
<u>Appendix J: Additional City of Langley Social Supports</u>	<u>74</u>
<u>Appendix K: Social Responsibility Matrices</u>	<u>76</u>

Executive Summary

In the spring of 2007, the City of Langley contracted with the Social Planning and Research Council of BC (SPARC BC) to create a social plan to provide guidance for the City on how to meaningfully and effectively engage with social issues in the community. In order to ensure that work already completed was not duplicated, the consultants conducted a literature review and interviewed key informants. A priority-setting workshop was held on June 21st with stakeholders, to identify additional issues and to prioritize the 28 social service elements that were identified through the literature review and key informant interviews. The social service elements were grouped in the following five broad categories: housing and homelessness; health and addiction; crime and safety; public spaces and transportation; and community inclusion and capacity. The participants at the workshop expanded that list considerably. In order to ensure that the City of Langley Social Plan is a useful and actionable tool, it was essential to prioritize a limited number of social service elements. The workshop participants went through a process of discussing and prioritizing the social service elements, and narrowed the social service elements to ten at the consultants' recommendation.

The ten priority areas identified during the workshop are (in no particular order):

1. homelessness;
2. detox and residential treatment;
3. affordable housing;
4. public education about social service issues;
5. education and awareness of all elements of safety;
6. social agency capacity with core funding and adequate resourcing;
7. second stage housing;
8. connecting isolated populations through a volunteer services centre;
9. community based health services for various populations; and
10. green spaces.¹

The project team then developed an inventory of existing social services and programs in the City of Langley for each of the social service elements prioritized during the workshop, and developed a matrix to outline the responsibilities of each level of government involved in a specific social service element. The matrices also identify the responsibilities of the community service sector and other potential interests, such as foundations, business groups, public advocacy groups and health authorities. A public workshop was held with community stakeholders and interested residents on October 2nd, 2007, to identify gaps in services and discuss options for addressing those gaps. At the completion of the public process, the consultants drafted the recommendations for the City of Langley Social Plan, identifying how the City can engage with the community to help meet social needs in Langley. The plan was presented at a workshop with Langley

¹ A number of social service elements were combined under the ten broad categories. A full listing of the ten social service element components and the initial social service elements prior to prioritization can be found in Appendix D.

City Council on November 5, 2007. Feedback from Council was incorporated into the final report and recommendations.

The City of Langley shows strong leadership in addressing social issues in the community. The City supports community social services through grants, tax exemptions, and provision of City land at nominal fees. The City has the second highest proportion of social housing units in the Metro Vancouver Region (after the City of Vancouver), and has a good supply of rental housing. Langley policies that have contributed to the stock of affordable housing include policies that support the development of multi-family housing, policies restricting conversion of rental housing, and policies that allow secondary suites. The City of Langley has more hectares of parkland and higher per capita spending on parks and recreation than neighbouring municipalities. The City recently won the Communities in Bloom international awards for medium sized municipalities. The City of Langley has one of the few accessible playgrounds for children in the region.

Despite the work that the City of Langley has undertaken to address a number of social issues in recent years, the process of developing the Social Plan highlighted a number of gaps that continue to persist. The Social Plan contains a set of recommendations to guide the City’s engagement in each of the ten priority areas.

SUMMARY OF SOCIAL PLAN RECOMMENDATIONS

Social Service Element	Short Term (1 to 3 years)	Long Term (3+ years)
Green Spaces	Identify additional potential sites for community gardens	
	Raise awareness about existing parks	
	Better utilize existing parks	
	Review Development Cost Charges for parks contributions	
	Consider density bonusing for community amenities	
	Promote accessibility in parks and open spaces	
Homelessness	Support the ‘Gateway of Hope’ project or an equivalent shelter project	Adopt policy affirming City’s role in engaging with the community on social issues
	Continue to Participate in Homeless Steering Committee	Continue an ongoing dialogue with the community on social issues
	Advocate for services for those who are homeless or at risk	
	Support volunteer recruitment for extreme weather beds	

Social Service Element	Short Term (1 to 3 years)	Long Term (3+ years)
Affordable Housing	Develop an Affordable Housing Strategy once Metro Vancouver releases their affordable housing targets	Continue to champion the creation of low cost housing
	Develop strategies to mitigate loss of low end market housing	Explore tax and DCC breaks for affordable housing
	Promote homelessness prevention strategies	
	Continue to encourage legalization of secondary suites	
	Advocate to senior governments for increases to rent supplements and housing allowances	
Second Stage Housing	Develop partnerships with community groups to address housing issues	Explore tax and DCC breaks for second stage housing
	Advocate to funders for second stage housing	
	Engage business community to support affordable and second stage housing	
Detox and Residential Treatment	Work with the Health Authority, community social service agencies and neighbouring municipalities to determine needs	Work with the province, neighbouring communities, local agencies and the community to find sites and develop appropriate services
	Partner with neighbouring municipalities to advocate for provision of services in the region	
Community Based Health Services	Continue to support role of HD Stafford School in linking youth to service providers & explore other ways to link youth to health services	
	Work with School District to provide in-school meal services for inner city schools	
	Work with health authority and local agencies to identify youth health needs	
	Collaborate with other groups on community based health initiatives	
	Provide planning and coordination support to community health-based initiatives	

Social Service Element	Short Term (1 to 3 years)	Long Term (3+ years)
Connecting Diverse Communities	Review volunteer programs to ensure they facilitate involvement of diverse populations	
	Work with community services to determine which population groups are experiencing isolation	
	Work with community agencies to explore the establishment of a volunteer services centre, and other initiatives to link diverse communities.	
Awareness of Community Safety Issues	Provide and distribute safety awareness materials	Continue to address safety when developing City infrastructure
	Work with community agencies to build awareness	Continue to implement pedestrian friendly design
		Continue to support police and other agencies to promote community safety
Awareness of Social Issues	Participate in community discussions, roundtables etc. with social service agencies and public	
	Work with agencies to address community concerns re: projects	
	Promote civic engagement and public participation in social issues	
Social Agency Capacity	Engage with community agencies to identify opportunities for the City to advocate for community services to senior governments	Create capacity on City staff to support agencies with needs assessments and coordination
	Provide non-financial support to agencies (e.g. free space)	Create staff capacity to respond to emerging issues
	Continue to work with agencies to improve community grants program	
Global Recommendations	Provide ongoing staff capacity to engage with agencies on community issues	Apply a social lens to policies, planning and development decisions
	Continue to provide non-financial and low cost support to community agencies	Continue to act as a leader in addressing social issues through partnership building and information sharing
	Advocate to senior levels of government and funders to support needed services	

Introduction

In the spring of 2007, the City of Langley contracted the Social Planning and Research Council of BC (SPARC BC) to create a social plan to provide guidance for the City on how to meaningfully and effectively engage with social issues in the community. Like many communities in British Columbia, the City of Langley faces growing social issues and challenges that the City is under increasing pressure to address. Although municipalities in Canada lack the mandate and capacity to directly address many of the social issues that take hold within their communities, the City of Langley does have a role in identifying, advocating for and supporting solutions to those issues. This social plan helps to articulate that role for the City, for community partners and for residents. The plan is also intended to develop a specific set of actions related to the community's priority social issues.

Considerable work has already been undertaken in the City of Langley to address aspects of community well-being. The social plan is intended to build upon work that has already been conducted rather than duplicate those efforts. Working within a restricted timeline, the project team endeavoured to be inclusive of community members at critical points in the development of the social plan. Through the process of creating the social plan, ten priority social service elements were identified. An inventory and matrices of government responsibilities related to each of the priorities were created to assist community members with identifying gaps in services and resources, as well as the community action necessary to address those gaps. Each phase is detailed within the report, and the outcomes from the process are found in the action steps for each priority area.

Process and Participation

The following process was designed by SPARC BC and approved by the City of Langley to ensure that the City of Langley Social Plan meets the needs of the community and builds upon work already undertaken by both the City of Langley and by community groups.

Literature Review and Key Informant Interviews

Previous research was reviewed and synthesized, which provided a background for the project and helped to ensure that work already completed was not duplicated. The literature was identified through internet searches and through conversations with community stakeholders during the interview process outlined below. The literature review allowed the project team to identify the existing social issues in the community, and provided background about the scope of existing issues and potential solutions. To the extent possible, the literature review sought to identify existing social service and planning capacity in the community, such as existing committees and roundtables that focus on particular issues. The second purpose of the literature review was to provide an overview of the approaches to social plan development taken by other municipalities in British Columbia.

The literature identified a range of social issues in the Langleys (City and Township), but noted a particular emphasis on affordable housing, homelessness and poverty. In fact, the City of Langley's 2007 Community Survey identified social issues as the second highest issue of concern in the community, with poverty and homelessness being specifically mentioned. Three reports take an indicators approach in determining how the City of Langley compares with other municipalities in Metro Vancouver (previously the Greater Vancouver Regional District). The indicators demonstrate a relatively high incidence of lone parent families, a higher percentage of household incomes derived from government transfer payments, a slightly higher incidence of low income individuals, and a lower incidence of high school completion. The literature review can be found in Appendix A.

The issues identified through the literature review were built upon through key informant interviews conducted by telephone in June of 2007. The short interviews explored perceptions of the biggest social issues facing Langley, the roots of those issues, potential solutions and identified key players in addressing those issues. The interviews also sought to identify existing initiatives, such as funding sources, partnership opportunities and planning committees, that could potentially impact action on social issues. A list of key informant interview participants can be found in Appendix B.

Work Plan Review

On June 18, 2007, the consultants presented the work program for the development of the Social Plan to the City of Langley Council. This meeting ensured that the work program met the objectives of City Council.

Prioritization Workshop

The social issues identified through the literature review and key informant interviews were used as a starting point for the priority-setting workshop, held on June 21, 2007. Attendance at the workshop was limited to professionals from social service agencies and government representatives.² Once the participants were introduced to the social plan process, the list of social issues identified to date was presented to the participants. The social issues were framed as social service elements, which are loosely defined as an activity, program, initiative or output that is linked to a social issue in the community, and has the potential to help improve the social well-being of Langley residents.³ There were 28 social service elements identified through the literature review and key informant interviews, which were grouped in the following five broad categories: housing and homelessness; health and addiction; crime and safety; public spaces and transportation; and community inclusion and capacity. The participants then expanded that list considerably through a discussion of issues that were missing.

Each of the issue areas identified in the development of the social plan has an enormously complex range of contributing factors, programs and services. In order to ensure that the City of Langley Social Plan is a useful and actionable tool, it was essential to prioritize a

² A list of attendees from the workshop can be found in Appendix C.

³ This definition was used to help keep the scope of the plan manageable and to ensure that the subsequent matrices and gap analysis are concrete, applicable and relevant.

limited number of social service elements. The workshop participants went through a process of discussing and prioritizing the social service elements, and narrowed the social service elements to ten at the consultants' recommendation.

In no particular order the ten priority areas identified during the workshop are: homelessness; detox and residential treatment; affordable housing; public education about social service issues; education and awareness of all elements of safety; social agency capacity with core funding and adequate resourcing; second stage housing; connecting isolated populations through a volunteer services centre; community based health services for various populations; and green spaces.⁴

Presentation to Langley City Council

A presentation on the outcomes of the social plan process to date was made to Langley City Council in September 2007. The presentation was followed by discussion with councillors, and resulted in the budgeting of an additional workshop to be held with Council in order to further explore the actions included in the social plan. The additional session with Council was held on November 5, 2007.

Inventory of Social Services in Langley

The project team developed an inventory of social services and programs. The inventory was limited to social service elements prioritized during the workshop and also limited to social services directly in the City of Langley, although exceptions were made for those services located outside of Langley that conduct a considerable amount of work in the city. The inventory served as a baseline for determining the level of service in the City of Langley and it was also used to inform the gap analysis aspects of the project, through which we identified the nature and scope of needs in the community relating to the prioritized social service elements. The inventory is attached as Appendix E.

Social Responsibility Matrices

At the completion of the inventory, a set of social responsibility matrices was developed to outline the responsibilities of each level of government involved in a specific social service element. The matrices also identify the responsibilities of the community service sector and other potential interests, such as foundations, business groups, public advocacy groups and health authorities. The matrices function as a reference tool for the social plan.⁵

The responsibilities outlined in the matrices fall into three general categories: planning, construction and siting, and operations. Each of these three categories is further

⁴ A number of social service elements were combined under the ten broad categories. A full listing of the ten social service element components and the initial social service elements prior to prioritization can be found in Appendix D.

⁵ The social responsibility matrices can collectively seem somewhat overwhelming. The matrices are meant to be dealt with individually. While there are some overlaps, a person or group that is active in one area may have no role in another. As such, each social responsibility matrix should be considered separately, as an individual matrix, which will serve as a reference tool for developing action plans to meet identified gaps in services.

subdivided into three categories of responsibility: legislative, financial and implementation. Because each level of government or service agency has a differing scope of responsibilities in each area, that scope is represented in the following three categories: primary, secondary and limited. The tables identify appropriate ministries or agencies when that information is readily available. The overlapping nature of many social service responsibilities indicates potential for partnerships and collaboration to address social needs, though overlaps in jurisdiction can also result in no one taking responsibility to address those needs.

The complexity of legislative responsibility can be overwhelming, and confusion exists in many communities about the difference between the responsibilities of a certain level of government or agency, and the roles that each can play in addressing social needs. In some cases this confusion can lead to paralysis when various actors come together to address social issues. The matrices developed for this project have proved to be a useful tool in developing a specific set of actions that can be taken by a community stakeholder, in this case the City of Langley. The social responsibility matrices are attached as Appendix K.

Gap Analysis and Discussion of Options

The next stage in the development of the social plan was to identify gaps in services and discussion options for addressing those gaps. A public workshop was held with community stakeholders and interested residents on October 2nd, 2007. A press release was issued by the City of Langley, advertisements were placed in the local newspaper and direct invitations were sent to a broad range of community stakeholders including representatives from all levels of government, health authorities and social service agencies. A list of workshop attendees is attached as Appendix F.

Participants had an opportunity to examine and discuss the inventory of services and the social responsibility matrices, and to provide feedback on omissions. The workshop was designed to gain community input into the needs within the ten priorities and to compare the needs to existing service levels. Given that the process did not allow for detailed analysis of gaps in each of the priority areas, it is important to note that the gaps are detailed to the greatest extent possible without additional studies being conducted. Nonetheless, the process provided a fairly clear understanding of the current gaps in available services and programs.

The workshop also explored possible options for addressing the various service gaps, and the participants had clear ideas about the role that the City of Langley could play in addressing social issues. Their ideas built upon an initial brainstorming list of possible actions provided by participants at the priority setting workshop. The process of identifying specific actions aided the project team in the developing the social plan. Notes from the workshop can be found in Appendix G.

Action Plan and Workshop with Langley City Council

The remainder of this report comprises the City of Langley Social Plan. The plan was drafted at the completion of the public process outlined above, identifying how the City

can engage with the community to help meet social needs in Langley. The plan was presented at a workshop with Langley City Council on November 5, 2007. The purpose of the workshop was to provide City Council with the opportunity to provide input and feedback on the recommendations in the draft social plan prior to it being finalized. The workshop explored the priority issues, the recommendations that were developed during the public consultation process, and clarified the role of the City in implementing the plan. The workshop helped to ensure that the plan fits with the goals of the City.

City of Langley Current Social Planning Initiatives

It is important to note that the City of Langley has taken great strides in addressing social issues in the community, and has shown strong leadership in this area. Before setting out a plan for action, it is important to identify what is already being done. Therefore, this section summarizes the actions the City has already taken (by priority area).

Green Spaces

The City of Langley has more hectares of parkland and higher per capita spending on parks and recreation than neighbouring municipalities. The City recently won the Communities in Bloom international awards for medium sized municipalities. The City of Langley has one of the few disability accessible playgrounds for children in the region, located in Douglas Park. The City has a community garden in the Nicomekl Elementary School.

Homelessness

The Langley Food Bank and Free Store and the Salvation Army provide services to low income people, including food and clothing distribution, hot lunches, showers, counselling, addiction services and other programs. The City of Langley has identified a City-owned site for the Salvation Army's proposed "Gateway to Hope" facility which would provide emergency shelter beds, transition housing and support services. Should the project be approved, the City will lease the site (valued at \$1.0 million) to the Salvation Army for \$1 a year, and is prepared to provide property tax exemptions to the Salvation Army for the facility. The City also participates on the Homelessness Steering Committee.

Affordable Housing

The City has implemented a number of initiatives to ensure the existence of adequate affordable housing in the city. The Official Community Plan designates large areas around the downtown core, currently zoned as single family residential, for multifamily residential development. In 2006, City Council adopted a secondary suites bylaw and is waiving all applicable permit fees until January 2008. The 2001 Census indicates that the City of Langley had the fifth highest proportion of rental housing within Metro Vancouver and since the 1970s the City has had restrictive policies on the conversion of rental housing units to condominium tenure. The policies have prevented the conversion of any rental housing stock in the last 25 years. Through cooperation with other government and not-for-profit societies, 112 new social housing units have been built in

the community since 2001. The City has 989 social housing units, representing 45% of the social housing units in the South Fraser Region and the second highest proportion of social housing units in the GVRD (after Vancouver City).

Second Stage Housing

There is currently no second stage housing in the City of Langley, but the Salvation Army's proposed "Gateway to Hope" facility described under homelessness will provide 25 units of transitional housing. The City is prepared to lease land at nominal cost and provide a tax exemption for the project, if it proceeds.

Supporting Community Agency Capacity

The City of Langley has been a generous supporter of community social service agencies. The City provides supports to social service agencies through the provision of municipal land and facilities and through direct funding. The City of Langley makes available \$150,000 annually through their Community Grants program, which is a generous grant budget for a relatively small municipality. In 2006, the City provided \$101,895 in grants to not-for-profit agencies. In 2007 this amount increased to \$129,746, although surprisingly few social agencies apply for Community Grants.⁶ The City of Langley also provides permissive tax exemptions to a number of not-for-profit agencies operating in Langley, amounting to a total of \$202,390 in 2006.⁷ Building and land commitments to social service agencies total over \$3.5 million to date, with a commitment for an additional \$1 million pending approval by City Council.⁸

Priorities, Gaps & Actions

The following section outlines the current capacity and recommended actions for the City of Langley in the ten priority issue areas. The priority actions appear in the report in no particular order.

A. Green Spaces

The City of Langley has more hectares of parkland and higher per capita spending on parks and recreation than neighbouring municipalities, and recently won the Communities in Bloom international award for medium sized municipalities. Further, the City of Langley has one of the few accessible playgrounds for children in the region, located in Douglas Park in the city's core. The importance of green spaces and recreational opportunities is being increasingly recognized as a significant component of community well-being in cities across the province, and the City deserves to be proud for its leadership in protecting green space in the City of Langley. Participants in the workshops expressed their desire for the City of Langley to maintain its "green" environment in light of continued densification.

⁶ A complete listing of Community Grant recipients for 2007 can be found in Appendix H.

⁷ Permissive tax exemptions are also offered to churches and the Montessori School in the amount of \$86,605 in 2006. A complete listing of permissive tax exemptions offered to not-for-profit agencies can be found in Appendix I.

⁸ A complete listing of additional social supports can be found in Appendix J.

Current Capacity

An area of concern for workshop participants was increasing densification in Langley, and ensuring that condominium developments provided an adequate amount of community spaces. The City requires developers to put aside 5% of the total land or cash in lieu for parkland in single family subdivisions and requires developers to contribute \$1,520 per unit in multi-family housing and 25 square feet per unit to be set aside for indoor amenities. However, there appears to be a lack of public awareness about these programs. Furthermore, stakeholders were uncertain whether or not this is sufficient. Specifically, participants expressed the desire for additional public spaces for families to gather with accessible play spaces for children and pets. With increasing densification in some areas of Langley, workshop participants expressed the desire for additional community gardens. Currently there is one community garden in the City of Langley. Some participants feel it is aesthetically unpleasing because of the chain link fence surrounding it. The desire to see additional play spaces for children was accompanied by the desire to see park space designed for multiple generations, rather than being focused on a single user.

Municipal Responsibility

Of the ten priorities identified for the Social Plan, green spaces is the only element for which the City has primary responsibilities in the areas of planning, construction and siting and operations. This range of responsibility means that the City of Langley is ultimately responsible for park bylaws, design, zoning and planning strategies as well as the maintenance of infrastructure. Local government also has responsibilities such as creating specific community initiatives related to parks like local environmental programs and establishing partnerships through inter-sectoral planning committees. City of Langley residents have enjoyed a relative abundance of parks and other green spaces through the efforts of the City of Langley. While there are opportunities to increase the number of public spaces through the development process, the City of Langley may also wish to focus on protection and upgrading of its existing green spaces.

Recommendations

- Identify potential sites for community gardens, and work with local residents and groups to raise awareness of the benefits of community gardens such as food security, recreation and increased community safety resulting from increased human presence in parks. Potential sites for community gardens can include existing parks or school sites, and new multi-family developments. Once potential community garden sites have been identified, the City of Langley could consider providing start-up infrastructure grants to community groups and local residents interested in developing and maintaining a community garden. Municipal public works staff may be able to assist not-for-profit groups with garden development.
- Work with the Parks, Environment, Recreation and Culture Committee to:
 - continue to raise public awareness about existing parks;
 - identify parks that are under-utilized, and;
 - determine how new park structures and designs can be integrated into existing parks spaces to increase the utility of the park as a community meeting space for diverse groups.

- Review current development cost charges and their potential to provide additional community amenities such as park space.
- Consider providing density bonuses for provision of community amenities (including parks and public space).
- Promote accessibility for people with disabilities in parks and open spaces, as recommended in the City of Langley Accessibility and Inclusiveness Study.

B. Homelessness

In recent years homelessness has emerged as a pressing issue in communities across British Columbia. The social and economic costs of homelessness have become increasingly significant over time, and a corresponding shortage of housing and services has exacerbated the problem for many. Homelessness often overlaps with many other social issues, including addictions, health services, employment and public safety. Efforts to address and prevent homelessness in the City of Langley could have a significant impact on reducing the overall social and economic costs of homelessness in the community.

The existence of homelessness as an issue in the City of Langley was identified through the literature review process, and confirmed in the key informant interviews. The 2005 regional homelessness count identified 52 homeless individuals in the Langleys, though workshop participants estimated the total to be closer to 125. Participants in the June prioritization workshop thought that homelessness, and strategies to address and reduce it, should be a priority for the City of Langley Social Plan. Participants also referenced the heightened need for shelter in the cold and wet weather season, and a need for barrier free shelter beds in the communities.⁹ Populations identified as in particular need of support include youths, women, seniors and people with mental illnesses.

Current Capacity

The current inventory of services addressing homelessness includes a range of services at the Langley Food Bank and Free Store and the Salvation Army. Services through these two agencies include food and clothing distribution, hot lunches, showers, counselling, addiction services and other programs. Additional services are discussed under the affordable housing priority.

While there are currently no emergency shelter beds in the City of Langley, the City has recently received an application for the Salvation Army's 'Gateway of Hope' project, which would include some shelter beds as well as a wide range of other services for the homeless and at-risk population. The City would provide the land, and the Salvation Army would be able to lease the land from the City of Langley at a nominal fee. If approved, the facility could be ready in 2009, and would include 30 emergency beds (8 for women), 25 transitional supportive independent living beds (13 for women), a 104 seat dining room and community family services referral process for alcohol and drug addiction. Workshop participants noted that the new facility would be an important

⁹ 'Barrier-free' shelters are spaces in which persons under the influence of alcohol or other substances may still access shelter. Most existing shelter services require people to be sober on entry.

addition to the community, but that the project is still in the proposal stage and there remain at least two full winters before the doors would open, so a need exists for immediate services as well.

Municipal Responsibility

The City of Langley has neither the capacity nor the mandate to build or operate facilities and programs that address homelessness. However, as with all local issues, the City of Langley has an important role to play in addressing the issue, and has some significant responsibility in supporting the development of locally needed solutions and programs. These can include planning and zoning support, regulation and business licensing, and the enforcement of bylaws and building regulations. The Salvation Army has proposed the Gateway of Hope project, comprising 30 emergency shelter beds and 25 units of transitional housing on a site that would be leased from the city for a nominal fee. Should the project be approved, this would go a great way towards addressing the issue of homelessness in the City and Township of Langley.

The City also has a range of advocacy and support options available for it to promote solutions to homelessness, and these are explored below.

Recommendations

Recommendations related to homelessness are divided into both short-term (1-3 years) and long-term (more than 3 years).

Short-Term

- Support the ‘Gateway of Hope’ project or an equivalent shelter project.
- Continue to participate in the Homelessness Steering Committee.
- Advocate to other levels of government to ensure that the homeless and at-risk populations are able to access the services they need in the community.
- Support volunteer recruitment efforts for the extreme wet weather beds in the winter.

Long-Term

- Develop a policy statement assigning the staff resources necessary to develop a long-term engagement with social issues in the community.
- Develop and implement a mechanism for ongoing dialogue with the community on social issues, including homelessness.

Options and Ideas to Explore

Participants in the workshops presented a wide range of ideas and options that the City might consider in implementing the social plan. While most of these ideas are not directly the responsibility of the City, they do reflect a range of positive options that the City could support or promote. The City of Langley may wish to work in partnership with local not-for-profit organizations to support the following initiatives:¹⁰

¹⁰ Support for these initiatives does not necessarily mean financial support, but could come in the form of staff planning support and letters of support for applications to senior levels of government.

- Develop a strategy to engage with youth in the community, possibly including a youth advocate.
- Promote the development and expansion of housing for people with mental illnesses, including some form of supportive housing.
- Support efforts to improve outreach services to the homeless, in particular, the provision of a female outreach worker.
- Participants identified a continuing need for a youth safe house in the community, which would include showers and other services as needed.

C. Affordable Housing

A shortage of affordable housing has been identified in many BC communities. The social impacts of affordable housing shortages are linked to homelessness, health issues, education outcomes and community safety. When individuals are unable to access or keep housing, it becomes significantly more difficult to address other issues such as addiction or mental illness.

Participants in the prioritization workshop identified affordable housing as a key priority for the City of Langley Social Plan.

Current Capacity

Current affordable housing capacity includes a number of agencies that serve a variety of populations. Over 1300 affordable units exist in the Langleys, including 849 operated by BC Housing, and a further 176 that are currently funded by the federal government. Of that total, 767 are located in the City of Langley. A total of 2202 affordable housing units are in place in the South Fraser region (which includes Abbotsford, the Township and City of Langley, Surrey and Delta).¹¹ Clearly, the City of Langley has a large share of the region's affordable housing units. Additionally, a number of community agencies work with vulnerable populations to operate and provide affordable housing (among other services), including the YWCA, the West Fraser Housing Society and others.

The City of Langley has a good supply of affordable housing relative to many other municipalities in Metro Vancouver, and also has a good supply of rental housing. However, there is still unmet need. In 2001 in the City of Langley, 850 households (8.4%) were paying more than 50% of their income on shelter¹². It is likely that number has increased in the past six years. Price Waterhouse Coopers forecasted a demand of 6,228 additional units of affordable housing in the City and Township of Langley between 2001 and 2021.¹³

¹¹ BC Housing GVRD Regional Inventory 2006.

¹² A high number of households with housing affordability issues does not indicate a failure on the part of a municipality to address housing issues. On the contrary, low income households often choose to locate in communities where housing is more affordable.

¹³ PriceWaterhouseCoopers, *Forecast demand for Affordable Housing in Greater Vancouver*, April 2004.

Table 1: Housing Affordability (2001)

Municipality	Average Rents	Total Hhlds	Renter Hhlds	Social Housing Units	Social Hsg as % of Total Hhlds	Social Hsg as % of Renter Hhlds
City of Langley	\$768	10,090	4,225	989	9.80%	23.41%
District of Langley	\$768	29,675	4,720	367	1.24%	7.78%
City of Surrey	\$738	115,710	33,020	4,590	3.97%	13.90%
City of Delta	\$781	32,785	6,765	676	2.06%	9.99%
City of Vancouver	\$912	236,100	132,750	23458	9.94%	17.67%
City of North Van	\$857	20,710	10,720	1021	4.93%	9.52%
Metro Vancouver	\$866	758710	295,745	47857	6.31%	16.18%

Source: *Housing Affordability in Greater Vancouver*, McClanaghan & Associates, July 2007.

Note: This study identified 989 social housing units in the City of Langley in 2001. The current estimate of social housing units in the City of Langley from BC Housing is 767 units.

Municipal Responsibility

The City of Langley does not have the mandate or capacity to build and operate affordable housing. However, the City does have an important role in promoting the creation of affordable housing in the community. The City has a wide range of tools and opportunities to encourage the expansion of affordable housing stock, particularly through the development and zoning process. Existing municipal policies in the City of Langley that promote the provision of affordable housing (and prevent its loss) include legalization of secondary suites, and policies that prohibit the conversion of rental suites.

The Metro Vancouver Affordable Housing Strategy presents a number of options for municipalities to consider when developing their own affordable housing strategy, depending upon the characteristics of that particular municipality.¹⁴ Municipalities can select those strategies from the Metro Vancouver Affordable Housing Strategy that work best for them. For example, the City of Langley may have opportunities to obtain affordable housing units through density bonusing, but does not have land available to contribute to affordable housing projects.

Recommendations

Recommendations related to affordable housing are divided into both short-term (1-3 years) and long-term (more than 3 years).

Short-Term

- Consider adopting an affordable housing strategy in anticipation of Metro Vancouver's update of the Regional Growth Strategy, which is expected to require

¹⁴ See the Draft Regional Affordable Housing Strategy at <http://www.gvrd.bc.ca/growth/pdfs/DraftRegionalAffordableHousingStrategy.pdf>

municipalities to develop such strategies. This strategy can include:

- developing anticipatory strategies to mitigate the loss of low-end market housing, and to promote the implementation of homelessness prevention strategies.
- continuing to encourage the legalization of secondary suites and explore options for expanding the legal use of secondary suites as a way to increase the number of lower end market rental units in the community.
- advocating to higher levels of government to increase rent supplements and housing allowances for low income residents.

Long-Term

- Continue to champion the creation of low-cost housing through the development and zoning process.
- Explore tax and development charge breaks to encourage the creation of affordable housing.
- Explore opportunities for obtaining affordable rental units through density bonusing.

D. Second Stage Housing

Second stage housing denotes housing for individuals who are transitioning out of homelessness or a homeless shelter, but are not yet ready to live in permanent independent housing. Residents usually stay between 3 months and 2 years, unlike long-term supportive housing which tends to be permanent. A number of different approaches to second stage housing exist, serving the specific needs of different populations.¹⁵

Participants in the prioritization workshop identified a shortage of second-stage housing as an important priority for the City of Langley Social Plan. When people are able to access shelter, the funding and limitations of shelter services normally restrict their stay to 30 days or less (occasionally up to three months). In many cases, individuals at the end of their stay are not ready to transition into permanent, independent housing without significant ongoing supports. As a result, they often become homeless again, perpetuating the cycle of marginalization and increasing the pressure on existing shelters and other services.

Current Capacity

Currently, second stage housing capacity is nonexistent in the City of Langley, and very limited in the rest of the region. However, the proposed 'Gateway of Hope' project would include approximately 25 new transitional supportive housing beds, and could be completed in 2009. Participants in the workshop indicated that although the new beds would be welcome, more facilities will be needed to meet the growing need in the community.

¹⁵ For example, a second stage housing facility that serves youths would have a different format than one serving women who have fled abuse.

Municipal Responsibility

The City of Langley does not have the mandate or capacity to build and operate second stage housing. However, the City does have an important role in promoting the creation and operation of second stage housing in the community and in the region as a whole. The City also has a wide range of tools available to it that can help promote the expansion of these services.

Recommendations

Recommendations related to second stage housing are divided into both short-term (1-3 years) and long-term (more than 3 years).

Short-Term

- Engage with community agencies and committees to build supportive connections and partnerships relating to housing.
- Advocate with other levels of government and private funders to support the creation of second stage housing facilities in the City and the region as a whole.
- Engage with the business community to identify and support options for increasing the supply of affordable and second stage housing.

Long-Term

- Explore tax and development cost charge breaks to encourage the creation of second stage and affordable housing.

E. Detox and Residential Treatment

The impacts of addictions on communities are increasingly visible across the province as effective treatment options are in high demand and short supply. A lack of capacity to offer treatment options in a timely and effective manner, with a range of supports in place to sustain individuals through the process of treatment, compounds the negative impacts of drug misuse on communities. Addictions also link with a variety of other social issues, including homelessness, poverty, mental illness and crime. Existing detox services and residential treatment options have been identified across the province as high barrier, and services are at capacity with significant wait periods. Programs to provide treatment for substance misuse can minimize the human and economic costs in the City of Langley.

Current Capacity

The need for detox and residential treatment was identified through the literature review and key informant interviews. Workshop participants confirmed that increased capacity in Langley was necessary to address the issues impacting the community. Workshop participants also identified the need to ensure that addictions services for seniors were addressed in any actions related to detox and residential treatment.

The lack of capacity is perceived to particularly impact those who are homeless. For people facing addictions but who have homes, the services are perceived to be generally available and effective. However, barriers are greater for those who have addictions and who are homeless because of the time limits in place for many treatment centres.

Current capacity for residential treatment is limited to a Christian discipleship program with a 50 bed capacity for men only in the Township of Langley. Although self-referral to the program is accepted, the barriers to residential stay and programming are high because residents must live in a particular faith-based environment and the use of nicotine is forbidden. Participants in the workshop noted that the service gap in this area is significant, and indicated that the provision of another 50 beds in the Fraser Valley would still not meet the need.

There are no short-term detox facilities in Langley, which indicates a gap in light of estimated needs. Detox facilities are an important part of the continuum of care, as many residential treatment facilities require clients to be clean for a number of days prior to their admission. Many individuals fail to qualify for residential treatment because their living situations do not typically allow for sobriety prior to their admission.

- The Salvation Army is proposing to increase shelter capacity. The shelter's services are expected to be broad reaching. Although the Salvation Army will provide referral services for detox and drug and alcohol treatment, there are no immediate plans to provide such services within the City. The City believes that detox and treatment facilities are best located in a rural setting.

Municipal Responsibility

Municipalities have limited responsibilities for detox and residential treatment facilities. They do not have any primary planning, construction and siting or operational responsibilities. Secondary responsibility exists in some areas but is limited to aspects such as land use planning and zoning, participation in planning regulation, enforcement of bylaws and business license regulation, and the development of location guidelines.

Recommendations

Recommendations related to detox and residential treatment are divided into both short-term (1-3 years) and long-term (more than 3 years).

Short-Term

- Work with social service agencies in Langley and surrounding communities to develop an understanding of the detox and treatment needs of various populations in the region. This work might be undertaken through the Homelessness Steering Committee, or by forming a sub-regional task force on detox and addictions treatment.
- Once an institutional understanding of the issues faced by the community has been developed, work with neighbouring municipalities to develop and implement an advocacy plan. The advocacy plan will assist in ensuring that the Province recognizes the need and adequately funds residential treatment options and related supports in the region.

Long-Term

- Partner with the Province, neighbouring municipalities and local agencies to plan for the development of detox and treatment services in the region, and work with the community to determine the appropriate locations for services.
-

F. Community-Based Health Services

There is growing recognition in British Columbia that the health needs of some populations are best met through health services that are based in the community with trained staff that can facilitate their access. Where services are not available, travel within the region is necessary to access some health services which presents a barrier for some populations. Socially excluded populations may need additional supports to access health services in an environment that is familiar to them, and workshop participants identified that there is a significant gap in community-based health services in Langley. The gap was identified as being particularly severe for youths and newcomers who may require services in languages other than English. Poverty was also identified as a barrier to accessing health services, especially for the working poor who do not qualify for the additional benefits available to income assistance recipients. Poverty in Langley also has impacts on the degree of food security in the community, and participants also identified access to nutritious meals for children in Langley schools as a significant gap. Related also to childhood development is the need for pre-natal and post-natal health services available directly in the community. Supports for people with brain injuries were also noted to be lacking during the workshop process.

Current Capacity

It is difficult to determine the magnitude of the shortfall in community health services in Langley, but workshop participants were clear that the coordination and integration of services was of specific concern. There are a number of different agencies focusing on various aspects of community-based health services, but coordination between services remains a challenge due to limited resources in the not-for-profit sector. As a component of increased coordination in the sector, participants also urged that increased communication with the Fraser Health Authority is critical. With the Langley Mental Health Centre and Langley Stepping Stone Community Services Society both operating in the community, participants perceived that there was sufficient care across the continuum for people suffering from mental health issues. Homelessness research in Metro Vancouver however, indicates that there is insufficient care across the continuum and additional research is necessary to determine whether or not sufficient care exists for mental health recipients in the City of Langley. Youth health services are available through the Langley Youth Wellness Centre, where youth obtain free and confidential health services. However, the clinic operates with limited hours each week and there is demand for greater access to services. The City of Langley's only secondary school is transitioning to a middle school, and there is concern that the essential role the school has played in linking youth to services in the community will disappear. While sexual health and crisis pregnancy services are available through agencies in both the Langleys, there is limited access and programming in the realm of pre- and post-natal health services.

Municipal Responsibility

Municipal responsibility for community-based health services is limited in all aspects, but some municipalities have carved out roles for themselves to assist the health sector in meeting the needs of residents. Aside from any zoning or incentive options in the creation of new health facilities, municipalities can assume an advocacy role to ensure that other levels of government and health authorities are aware of the community's needs for reduced-barrier health services. Although municipalities do not provide health services, local governments can partner with community health services to ensure that they have adequate space for their operations.

Recommendations

- Continue to emphasize the importance of HD Stafford School for service providers accessing youths in the community.
- Continue to maintain relationships with the School District in order to build support for in-school meal services in inner-city schools, and to continue to identify the health needs of youths and determine how to increase youths' access to community-based health services in the community.
- Develop relationships with social and health agencies in the community to identify opportunities for collaborating on community-based health initiatives, both those that are already occurring and in planning for future initiatives.
- Contribute planning and coordination support to existing community-based health services in Langley in order to support the community desire for greater coordination within the sector and to prevent duplication in service.

G. Connecting Diverse Communities

This priority social service element emerged during the prioritization workshop from a combination of two distinct elements. One of the elements identified the need to connect isolated populations, and the other sought the re-establishment of a volunteer services centre in Langley. "Isolated populations" was a term used to reference groups of people in Langley that were not connected through specific social service agencies, such as First Nations communities and newcomer groups. Langley has a relatively low percentage of newcomers relative to other Metro Vancouver municipalities, but these numbers are expected to grow as society continues to diversify. Discussion at the fall workshop highlighted the notion that connecting isolated populations might not best be done through a volunteer services centre, and questioned the merit of combining the two elements. The consultants have changed the element to underscore the general importance of connection between diverse communities within Langley.

Current Capacity

Many social service agencies in Langley utilize the services of volunteers in conducting their operations, and members of at least two agencies volunteer in the community as a means of developing networks and skills. The community presence of You've Gotta Have Friends and Stepping Stone Community Services Society indicate that some capacity in this area does exist in the community, but participants at the workshops suggested that such capacity is not necessarily coordinated. The recent closure of a

volunteer centre in Langley has been noted as a considerable loss to the community, and there is interest in renewing the capacity offered through such a centre.

Municipal Responsibility

Although municipal responsibility in this area is limited, a secondary responsibility exists in participating in planning for community social services and providing support for service coordination. Should the planning result in the development of new facilities, the City has zoning, land-use and business licensing responsibilities.

Recommendations

- Work with not-for-profit organizations in Langley to conduct a review of existing volunteer programs in the City of Langley, to determine whether they facilitate the involvement of diverse populations, and identify opportunities for reaching out to diverse populations to encourage involvement.
- Work with the community services sector to determine the extent to which there are diverse populations in Langley that are experiencing isolation due to a lack of services that meet their needs.
- Continue working with Langley service agencies to determine the efficacy of developing a volunteer services centre to meet the needs of those populations experiencing isolation due to a lack of services.
 - Should the development of a volunteer services centre be determined as the best course of action, establish an inter-agency working group to explore how the City can support the development of the centre. It is anticipated that the City's support of a volunteer services centre would be conditioned on a model of operation that encourages the connection of various communities within Langley.
 - Should the development of a volunteer services centre be determined ineffective in connecting diverse communities in Langley, establish a collaborative planning table to determine how best to coordinate activities related to connecting diverse populations. The collaborative planning table should include representatives from a number of sectors, including community services, education, health and business, representatives from the populations identified, as well as municipal representatives from the City of Langley and neighbouring municipalities.

H. Education and Awareness of all Elements of Safety

Public safety is a perennial issue that overlaps many social issues in the community. Participants in the prioritization workshop identified public education and awareness of all elements of safety as a key priority for the City of Langley Social Plan. Of particular importance are the prevention of family and senior abuse, senior safety in the streets, and the use and promotion of Crime Prevention through Environmental Design (CPTED) principles in developments and landscaping.

Current Capacity

Current capacity in the community includes a number of violence prevention services, counselling agencies and advocates for issues such as pedestrian safety. Additionally,

some services work to address specific safety issues, such as senior abuse or youth violence. The RCMP work to address safety issues and to prevent violence. The City of Langley has adopted CPTED principles and reviews all major development applications through a CPTED lens. In addition, the City supports and encourages the Crime Free Multi-Housing Program, and has two tier business licensing which offers fee reductions for rental property owners who have been through the program. There is also an active Block Watch Program operating in the City of Langley through the Community Policing Office. The inventory did not identify any other community-wide safety awareness projects or any multi-agency safety campaigns.

Municipal Responsibility

The City of Langley does have a significant role in community safety issues, particularly crime prevention and enforcement. It has primary responsibility in overseeing land use and development within the community, and in the design of parks, streets and public spaces. In the case of family violence issues, the city has less responsibility. However, some municipalities have taken a leadership role through a number of avenues. These avenues include partnering with local not-for-profit agencies, by adopting “zero tolerance of violence” policies, recognizing November as Together Against Violence Month, and supporting anti-violence initiatives in their communities, including programs that address abuse of vulnerable seniors.

Recommendations

Recommendations related to safety education and awareness are divided into both short-term (1-3 years) and long-term (more than 3 years).

Short-Term

- Identify opportunities to provide and distribute public safety awareness materials.
- Work with community agencies to build awareness of existing services and violence prevention programs.

Long-Term

- Continue to incorporate and build upon safety considerations when developing municipal infrastructure, including parks and other facilities.
- Continue to implement pedestrian friendly design in traffic planning processes.
- Continue to support police and other public safety agencies in promoting community safety.

I. Public Education about Social Service Issues

Public awareness of social issues can be limited, and often awareness building can help to reduce or eliminate negative community responses to new programs or facilities. Perhaps understandably, few people outside of the community service sector have cause to build awareness or support for community programs or strategies to address social issues. Increased awareness of social issues can help to build community support for proactive solutions to social problems, as well as helping to facilitate access to needed services when people find themselves in crisis.

Participants in the prioritization workshop identified public education about social service issues as a priority for the City of Langley Social Plan. This would build public support for programs, and increase the ability of vulnerable populations to access the information and services they need.

Current Capacity

Currently a number of social service agencies that operate in the City of Langley do public awareness campaigns. Additionally, there are inventories of existing community and social services available over a larger geographic area, including the 'Red Book' of social agencies in Greater Vancouver. However, at present there is no existing communications apparatus that promotes or builds awareness of the community services that are available in the City of Langley.

Municipal Responsibility

The City of Langley does have a variety of options available to help increase public awareness of community programs and social service issues. The City of Langley has a strong voice in the community, and a number of pre-existing communications tools available through existing programs and services.

Recommendations

Participants in the consultations had a number of ideas and suggestions about how the city can work to build awareness of social service issues in the community.

- Ensure that the City has a connection to social agencies and social issues by participating in and hosting discussions, roundtables and consultations with community agencies.
- Use existing communication tools (e.g. the Municipal Web Pages) to publicize the existence of social services in the community
- Work with the community and community agencies to help address fears, provide accurate information and mitigate impacts when new social service facilities or programs are proposed.¹⁶
- Continue to promote civic engagement and participation in social issues by members of the community.

J. Building Capacity of Community Social Service Agencies

Not-for-profit social service agencies are continually struggling to raise the funds needed to fulfill their respective mandates. In recent years, changes and reductions in the amount of funding available to community based agencies have resulted in dramatic reductions in the capacity and ability of agencies to provide services and meet the needs of the community. As a result of limited capacity and funding challenges, local services can be lost or severely constrained in their ability to respond to changing community problems.

¹⁶ NIMBY is an acronym for 'Not In My Backyard', a term commonly used to describe a frequent community response to proposals for the development of social service facilities for vulnerable populations.

Current Capacity

The South Fraser Community Services Society provides low cost meeting space and other services for community agencies in Langley. A range of private funding agencies, including the United Way and the Vancity Foundation, also support community services through operational and project funding. The City of Langley supports social service agencies through the provision of municipal land and facilities and through direct funding.¹⁷ The City of Langley also provides \$150,000 annually through their Community Grants program, which is a generous grant budget for a relatively small municipality¹⁸. In addition, the City of Langley provides tax exemptions to local not-for-profit organizations worth \$118,484 in 2006.

Municipal Responsibility

The City is not primarily responsible for funding or providing social services, though it does have the option to support specific programs if it chooses. The City of Langley has a generous community grants program, and these grants, even if small, can assist not-for-profit agencies to access funding from senior levels of government. Municipal grants are generally seen by funders as evidence of local support for the programs. The City also has the ability to indirectly support community agencies through a variety of tools, including tax exemptions, space provision and communications support. The City can also provide advocacy and other forms of support for agencies seeking funding from other sources, including other levels of government and private funders.

Recommendations

Recommendations related to social agency and not-for-profit capacity are divided into both short-term (1-3 years) and long-term (more than 3 years).

Short-term

- Engage with community agencies to identify opportunities for the City of Langley to influence other governments and private funders to support services in the community through stable, sustained funding.
- Engage with community agencies to identify and act upon opportunities for the City to provide non-funding related support to enhance social agency capacity (e.g. letters of support, reduced cost for space rentals, or free access to facilities).
- Engage with community agencies to identify improvements to the application process for the City of Langley Community Grants program.

Long-term

- Create capacity within City staff to support agencies in coordinating efforts, inventorying services and coordinating funding requests.
- Ensure the City has the capacity to identify and act on emerging issues in the community, in partnership with community agencies and other levels of government.

¹⁷ Langley Community Services Society operates from a City facility. If the Salvation Army's Gateway to Hope project proceeds, the municipal lands will be leased to the Salvation Army for \$1 a year. The City provides direct funding to Langley Youth and Family Services.

¹⁸ It was noted at the workshop that surprisingly few social agencies apply for funding from the City's grant program

Global Recommendations

The priorities and actions for the City of Langley Social Plan have some significant common themes. Since the City often holds secondary or limited responsibility for social services, many of the options available to the City involve communications, advocacy and partnership building with and between community agencies. While the City does not have the mandate or capacity to function as a front-line social service delivery agency, it does have an opportunity to engage with the community and community agencies to identify community needs and help ensure that the needs of community members are met. In fact, the City of Langley recognizes its role by addressing the theme of social issues in its corporate strategic plan.

In order for a social plan to be effective, it is essential to regularly assess the needs of the community, to identify emerging issues and to ensure that the City has the capacity to engage with community agencies over time and across a range of issues. The following global recommendations reflect the overarching goals of the Social Plan.

Short-term

- Ensure that adequate staff capacity exists at the City to engage with community agencies and community issues on an ongoing basis.
- Develop a process to identify low- and no-cost opportunities for the City to support community agencies in providing services to the community.
- Work with community agencies and citizens to identify opportunities for the City to advocate to funders and other levels of government.

Long-term

- Apply a ‘social’ lens to development and policy planning, to ensure that the social priorities of the community are considered in municipal planning and processes.
- Continue to position the City of Langley as a leader in addressing the social issues in the community by serving a partnership building and information sharing role.

SUMMARY OF SOCIAL PLAN RECOMMENDATIONS

Social Service Element	Short Term (1 to 3 years)	Long Term (3+ years)
Green Spaces	Identify additional potential sites for community gardens	
	Raise awareness about existing parks	
	Better utilize existing parks	
	Review Development Cost Charges for parks contributions	
	Consider density bonusing for community amenities	
	Promote accessibility in parks and open spaces	
Homelessness	Support the 'Gateway of Hope' project or an equivalent shelter project	Adopt policy affirming City's role in engaging with the community on social issues
	Continue to Participate in Homeless Steering Committee	Continue an ongoing dialogue with the community on social issues
	Advocate for services for those who are homeless or at risk	
	Support volunteer recruitment for extreme weather beds	
Affordable Housing	Develop an Affordable Housing Strategy once Metro Vancouver releases their affordable housing targets	Continue to champion the creation of low cost housing
	Develop strategies to mitigate loss of low end market housing	Explore tax and DCC breaks for affordable housing
	Promote homelessness prevention strategies	
	Continue to encourage legalization of secondary suites	
	Advocate to senior governments for increases to rent supplements and housing allowances	
Second Stage Housing	Develop partnerships with community groups to address housing issues	Explore tax and DCC breaks for second stage housing
	Advocate to funders for second stage housing	
	Engage business community to support affordable and second stage housing	

Social Service Element	Short Term (1 to 3 years)	Long Term (3+ years)
Detox and Residential Treatment	Work with the Health Authority, community social service agencies and neighbouring municipalities to determine needs	Work with the province, neighbouring communities, local agencies and the community to find sites and develop appropriate services
	Partner with neighbouring municipalities to advocate for provision of services in the region	
Community Based Health Services	Continue to support role of HD Stafford School in linking youth to service providers & explore other ways to link youth to health services	
	Work with School District to provide in-school meal services for inner city schools	
	Work with health authority and local agencies to identify youth health needs	
	Collaborate with other groups on community based health initiatives	
	Provide planning and coordination support to community health-based initiatives	
Connecting Diverse Communities	Review volunteer programs to ensure they facilitate involvement of diverse populations	
	Work with community services to determine which population groups are experiencing isolation	
	Work with community agencies to explore the establishment of a volunteer services centre, and other initiatives to link diverse communities.	
Awareness of Community Safety Issues	Provide and distribute safety awareness materials	Continue to address safety when developing City infrastructure
	Work with community agencies to build awareness	Continue to implement pedestrian friendly design
		Continue to support police and other agencies to promote community safety

Social Service Element	Short Term (1 to 3 years)	Long Term (3+ years)
Awareness of Social Issues	Participate in community discussions, roundtables etc. with social service agencies and public	
	Work with agencies to address community concerns re: projects	
	Promote civic engagement and public participation in social issues	
Social Agency Capacity	Engage with community agencies to identify opportunities for the City to advocate for community services to senior governments	Create capacity on City staff to support agencies with needs assessments and coordination
	Provide non-financial support to agencies (e.g. free space)	Create staff capacity to respond to emerging issues
	Continue to work with agencies to improve community grants program	
Global Recommendations	Provide ongoing staff capacity to engage with agencies on community issues	Apply a social lens to policies, planning and development decisions
	Continue to provide non-financial and low cost support to community agencies	Continue to act as a leader in addressing social issues through partnership building and information sharing
	Advocate to senior levels of government and funders to support needed services	

Implementation

This Social Plan for the City of Langley sets out an ambitious plan for coordinating social planning efforts in the City and building upon the good work that has already been done. This following section outlines a process for implementation.

1. Set up a structure for community consultation regarding Plan implementation

Many of the recommendations in this Social Plan involve working in collaboration with community social service agencies to address issues that have been identified during the planning process. There are a range of options available to Council for working with community agencies. A broad-based steering committee could be formed to provide the City with guidance, with membership from a range of community agencies and a Council liaison person. Council could also appoint community residents to this committee. Alternatively (or in addition to a steering committee), City staff could organize stakeholders' meetings at key points, particularly when determining priorities for the annual implementation plan.

Rather than setting up a new committee or coalition, the City may wish to expand their existing Social Planning Committee. While the membership of the current Social Planning Committee consists only of Council members, the Committee's current terms of reference allow for the appointment of stakeholders and community members.

While City Council is ultimately responsible for determining which elements of the City of Langley Social Plan are included in each year's implementation plan, consulting with community agencies ensures that the annual plans continue to reflect community priorities, and ensures that the City of Langley continues to be "The Place to Be".

2. Develop an annual implementation plan

In order to move forward in a coordinated way in implementing the Social Plan, it is recommended that City of Langley staff, in consultation¹⁹ with social service agencies and the community, develop an annual implementation plan for Council's approval, based on the priorities identified in this Social Plan. In brief, the steps City staff will take to develop the annual plan include:

1. Setting priorities in consultation with social service agencies, stakeholders, and the community
2. Develop strategies to address the annual priorities
3. Assign responsibility to tasks identified and
4. Set timelines for implementation.

3. Monitor progress, and report to Council on an annual basis on accomplishments

It will be important for City staff to monitor progress on the Social Plan, and report annually to Council on their achievements. This report could be part of the implementation plan.

4. Advocate to Senior Levels of Government

1. Work with community agencies to coordinate advocacy efforts and develop an advocacy strategy.

There are a number of recommendations in the plan that involve advocating to senior levels of government to ensure that adequate levels of social services are provided in the City of Langley and the South Fraser Region. It is recommended that City staff work with community agencies and neighbouring municipalities to develop a coordinated advocacy effort.

2. Bring advocacy statements to Council for endorsement.

While advocacy is usually an ongoing process, Council endorsement of recommendations to senior levels of government will be crucial if advocacy efforts are to be effective. On many issues, the City of Langley may wish to encourage other municipalities to join their advocacy efforts, including bringing motions forward to the Union of BC Municipalities.

¹⁹ The consultation can take one or more of the forms outlined in Section 1. on page 24.

5. Partner with other local municipalities

The City and neighbouring municipalities can benefit from working in partnership to meet the social service needs in the region. By combining resources and planning together, these two municipalities can provide a broader range of services than either municipality could accomplish alone.

The Union of Nova Scotia municipalities notes that “The process of partnership encourages compromise, consultation, evaluation, strategic planning, and goal setting. It optimizes use of knowledge and know-how of the partnering municipalities, helps to eliminate duplication of effort, and promotes a culture of organizational co-operation.... Most often cooperative arrangements result in actual dollar savings, improved or sustained delivery of services or programs, and an enhanced ability to share costs and skills.”²⁰

Whatever the form of cooperative arrangement or partnership that exists, normally the undertaking will involve the following four main components:

1. A sharing of roles and responsibilities,
2. Contributions from each participant of human, financial, technological, or material and structural resources,
3. A sharing of risk, control and benefits,
4. Added value in products and/or services.

Partnerships are especially beneficial where one municipality does not meet the threshold population to support a particular service (for example, detox and substance abuse treatment services, or a homeless shelter). With partnerships, one municipality might provide free land and tax exemptions to a non-profit organization, while the other municipality might provide core operating funding.

Conclusion

The City of Langley has shown considerable leadership in supporting social services in the community. Developing and implementing an annual action plan for will ensure that the City of Langley remains a leader in this area, and that the quality of life in the City of Langley remains high.

²⁰ Union of Nova Scotia Municipalities, *Handbook on Inter-Municipal Partnership and Co-operation for Municipal Government*, (2003)
http://www.gov.ns.ca/snsmr/muns/workshops/PDF/MunicipalCooperation_Seminar/Intermunicipal_report.pdf

Appendix A: Literature Review

Literature Review

This literature review is intended to assist the project team in identifying the existing social issues in the community, as well as to provide background about the scope of existing issues and potential solutions or ideas that might contribute to addressing those issues. To the extent possible, the literature review also seeks to identify existing social service and planning capacity in the community, including existing committees and roundtables that focus on particular issues.

The first section of the literature review addresses the above considerations and is specific to the Langley context. Section two provides an overview of the approaches taken in developing other municipal social plans in BC.

Literature Review Exploring the Langley Context

Anne, K. Morrison Consulting, *et al.* (2000). “Langley Community Mapping Project.” Presented to Langley Family Services and Langley Child and Youth Committee.

The intent of the mapping project was to identify key indicators of the physical, emotional and social health of children and youth in Langley and to disseminate the report through the community to assist with collaborative service planning. The focus of the project was on to collect data that is particularly relevant to children and youth, as well as to establish a broad profile of the Langley community. The project’s methodology combined the collection of both hard and soft data, and the Steering Committee ultimately decided to develop two complete profiles of the Murrayville and Aldergrove communities within the Township of Langley.

The indicators that comprise the mapping project are similar to those identified through other reports in this literature review. The statistical indicators tell us the following about the City of Langley in comparison to surrounding communities and the GVRD as a whole:

- Average family sizes
- Higher rates of mobility/moving
- Higher percentages of lone parent families
- Higher rates of unemployment
- Higher divorce/separation rates
- Lower household incomes
- Higher percentage of low-income families
- Similar rate of home ownership as the GVRD but lower than surrounding area
- Lower rate of Criminal Code offences than Vancouver, Surrey and Chilliwack
- Higher perceptions of vulnerability amongst senior populations
- Lower rates of child care investigations, protection reports and intakes
- Rates of grade nine being the highest level of education are average for the region but higher than neighbouring communities
- Slightly higher rates of residents educated only to Grade 12
- Lower rates of university graduation

- Lower than regional rates of students with English as a second language.

The community mapping project also included a number of qualitative interviews with residents of Murrayville and a profile of Aldergrove. Because both of these communities are outside of the City of Langley Social Plan area, they are not included here.

City of Langley (2006). “Social Planning Committee: Terms of Reference.” January 26.

The terms of reference for the City of Langley Social Planning Committee outline the purpose of the committee, its function, its establishment and authority and its composition and procedures. The purpose of the Committee is to liaise with social issue groups to determine initiatives and recommendations to address social issues in the City. It is comprised of the Mayor and a minimum of two councillors, as well as designated staff members. At the Mayor’s invitation, other non-voting advisors to the Committee may be added. All meetings are open to the public, and the Committee Chair (the Mayor) prepares and presents an annual report to City Council for the preceding year.

Existing Social Service and Planning Capacity Identified:

- Although not a planning body, the Committee advises City Council on social issues and facilitates discussion and review of social issues with the public.

City of Langley (2004). “Report to Director of Development Services: Statistical Indicators for Social Planning – City of Langley in GVRD Context.” November 15.

For informational purposes only, this report identifies demographic statistics that may indicate a presence of socioeconomically disadvantaged communities in Langley. The City of Langley ranks at the top of the following potential indicators for need of social services within the population:

- Lone parent families (21.1% in City of Langley, 15.3% GVRD)
- Income derived from government transfer payments (13.2% in City of Langley, 9.6% GVRD)
- Incidence of low income individuals (43.3% in City of Langley, 39.8% GVRD)
- Population aged 20 years and over without high school diploma (22.4% in Langley, 14.7% GVRD)

The City of Langley also ranked higher than the GVRD average on the following indicators: incidence of low income families; percentage of persons living alone, percentage of total population over 65 years; and percentage of total population aged five and over that lived at a different address five years earlier.

The report also identifies the potential social service implications of the census statistics outlined in the report, as well as the affected social service agencies and government department related to the indicators.

City of Langley (undated). “Affordable Housing: What are we Doing?”

This document outlines six areas in which the City of Langley is acting to ensure the existence of adequate affordable housing in the city. The Official Community Plan designates large areas around the downtown core, currently zoned as single family residential, for multifamily residential development. In 2006, City Council adopted a secondary suites bylaw and is waiving all applicable permit fees until January 2008. The 2001 Census indicates that the City of Langley had the fifth highest proportion of rental housing within the GVRD and since the 1970s the City has had restrictive policies on the conversion of rental housing units to condominium tenure. The policies have prevented the conversion of any rental housing stock in the last 25 years. The City has the second highest proportion of social housing units in the GVRD. Through cooperation with other government and not-for-profit societies, 112 new social housing units have been built in the community. The City is currently working closely with BC Housing and the Salvation Army to identify a location for a homeless shelter.

Ipsos Reid Public Affairs (2007). “2007 Community Survey.” Report for the City of Langley.

The first public opinion survey for the City of Langley in three years, the results show very strong overall perceptions towards the community and the City. However, the results are not as favourable as in 2004. Quality of life is seen to have taken a “downward turn” in the last several years. The top issues to emerge from the survey are as follows:

- Transportation (30%)
 - Congestion, condition of the streets/sidewalks, and public transit
- Social issues (30%)
 - Poverty and homelessness
- Crime and personal safety (21%)
 - 54% feel less safe in their community than five years ago

Perceptions of issues are also an important consideration in social planning. At a two to one ratio, citizens would rather see an increase to taxes than a cut in municipal services. There is a lack of understanding about the City’s casino proceeds policy, but citizens would be included to support they policy if they knew more about it.

Jim Woodward and Associates (2005). “Report to Langley City Council on Homelessness in Langley in 2005 and Recommended Action Plan.” *Confidential and not for public release.*

The report on homelessness in Langley is comprised of an overview of the 2005 regional homeless count results and reviews local reports that have recently been completed on homelessness in Langley. It also provides examples of initiatives related to addressing homelessness in other municipalities in the region. Based on the information outlined in the report, the authors develop an action plan centred on four recommendations.

The nighttime portion of the homeless count enumerated two sheltered individuals in the Township and City of Langley, while the daytime counted recorded 52 people. Nearly half of respondents indicated that their last permanent home was outside of Langley, but elsewhere in the GVRD 11 respondents indicated that their last permanent home was in Langley. The overall numbers from the 2005 homeless count represent a significant increase in the homeless population in the Langleys. The recommendations contribute to both building capacity to address homelessness in Langley and building planning capacity to determine how to address homelessness. They are as follows:

- That the City of Langley support and assist the Langley Homeless Steering Committee and the Salvation Army with their efforts to identify an appropriate location for an emergency shelter/transitional housing facility in the City.
- That the City of Langley embark on a homeless priority-setting initiative with the Township of Langley and the Langley Homeless Steering Committee.
- The City of Langley continue to actively participate in and support the work of the Langley Homeless Steering Committee
- That the City of Langley consider adopting the Communities in Action program to support building close working partnerships with community organizations particularly with continuing efforts to address homelessness in the City.

Existing Social Service and Planning Capacity Identified:

- Langley Homeless Committee

Jim Woodward and Associates (2002). “Langley Study on Homelessness and Action Plan.” The Langley Stepping Stone Rehabilitative Society.

Although GVRD homeless count figures indicate that the homeless population in Langley is relatively low (10 sheltered homeless and 7 absolute homeless), anecdotal evidence suggests that the figure is considerably higher. Although not generalizable, the data emerging from seven interviews with formerly homeless individuals is interesting. Interview participants indicate that relationship breakdowns, mental health issues and poverty were the most frequent triggers contributing to homelessness. A minority of interview participants sought help prior to becoming homeless, but once homeless they indicated a number of barriers to receiving help: pride, lack of awareness of service available, drugs and alcohol and low self-esteem.

The homelessness study and action plan also overviews the demographic make-up of the City of Langley, which indicates that there is a relatively large seniors’ population and a relatively low level of ethno-cultural diversity. The study also indicates that 9.2% of households in the City of Langley are at-risk of becoming homeless and looks at types of households that comprise the at-risk population. In the City of Langley, 67% of at-risk households have a female primary maintainer, which is a contrast to the Township of Langley and the GVRD overall where 55% of primary maintainers are male.

Using the “three ways to home” framework adopted by the Regional Homeless Plan for Greater Vancouver, the study looks at Langley housing continuum, its income security measures and the nature of its support services.

The action plan outlines several recommendations for addressing homelessness in Langley:

- The development of 4-5 cold/wet weather barrier-free beds
- Service and housing providers assess the needs of the frail elderly, individuals with serious and persistent mental illness and others with disabilities to determine the gaps in assisted and supported housing.
- Langley Stepping Stone Rehabilitative Society to develop a proposal for supportive housing to accommodate mental health consumers
- City of Langley to create an affordable housing reserve fund
- City of Langley to continue to advise the provincial and federal governments of the ongoing need for affordable rental housing for families
- City of Langley to consider legalizing secondary suites
- Langley Youth Resource Centre to develop and integrated strategy to provide coordinated services for youth
- Develop a working group to research and document specific gaps in detox and residential addiction treatment services
- City of Langley to seek through the GVRD an update of the INALHM tabulation with 2001 census data when it’s available and conduct a subsequent survey of the homeless.

Existing Social Service and Planning Capacity Identified:

- Langley Homeless Committee

Morrison, Anne and Warren Sommer (2003). “Snapshot 2003: Community Profile.” Prepared for the Langley in Action Committee.

There are two main components to this report: a compilation and analysis of 47 statistical indicators of current conditions in the City and Township of Langley, and the results of a community survey that documents residents’ perceptions of their community.

A number of indicators projects have already been reviewed as part of this literature review. The emphasis here will be on reporting on those indicators that were not included in other studies. The snapshot report combines the City and Township in its reporting, whereas the other studies identified here treated the two municipalities separately, where possible.

- Per capita circulation of library materials is on par with surrounding cities
- Average percentage of students with special education needs
- Number of physicians per 1000 people is lower in Langley than Abbotsford and Maple Ridge but considerably higher than Pitt Meadows
- Life expectancies of babies born between 1997 and 2000 are similar to surrounding communities

- Fewer suicides per year than Abbotsford and Maple Ridge
- Number of pregnant teens aged 15 to 17 considerably lower than neighbouring cities
- City of Langley has more hectares of parkland and higher per capita spending on parks and recreation than surrounding communities
- City of Langley has fewer kilometers of municipal trails per 1000 people than neighbouring communities
- Substantially lower municipal per capita spending on culture
- Slightly lower voter turn out for municipal elections in 1999 and 2002
- Rate of contribution to charities is consistent with the GVRD average

The second component of the Langley in Action Snapshot was a community survey that sought to document the perceptions that Langley residents have of their community. A total of 745 surveys were completed, but only one quarter of those were completed by residents of the City of Langley. Key strengths of Langley were identified as follows: the social community, its green and rural character, and good environmental quality. The community's key challenges were identified as: transportation, transit and traffic.

Existing Social Service and Planning Capacity Identified:

- Langley in Action Steering Committee

Partners in Prevention (1999). “Strengthening Families: A Community Approach.” Proposal submitted to The National Crime Prevention Centre.

The proposal outlines steps that the project would take to achieve a safer, healthier community with an overall reduction in criminal activity through work with families. The project focuses on the Douglas Park and Nicomekl Inner City Areas, and highlights that the two communities have a greater percentage of single-parent families, a higher unemployment rate, a higher frequency of family moves and have lower household incomes than either the City of Langley or the GVRD. The targeted areas also have significantly higher Aboriginal and ESL populations, a higher number of residents on income assistance and lower scores in all academic areas.

Existing Social Service and Planning Capacity Identified:

- A number of agencies and contacts are listed, but no specific planning capacity is identified.

Township of Langley (2006). “Report to Mayor and Council: Social Agency Information-Sharing Meeting.” Presented October 16 by the Community Development Division.

The report to Mayor and Council recommends that Council support the concerns expressed by participating agencies in Aldergrove by conveying the concerns with appropriate Provincial Ministries. The report also provides Council with meeting notes of the social agency information sharing meeting that was held in Langley in April 2006 with social agencies who deal with children.

The key issues that we identified during the course of the meeting are as follows:

- Lack of consistent funding and facilities due to changes in Provincial funding formulas (from general operating dollars to a program specific approach)
- Langley not-for-profit community is a collaborative and supportive one

Existing Social Service and Planning Capacity Identified:

- Aldergrove Interagency Committee
- Langley Social Planning and Research Society

Municipal Social Plans in British Columbia

Since the mid-1990s municipalities in BC have been taking an increasing interest in exploring the ways in which they can contribute to resolving social issues in their communities. In order to ensure that residents continue to enjoy a high quality of life, a number of municipalities have developed plans to determine how it will respond to emerging issues. This literature review outlines the approaches used in developing social plans in BC. It also identifies the components and priority social issues in each municipality. Each municipal social plan in BC is highlighted here independently, but several common themes have emerged overall.

Of the six plans in BC, four limited their scope to a handful of key social issues (Surrey, Nanaimo, Kamloops and Prince George) and two took a broader lens and included between ten and fourteen issues (North Vancouver and Kelowna). Three social plans blended social issues with population groups, while others separated the two and discussed population groups in relation to the social issues being addressed. The following six social issues appeared in the majority of plans:

- Housing and shelter
- Community life
- Community health
- Safety and security
- Education
- Employment and income.

Other issues that were addressed in only one or two of the social plans include accessibility, substance abuse and diversity. In almost all cases the priority social issues emerged through the process of plan development. In the case of Surrey, the municipality determined the five issue areas from the outset and the engagement process centred specifically on the five issues.

Social plans in BC generally outline the City's goal in addressing a specific issue, which is supported by a number of objectives and specific activities or strategies. Several plans also provide a snapshot of what is happening to address specific issues in the community. Other plans outline specific partners with whom the municipality can work. In the case of the Surrey plan, specific gaps in the community are highlighted and the recommended actions to fill the gaps fall into three primary roles for the City: understanding the issues affecting the City; advocating to seek resolution of the issues; and supporting the implementation of solutions to social service issues.

In terms of approaches used in developing the social plans, social plans in BC have typically taken one of two approaches. In the cases of Surrey, Prince George and Nanaimo, an extensive public process with a number of different opportunities for both “expert” and broader public participation occurred. In the cases of Kelowna, North Vancouver and Kamloops the plan process was informed by information gathered through previous municipal public engagement opportunities such as surveys and open houses during OCP reviews.

During the plan development process, most municipalities in BC have used the expertise of some type of advisory body as a means of informing the process. The advisory bodies are commonly municipal social planning committees made up of residents and social service providers. Other approaches include a body of municipal staff who are representative of all municipal departments such as the Surrey example and an inter-sectoral steering body made up of organizations representing several sectors and each level of government as in the case of Nanaimo.

What follows is a brief summary of the approach and plan components for each of six social plans in the province.

City of Surrey – Plan for the Social Well Being of Surrey Residents (2006)

Approach

- The City of Surrey began its two phase social plan development process by identifying five main issue areas for inclusion in the social plan. Within these five areas, over 150 potential sub-issues were identified by way of literature review. Given the complexity of the subject matter, a stakeholder meeting was held to reduce the total number of elements to 31. A social responsibility matrix was developed to identify the degree to which each level of government had a mandated responsibility. The responsibilities of community agencies were included in the matrix. One public workshop for each of the five main issue areas was held so that members of the public could help to identify the type and scope of key gaps in service for each element. A youth workshop was held separately. The gap analysis, the social services inventory and the responsibility matrix were presented at the public meeting, which concluded Phase I of the project.
- Another set of community consultations was conducted to determine how the gaps could best be “filled”. The action plan was developed in two stages, with the first stage focusing on those elements and gaps for which the City has primary responsibility in order that the City could commence its work in these areas quickly. The second set of consultations focused on developing an action plan for which the has secondary, limited or no responsibility. In addition to the focus group and interview methodologies, workbook sheets were available online in a paper format for those wishing to provide input into the action plan.

Plan Components

- The action plan is divided into two sections: gaps for which the City of Surrey has primary responsibility and gaps for which the city has Secondary, Limited or no

responsibility. The five gaps, or “issue elements” in section one are: (1) child and youth friendly city; (2) programs and recreation for children and youth; (3) initiatives to encourage citizen engagement; (4) public education on clean-up issues and civic pride; and (5) ethno- and culturally appropriate service, opportunities and programming. Each of the five elements identifies a key gap, short- and long-term recommendations, a highlight of the interview and workshop process, an overview of current and existing work, opportunities that may help address the gap and potential collaborations.

- Section two addresses a number of elements within the following five major issues: (1) housing and homelessness; (2) substance abuse and addictions; (3) children and youth; (4) crime and public safety; and (5) community development and diversity. The recommended actions here fall into three primary roles that the City can plan in facilitating solutions: understanding the issues affecting the City; advocating to seek resolution of issues; and supporting the implementation of solutions to social service issues.

Abbotsford Cares: Agenda for Social Planning in the City of Abbotsford (2006)

Although not a social plan, a short review of this report is included here because it highlights a number of key priority areas based on research and community consultation. The City of Abbotsford hired a social planner in July 2005, the first community in the Fraser Valley Regional District to do so. The document provides an update to Council on the first six months of municipal social planning in Abbotsford. It outlines what social planning is, how it is practiced in other communities, what Abbotsford has already accomplished the key social development challenges and opportunities facing the City, key priorities for action as identified for the community and recommendations for Council.

The key social issues identified through consultation with the social development community are: affordable and accessible housing; children’s issues; community networks; community safety and crime prevention; diversity and inclusion; general community well-being; health issues; seniors’ issues; and youth issues. The four recommendations to address the social issues in the nine key areas are: (1) organize a social sustainability advisory committee; (2) develop a social development master plan; (3) develop an affordable and accessible housing strategy; and (4) respond to the opportunities for City involvement in social development.

Nanaimo Social Development Strategy (2004)

Approach

- The social development strategy was developed through a multi-sectoral partnership. Although the City of Nanaimo participated extensively, it will not be the body to lead the implementation. Rather, the preferred option was determined to be the establishment of a Social Development Group with an executive and a larger membership with the use of formal written agreements or memorandums of understanding between all involved partners.
- Established a 16- member steering committee to guide the social development strategy. Members came from: social service agencies; school districts; First Nations

groups; municipal, regional, provincial and federal governments; the business sector and the health authority.

- Community consultation was a key term of reference for the development of the strategy, and the consultant and steering committee designed a process that began with the development of a discussion paper organized by age group: children and families, youth and young adults, adults and seniors. The discussion paper facilitated the input of the identified groups and was used as the basis for two community symposiums. The steering committee also included those who are not typically involved in consultation processes: the aboriginal community, the homeless, lone parents and street-involved youth. The overall consultation reached more than five hundred individuals and involved:
 - A community service provider forum
 - Two community symposiums to introduce the discussion paper
 - Completion of the discussion paper
 - An aboriginal focus group
 - A youth forum
 - Two seniors focus groups
 - Two long/young parents focus groups
 - An alcohol and drug focus group
 - A senior management meeting
 - Two community forums to discuss the draft strategy report
 - Interviews with key informants
 - Five steering committee meetings.

Plan Components

- Five major themes emerged through the public consultation: asset-based development; early intervention and prevention; root causes; inclusiveness; and collaboration and partnership. Different from the main issue areas, these five major themes are intended to guide the implementing body in its work.
- The consultations produced over 20 possible issue areas which were then refined to the following six major areas of focus: education and learning; employment and income; community and health services; housing and shelter; safety and security; and community life. For each of the six areas, the strategy outlines existing assets and strengths, challenges, the proposed goal, suggested strategies for the implementing body and possible benchmarks.

Prince George Social Plan (2002)

Approach

- The Prince George Social Plan was conducted by the municipally-funded Prince George Community Planning Council in 2002, and is divided into two documents: the supportive data and the social plan. The social plan has been adopted by the municipality.
- Used several methodologies, some of which were neighbourhood based because of Prince George residents' high level of identification with neighbourhoods. Other methods include:
 - A social service agency survey

- Focus groups with UNBC planning students
- Focus groups with a selection of Grade 10-12 students
- Discussions with stakeholder groups
- Development of a social mapping system
- Neighbourhood safety audits
- Neighbourhood discussion consultations
- Open houses and public forums.

Plan Components

- A broad range of issues were identified through the public process, which were narrowed down to include a final seven: housing; health, welfare and education; unemployment and poverty; community safety; substance misuse; downtown revitalization; and recreation. Each of the identified issues has a number of objectives attached and a number of initiatives are outlined to support the objectives. Each of the issues is accompanied by a list of suggested partners. The social plan concludes with the articulation of a long range vision that recommends establishing a steering committee to ensure that the plan's recommendations are implemented.

City of North Vancouver Social Plan (1998)

Approach

- Established a citizen's committee to assist in the main phases of plan development (6 person Social Plan Working Group included a representative from the Advisory Committee on Disability Issues and the Social Planning Advisory Committee)
 - Provided feedback on drafts of the Background Document, developed the vision and value statements (the basis of the social plan) and participated in defining the consultation methods.
 - Reviewed and edited drafts of the social plan, and were involved in open houses.
 - Three presentations to Council throughout the process
- Community input occurred at two intervals: (1) initial drafting of the plan sections (key professionals and interested individuals); (2) review and comments on the first draft were obtained through presentations and discussions with target groups, focus groups and meetings with service agencies; (3) a two-week open house was hosted at City Hall to inform and solicit opinions.
 - Community involvement was "abbreviated" because of a short timeframe – consultation relied on key stakeholders and fewer in-depth consultations with specific target groups and the general public than initially planned.

Plan Components

- The plan has two components: (1) vision and values statements have guided the development and updates of the plan; (2) goals, objectives and actions for each issue area identify what the City will do to achieve the vision (prioritized by ongoing, short-term and long-term frames for implementation).
- The social plan blends population groups with issue areas (but does not outline actions for each population group within each issue area). The fourteen focus areas

are: community life; youth; seniors; families and children; people with disabilities; housing; community social services; safety and security; transportation; cultural diversity; arts, culture and heritage; leisure services; emergency preparedness; and linkages. Each of the focus areas contains a goal, supporting objectives and the actions that the City will take to meet each objective.

- The City of North Vancouver responds to social issues in three ways: (1) social planning staff provides professional advice to Council in the development of municipal programs and assists the community in developing responses to social issues; (2) the City provides funding in support of community initiatives; and (3) the City provides land and facilities for community services.

City of Kelowna Social Plan (1996)

Approach

- Although the social plan document itself does not identify the approach that the City took in developing the plan, the approach was described by community planning staff to SPARC BC. A draft social plan was developed by community planning staff using existing municipal policies and research documents (a report on homelessness and a 1993 social needs assessment conducted by telephone survey are two examples), which had included community consultation. The draft social plan was then reviewed at a public workshop attended by 94 participants. There were three objectives for the workshop: (1) to suggest changes to the draft social plan; (2) to identify specific actions for the strategies; and (3) to recommend strategies for future public input into the draft social plan. The feedback received from the workshop was taken into consideration by the Social Planning Board for incorporation into the final plan.

Plan Components

- The social plan identifies and outlines the needs of a number of specific population groups: children, families, men and women, people with special needs, seniors, single adults, transient population and youth.
- At the time the social plan was written, the City of Kelowna had identified its role in addressing social issues as a preventative one and its social plan was developed through this lens.
- A broad range of social issues are addressed through the plan: accessibility; arts and culture; childcare; community development; crime prevention; education; employment; health; housing; and human rights. Each of the issues includes a section on community initiatives currently in place to address the issue, the City's goal in addressing the issue, objectives, and short, long-term and ongoing strategies.

City of Kamloops Social Plan (1996)²¹

Approach

- Considerable background research and engagement was conducted as a means of determining what work on social issues had already been completed, which was seen as an important first step as the social plan was developed at a time when the City of

²¹ The City of Kamloops is currently developing a new social plan, which involves a fairly extensive public process. The plan will focus of five key issue areas: housing and homelessness; health and addictions; child and youth issues; crime and public safety; and community development.

Kamloops was expanding its social planning function. A social planning workshop was held with service providers and community organizations to develop the social action strategy in 1995, a precursor to the social plan. Background research to identify thirteen topic areas was conducted shortly thereafter, followed by a community social providers workshop. Issues were identified and grouped into the following seven key topic areas in order of priority: education, health and social service reform, youth issues, employment, housing, quality of life, and people. The information emerging from the workshop was further refined during an OCP conference, which was open to members of the public.

Plan Components

- The social plan is comprised of two components: section one outlines the general principles, goals, specific objectives and actions to direct the City's social planning function; section two details the background information that informs section one.
- Seven social issues are identified and addressed in the plan: education, children and youth, employment, health, housing, quality of life and people. Each issue area has a goal with a number of objectives and actions outlined to meet the goal. Each of the actions are given either a high or medium priority.

Appendix B: Key Informant Interview Participants

Key informant interviews took place with representatives from the following organizations:

Big Brothers and Sisters

Langley Association for Community Living

Langley Child Development Centre

Health Evaluation Assessment and Liaison Team

Langley Meals on Wheels

Langley Senior Citizens' Housing Society

Langley Seniors Resource Society

Langley Youth and Family Services

Salvation Army (Langley South)

City of Langley Recreation, Culture & Community Services

Appendix C: Prioritization Workshop Attendees

List of Attendees
 City of Langley Social Plan
 Issues and Priorities Workshop
 June 21st, 2007 – 9:00 am to 2:00 pm
 Langley City Hall

Name	Organization
Betty Anne Batt	Langley Association for Community Living
Sharon Birney	Langley Seniors Centre Society
Debbie Boles	Mennonite Central Committee Supportive Care Services
Jeanette Dagenais	Langley Lions Senior Citizens Housing Society
Fraser Holland	Stepping Stone Community Services Society
Pauline Huth	Langley Meals on Wheels
Gary Johnson	Salvation Army (Langley South)
Dorothy McKim	Ishtar Transition Housing Society
Shannon Peters	Langley Meals on Wheels
Barb Scott	Big Brothers and Sisters
Val VandenBroek	Langley City Community Policing Coordinator
Joy Wilson	Langley Child Development Centre
Gerrie Wise	Blockwatch/Community Policing
Karen Walden	Ministry of Employment and Income Assistance (Langley Office)
Pat Weibelzahl	You've Gotta Have Friends
Roy Beddow	City of Langley

Appendix D: Outcomes of Prioritization Workshop

City of Langley Social Plan
Issues and Priorities Workshop
June 21st, 2007 – 9:00 am to 2:00 pm
Langley City Hall

Priority Social Service Elements Emerging from the Workshop

The following is a list of the top ten priority social service elements to be addressed in the City of Langley's Social Plan. In determining the priority elements, a number of social service elements were combined during the workshop process. The overarching element is listed first, with the combined elements falling in place beneath. The priority social service elements are listed in no particular order.

- 1. Green spaces, including:**
 - community gardens
 - maintenance of public space
 - ensuring designated community spaces in new development
 - space for families to gather with accessible play spaces for children
 - spaces for pets
 - community amenities provided through developers

- 2. Homelessness – youths, women, men, seniors and people suffering from mental health issues, including:**
 - cold/wet weather barrier free beds

- 3. Detox and residential treatment, including:**
 - addictions services for seniors
 - drug use and treatment centres

- 4. Affordable housing for all populations, including:**
 - mixed housing types to encourage integrated housing
 - market rental housing and affordable home ownership
 - supports to address security of tenure and reducing transience

- 5. Public education of social service issues, including:**
 - ongoing support for vulnerable populations to access info and services
 - public awareness of existing programs and services

- 6. Education and awareness of all elements of safety, including:**
 - CPTED
 - safety and prevention of family abuse
 - senior safety in the streets
 - senior abuse

- 7. Social agency/not-for-profit capacity with core funding and adequate resourcing**

8. Second stage housing, including:

- supports for women in transition to address alcohol and drug addictions

9. Connect isolated populations through volunteer services centre

10. Community-based health services for various populations, including:

- mental health supports
- multilingual access to health services
- access to health services for the working poor
- access to supports for people with brain injuries
- access to pre-natal and post-natal health services
- in-school meal services in inner-city schools
- coordination and integration of services
- and coordinated youth services

The following social service elements were discussed during the workshop. While they will be included in the report, they have not been prioritized.

- Opportunities for job/skill training for people with barriers – including: supports for people with low literacy skills; engaging businesses for job and skills training programs
- Prevention, education and early intervention in health and drug abuse issues – including prevention of addiction
- Fire and emergency social services
- Youth – fear of crime
- Support services for families – including support for lone parents
- Services for men
- Outreach and support for populations with barriers and hard to reach populations – including: marginalized new immigrants; mentally ill
- Gathering places for Aboriginal community
- Inclusion of people with disabilities*
- Youth programs and activities
- Transportation options – including: pedestrian and cycling facilities; scooter policy; coordination of Handidart*
- Continue to support civic pride
- Traffic
- Food security (emergency food)
- Outreach to the homeless
- Healthy eating and budgeting
- Child and youth friendliness
- Youth programs and activities – including: programming for young teens/peer programming; low-cost activities for youth; multi-service youth centre
- Assisted living and supportive housing (government supported)
- Youth shelter and showers – including youth wellness centre
- Youth drug use

* Issues related to accessibility and inclusion for people with disabilities will be addressed in a concurrent City of Langley study.

The Potential Role of the City in Addressing Social Priorities

Workshop participants were asked to identify possible ways the City might help to address the ten priority social service elements in Langley. The following ideas were captured:

- 1. Green spaces (including community gardens; maintenance of public space; ensuring designated community spaces in new development; space for families to gather with accessible play spaces for children; spaces for pets; community amenities provided through developers)**
 - Need for community and neighbourhood centre or spaces to gather that are safe and accessible to all. The City could require developers to assist in this process when proposing new development.
 - The City could ask each neighbourhood what they see as a solution to this issue
 - City to ensure that green spaces are protected and planned for
 - Enact City policies to ensure green space and green environmental initiatives in new developments
 - Parks with social gathering areas (e.g. picnic tables, playgrounds, open spaces), not specific places for each event
 - Recycling program bins in parks
 - Enforced curfews for school areas and playgrounds (e.g. Chilliwack bylaw)

- 2. Homelessness – youths, women, men, seniors and people suffering from mental health issues (including cold/wet weather barrier free beds)**
 - Homelessness is still an issue in communities with a shelter – we need to look at how to reach those not willing to entertain the resource for whatever reason (not willing/able to separate from life on the street – uncomfortable working with faith-based organizations)
 - Shelter coming and City is supportive
 - There needs to be something that can work with mental health issues after addictions have been worked on – no discussion regarding co-occurring or concurrent disorder work/resources
 - Shelter
 - Programs offered for rehabilitation and job skills
 - Mental health
 - More affordable housing structure towards behaviours, etc
 - Supportive type housing with stronger supports to keep those hard to house in place by government bodies
 - Drop-in centre with volunteers to help find opportunities

3. Detox and residential treatment (including addictions services for seniors; drug use and treatment centres)

- Good models in Surrey (Phoenix Centre)
- Need City land – zoning pressure
- Forgive property taxes to a charity for this purpose
- Support tax free mortgage
- Outpatient and inpatient programs – follow-up treatment
- Be an active partner in initiating and planning for this
- Provide land for the building
- Residential, professionally staffed facility for detox

4. Affordable housing for all populations (including mixed housing types to encourage integrated housing; market rental housing and affordable home ownership; supports to address security of tenure and reducing transience)

- More housing provided for lower incomes outside of the family (seniors and people with disabilities)
- Huge need for affordable housing – would like to see creative ways in which the City can participate (e.g. some sort of “amnesty” for existing secondary suites; partnering with NGOs like Habitat for Humanity)
- Tax breaks for those areas designated as affordable/accessible housing in new developments
- Investigate partnerships – Habitat for Humanity (provide land for buildings); cooperative housing; not-for-profit associations
- Try not to segregate – causes social stigma
- City to adopt a policy for developers to include social sustainability in their plans – and to put some teeth in implementing the policy
- Institute “labour in lieu” of property taxes process – forgive taxes for low income groups until property sale
- New mix of housing – no ghettos
- City planning can be the influence with developers
- Support cooperative housing with different property tax structure
- Look at bylaws
- Do not ghettoize housing and communities
- Work with other ministries to creatively problem solve this issue
- By supplying solutions to offer affordable housing, may assist with homelessness

5. Public education of social service issues (including ongoing support for vulnerable populations to access info and services; public awareness of existing programs and services)

- People in need of service need to be made aware of these services that are already available to them. Access to this information should be widely

distributed, keeping in mind that those who need services do not always look like they are in need.

- Langley citizens need to be made aware of the social needs in their community – helps if they hear people’s individual stories (reduces fear of marginalized people and gain their support for provision of services)
 - Mandatory classes in schools (age appropriate)
 - Public awareness can be very effective when started early – elementary schools, high schools and supplemented by community awareness
- 6. Education and awareness of all elements of safety (including CPTED, safety and prevention of family abuse; senior safety in the streets; senior abuse)**
- City has a huge role to play in providing and distributing supportive public awareness communications
 - Educate public about all issues discussed – preventative
 - Fund, promote and utilize existing programs under police, fire and emergency coordination
- 7. Social agency/non profit capacity with core funding and adequate resourcing**
- Always the barrier to progress
 - City could influence funders
 - City to advocate for stable, sustainable funding for social agency and not-for-profits, and whenever possible provide space, tax breaks, etc.
 - Create staff position for referral, inventorying of services and coordinating funding requests
- 8. Second stage housing (including supports for women in transition to address alcohol and drug addictions)**
- Second stage housing with various levels of staffing – semi-independent to 24/7 staffing to handle demands of various populations
 - Counsellor training and in-home support services
 - Will reinforce that the community cares and supports those at risk
 - Important that once this is in place – carries on after moving on with support and a connections to affordable housing
 - Desperate need; City needs influence
 - Forgive property tax to charity for this purpose
 - Support interest free mortgage
- 9. Connect isolated populations through volunteer services centre**
- Fund a volunteer bureau
 - Need a cost-effective work force

- City could support showers
- Will encourage people to learn employable skills
- Help to coordinate all services and mobilize people in this community
- Builds community pride
- Volunteer opportunity listings on a board or in newspapers (free)
- Central volunteer bureau with associated website (needs to be continually updated)
- Can this be initiated, funded and managed by the City: physical space, person designated, online database

10. Community-based health services for various populations (including mental health supports; access to health services for multilingual populations and the working poor; access to pre-natal and post-natal health services; in-school meal services in inner-city schools; coordination and integration of services; coordinated youth services)

- Neighbourhood based makes them the most accessible
- City to work in collaboration with health serving organizations – to advocate for and whenever possible make space available for
- City must not shut out the community agencies
- City must nurture focus groups to support action and problem solving
- There may be space and opportunity to address many aspects of this category by supporting and enhancing existing agencies
- Influence government
- Support those in the community doing such work
- Identify at-risk populations
- Get agencies and groups together to problem solve

Appendix E: Inventory of Social Services

Langley Social Service Inventory - Priority Social Service Elements

AFFORDABLE HOUSING

Service	Description	Population	Contact Information
Canadian Cohousing Network (CCN)	Promotes the creation of sustainable communities through public education and by bringing people together to form cohousing communities. These communities are developed by residents who can afford home ownership, who want to be part of an interactive neighbourhood, and who are willing to participate in community governance through a consensus decision-making process. Nonprofit society.	Residents who can afford home ownership	Phone: 604-878-3311 24-20543 96th Avenue Langley V1M 3W3
Greater Vancouver Housing Corporation	Develops and manages rental accommodation throughout the lower mainland for low- and moderate-income families, seniors, and people with physical disabilities. Subsidy program.	Low-income families, seniors and people with physical disabilities	Phone: 604-432-6300 4330 Kingsway Burnaby V5H 4G8
Habitat Housing Society	Sister society of OPTIONS, established in response to the growing need for affordable housing in the region. Participates in developing and building affordable housing complexes in Langley, North Delta, Surrey, and White Rock. Accepts applications from low-income families and adults with mental health disabilities. Self-referral. Hours are 9 am to 2 pm Monday to Wednesday.	Families and adults with mental health disabilities	Phone: 604-590-7368 100-6846 King George Hwy Surrey V3W 4Z9
Langley Lions Senior Citizens Housing Society		Seniors	Phone: 604-530-7171 20355 54 Ave Burnaby
Langley Seniors Outreach Programs	Provides services to frail elders to enhance independence and quality of life. Programs include information and referral, a telephone reassurance line, housing counselling, transportation and shopping assistance, shop-by-phone, social tea, and peer counselling support. Special attention is paid to the screening and training of volunteers, because of the personal nature of the services. Serves Langley.	Seniors	Phone: 604-530-3020 Peer Support (Janice): 604-530-3020 (ext. 306) 20605 51B Avenue Langley V3A 9H1
Seniors Housing Information Program	Offers housing services to lower mainland seniors, including housing information counselling, help with filling in applications for housing, and outreach to homeless seniors. Also publishes the BC-wide 'Seniors Housing Directory', which is available to community service agencies at cost, and accessible through the website.	Seniors	Phone: 604-520-6621 Royal Square Mall 209-800 McBride Blvd. New West V3L 2B8

Tenant Resource and Advisory Society (TRAC)	Advances the rights of tenants, and helps to secure safe, affordable housing for all British Columbians. Provides legal education, legal information, and publications and educational materials about residential tenancy law. Offers help to tenants who want to organize tenants' groups in their building or neighbourhood. Also provides speakers on tenants' rights. Operates the Tenant Hotline, which provides information on tenants' rights in the areas of evictions, repairs, security deposits, rent increases, and arbitration hearings; hotline hours are 9 am to 5 pm Monday to Thursday.	All	Phone: 604-255-3099 Tenant Hotline: 604-255-0546
YWCA Fraser Gardens	Provides safe, affordable housing for low-income single mothers. In-house staff offer information and referral, resources, and support. Women participating in YWCA programs have priority interviews.	Low-income single mothers	Phone: 604-514-1255 20750 Fraser Highway Langley V3A 4G6
West Fraser Housing Society	Operates 33 units of affordable housing: 16 for people with low to moderate income, and 17 for adults recovering from a mental illness. Office hours are 9 am to 4:30 pm Monday to Friday.	All/Mental health	Phone: 604-530-0062 20101 Michaud CrescentLangley V3A 8L9
SECOND STAGE HOUSING			
Service	Description	Population	Contact Information
No existing capacity in this area.			
DETOX AND RESIDENTIAL TREATMENT			
Service	Description	Population	Contact Information
Wagner Hills Farm Society	Provides healing from harmful dependencies in a Christian community on a farm setting. Trains men for discipleship through community living, work, worship, recreation, and character building. Core program asks for a 12-month commitment, beyond which men stay for various lengths of time. Licensed for 50 men in residence. Self-referral is accepted; intake hours are 8 am to 4:30 pm Monday to Friday. Does not accept men on methadone maintenance or using nicotine.	Men with addictions	Phone: 604-856-9432 8061 264th Street Langley V1M 3M3
HOMELESSNESS			
Service	Description	Population	Contact Information
Langley Food Bank and Free Store	Distributes food, clothing, and other basic necessities to residents of Langley. A cafeteria serving hot lunches is open during distribution hours. Registration by appointment; first time visitors are required to bring picture ID and proof of residence. Also offers services to the homeless, including a hot meal 7:30 pm to 9 pm Fridays, food hampers, clothing, and showers. Distribution hours are 10 am to 2 pm Monday to Wednesday, and Fridays; office hours are 8:30 am to 4:30 pm Monday to Friday.	All	Phone: 604-533-0671 5768 203rd Street Langley V3A 1W3

Salvation Army, Langley South	International Christian charitable organization devoted to helping people in need, including families in crisis, single parents, children, seniors, and those experiencing hunger, homelessness, addiction, and abuse. Provides for basic human needs, offers personal counselling, and undertakes the spiritual and moral regeneration and physical rehabilitation of people in need. Programs are grouped under the following headings: addiction services, community/family services centres, correctional services, free food service, free or low-cost goods, hospice services, housing, legal and court services, missing person tracing service, and seniors services. Office hours are 8:30 am to 4 pm Monday to Friday.	All	Phone: 604-514-7375 108-20218 Fraser Hwy Langley V3A 4E6
----------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----	----------------------------------------------------------------

COMMUNITY-BASED HEALTH SERVICES

Service	Description	Population	Contact Information
Centre for Child Development	Provides comprehensive therapeutic services for children and youth with special needs, and provides support to their families. Addresses neurological, orthopedic, developmental, and learning difficulties including cerebral palsy, spina bifida, muscular dystrophy, Down syndrome, autism, attention deficit hyperactivity disorder, brain injury and infections, and seizure disorders. Serves Delta, Langley, Surrey, and White Rock.	Youths	Phone: 604-533-3088 Langley Satellite Office 103-5844 Glover RoadLangley V3A 4H9
Community Brain Injury Program for Children and Youth in BC	Funds and coordinates rehabilitation and support services for children and youth up to age 19 who have an acquired brain injury, and do not receive third party funding. Community-based, short-term, intensive rehabilitation services may include case management, physiotherapy, occupational therapy, speech/language therapy, and neuropsychological screening. Province-wide program.	Children and youths	Phone: 604-451-5511 2805 Kingsway Vancouver V5R 5H9
Early Psychosis Intervention (EPI) Program - Fraser South	Provides assessment for community based treatment and case management, with the goal of early identification and treatment of psychotic conditions. The program bridges youth and adult mental health services, since the first episode often occurs in young people between the ages of 13 and 30. The team also provides education and is actively involved in research studies. Serves Delta, Langley, Surrey, and White Rock. A collaborative initiative with MCFD Child and Youth Mental Health.	Youths and adults	Phone: 604-538-4278 15521 Russell Avenue White Rock V4B 2R4
Fraser Valley Pregnancy Centre	Crisis pregnancy centre	Women	Phone: 604-856-9151 204-3100 272nd Street Langley Tnshp V4W2T9
Langley Clinic	Operated by Options for Sexual Health. Supports reproductive choice and healthy sexuality. Offers research-based information on all aspects of sexual and reproductive health through clinical services. Clinic hours are 6 pm to 9:30 pm Thursdays.	All	Phone: 604-530-8155 Langley Family Services Association Building 5339 207th Street Langley V3A 2E6

Langley Home Health	Continuing Care provides a variety of in-home health care support services, residential care services, and special support services. Home Nursing Care and Long Term Care provide nurse and social worker case management services to eligible adults with ongoing health challenges who require assistance to remain independent. Rehabilitation Services provides occupational and physiotherapists for in-home consultations and interventions. Health Services for Community Living provides consultation to caregivers of adults with developmental disabilities. Nursing Support Services instruct and monitor caregivers who perform clinical procedures in home, daycare, and school settings for children with special needs.	All	Phone: 604-532-6500 101-20651 56th Avenue Langley V3A 3Y9
Langley Mental Health Centre	Provides Community Mental Health Services for adults. Multidisciplinary teams consisting of nurses, psychologists, psychiatrists, general practitioners, and social workers offer assessment and screening, treatment and counselling, supportive case management, pharmacotherapy, consultative services, assertive case management services, and referrals. The Community Residential Program offers a variety of supported housing options. Rehabilitation Services can also be accessed through mental health centres. Office hours are 8:30 am to 4:30 pm Mondays, Tuesdays, and Fridays; and 8:30 am to 7:30 pm Wednesdays and Thursdays.	Adults	Phone: 604-514-7940 305-20300 Fraser Highway Langley V3A 4E6
Langley Public Health Unit	Audiology Services; Community Care Facilities Licensing; Dental Health; Baby and Me; Nutrition Services; Public Health Nursing; Speech/Language Pathology Program; Langley Youth Wellness Centre; Public Health Protection and Safety Program.	All	Phone: 604-539-2900 20389 Fraser HighwayLangley V3A 7N2
Stepping Stone Community Services Society	Psychosocial rehabilitative program helps adults recovering from a mental illness realize social, vocational, and housing opportunities in the community. Provides a friendly environment where individuals are encouraged to become more self-reliant. Affordable and nutritious meals served daily. Also offers an outreach service, supported work, volunteer opportunities, and community living support. Referrals through the Langley Mental Health Centre.	Mental health	Phone: 604-530-5033 20101 Michaud Crescent Langley V3A 8L9
Langley Association for Community Living	Serves children with special needs and adults with developmental disabilities. Offers community life skills programs, supported work and work experience programs, day programs, a respite care program for children, and a residential program for adults. Serves Langley. Office hours are 8 am to 4 pm Monday to Friday.	Disabilities	Phone: 604-534-8611 23535 44th Avenue Langley V2Z 2V2

PUBLIC EDUCATION OF SOCIAL SERVICE ISSUES

Service	Description	Population	Contact Information
Langley Seniors Outreach Programs	Provides services to frail elders to enhance independence and quality of life. Programs include information and referral, a telephone reassurance line, housing counselling, transportation and shopping assistance, shop-by-phone, social tea, and peer counselling support. Special attention is paid to the screening and training of volunteers, because of the personal nature of the services.	Seniors	Phone: 604-530-3020 (ext.302) 20605 51B Avenue Langley V3A 9H1
VictimLINK	Provides 24-hour, toll-free, multilingual assistance seven days a week to people throughout BC and the Yukon who have been victims of family and sexual violence, and all other crimes. Victim service workers, available 24 hours a day, seven days a week, provide emotional and crisis support; information and referral regarding victim services, transition houses, counselling resources, and community services; and information about the justice system, relevant federal and provincial legislation and programs, crime prevention, safety planning, protection orders registry, and other resources as needed.	All	Phone: 1-800-563-0808

EDUCATION AND AWARENESS OF ALL ELEMENTS OF SAFETY

Service	Description	Population	Contact Information
Building Better Relationships (Ishtar Transition Housing Society)	Free 16-week group program for men who have problems of abuse in their relationships and are interested in creating healthy, respectful relationships with their partners. Assessment interview is required.	Men	Phone: 604-534-1011 5507 208th Street Langley V3A 2K4
Burden Bearers of Canada - Coastal Counselling Services	Registered clinical counsellors provide individual, couple, and family counselling. All counsellors can provide services from a Christian perspective. Sliding scale fee. Also provides EAP counselling. Serves Coquitlam, Delta, Langley, New Westminster, Richmond, Surrey, and Vancouver. Nonprofit society.	All	Phone: 604-584-4112 9815 140th Street Surrey V3T 4M4
Community-Based Victim Services Program (Ishtar Transition Housing Society)	Provides victim services to victims (all ages and genders) of relationship violence, sexual assault, child abuse (sexual or physical), criminal harassment, elder abuse, and other forms of family violence. Services include emotional support, advocacy, accompaniment to police, court orientation and accompaniment, form completion assistance, and referrals to other resources. Office hours are 8:30 am to 4 pm Monday to Friday; evening appointments are available on request.	All	Phone: 604-534-0708 5507 208th Street Langley V3A 2K4
Langley Coalition Against Abuse of Seniors	Multi-agency committee working to prevent elder abuse. Advocates and educates on behalf of seniors, addressing emotional, physical, and financial abuse. Serves Aldergrove, Cloverdale, Fort Langley, and Langley.	Seniors	Phone: 604-530-3020 20605 51B Avenue Langley V3A 7T3

Langley Youth and Family Services	Provides counselling and intervention for children and youth up to age 17 to prevent anti-social behaviour and conflict with the law. Family involvement is required. Referrals from schools, social service agencies, and other community members for children up to and including 13 years of age, and referrals from RCMP for children and youth up to 17 years of age. No fee for service. Program jointly operated by Langley City and Langley Township; serves residents of both communities. Hours are from 8:30 am to 12 noon and 1:30 pm to 4:30 pm Monday to Friday.	Children and youths	Phone: 604-514-2900 5569 204th Street Langley V3A 1Z4
Langley Meals on Wheels	Volunteers deliver low-cost meals between 11:30 am and 12:30 pm Mondays, Wednesdays, and Fridays, excluding statutory holidays. Serves the elderly, handicapped, chronically ill, and convalescents who are unable to prepare adequate meals in their own homes.	Seniors	Phone: 604-533-1679
Putting Pedestrians First	Through lobbying and education, this advocacy group works to improve the safety, comfort, and efficiency of walking as a mode of transportation. Goals include increased law enforcement against driver violations with higher penalties, improving pedestrian infrastructure with raised crosswalks, corner bulges, and speed humps to make it easier for pedestrians to cross streets safely. Hours are 12 noon to 4 pm Monday to Friday. Focus is the Greater Vancouver area.	All	Phone: 604-736-9542

SOCIAL AGENCY CAPACITY

Service	Description	Population	Contact Information
South Fraser Community Services Society	Also offers low-cost rental space to not-for-profit community organizations; meeting rooms and individual or shared office space are available on a daily, monthly, or long-term basis. Services available in Delta, Langley, Surrey and White Rock.	All	Phone: 604-589-8678 10667 135A Street Surrey V3T 5B7

CONNECT ISOLATED POPULATIONS

Service	Description	Population	Contact Information
No existing capacity in this area.			

PUBLIC GREEN SPACES

Service	Description	Population	Contact Information
City of Langley	Maintenance and development of parks and other green spaces.	All	Langley City Hall Phone: (604) 514-2800

Appendix F: Gaps and Actions Workshop Attendees

List of Attendees
 City of Langley Social Plan
 Gaps and Actions Workshop
 October 2nd, 2007 – 7:00 pm to 10:00 pm
 Rose Gellert Hall
 Langley Community Music School

Name	Organization
Ruby Allen	Regional Disabled Persons Association
Dan Collins	Langley Association for Community Living
Fraser Holland	Stepping Stone Community Services Society
Pauline Huth	Langley Meals on Wheels
Gary Johnson	Salvation Army (Langley South)
Wendy Johnson	HD Stafford Secondary School
Maureen Joyce	Stepping Stone Community Services Society
Rudy Storteboom	Citizen
Marika van Dommelen	Rick Hansen Foundation
Roy Beddow	City of Langley

Appendix G: Outcomes of Gaps and Actions Workshop

City of Langley Social Plan
Gaps and Actions Workshop
October 2nd, 2007 – 7:00 pm to 10:00 pm
Rose Gellert Hall
Langley Community Music School

Two main tasks for the evening were outlined at the beginning of the workshop: (1) getting a sense of the scope of the gaps in each of ten priority areas; (2) understanding how the City can constructively engage with priority social issues.

Green Space

This is the only priority issue for which the City has primary responsibility.

Discussion of Gaps

- Is there a magic formula for developers – how much green space do I have to build. Explanation of DCCs. Subdivision of land also requires 5% of land to be set aside or cash in lieu.
- Open space within the development itself – there are requirements in terms of open space and indoor community space. This is in place already depending on the project.
- What kind of changes or revised approaches need to be taken in existing parks? Accessibility study – very few of them are accessible and this needs to be addressed.
- There are lots of parks – they are geared towards one user (they are all for children, singularly focused). Creating spaces that invite multiple generations and multiple users.
- Safety is the other issue – how can they be safe (particularly around washrooms in parks). Lots of activity. Lighting is crucial.
- Community gathering place – no real place other than Douglas Park (received spirit square grant for this area). We need an outdoor townhall to develop community civic sense.
- Community gardens – there is only one. Stepping Stone had been approached to build community garden in City Park but one of the neighbours complained.
- The one here is oppressive because of the huge chain link fence – this is perhaps not necessary. There is space around for community gardens.
- Maintenance of public space: few years ago there was a lack of garbage cans but this has improved. Some areas there could be more garbage cans. There are special containers for dog doo.
- Spaces for pets – there is an off-leash park that is well used and well set up. We used to walk there nightly and picking up garbage.

Affordable Housing, Homelessness and Second Stage Housing

These three priority areas were combined for the purposes of discussion. The gaps were discussed for each of the three issues in turn and then the discussion on roles for City addressed the three issue areas together.

Homelessness – Discussion of Gaps

- We see the population increasing with new faces who are becoming homeless (both come from aways and locals becoming homeless).
- City is very supportive
- Plans for the Gateway of Hope have just been finalized and include: zoning on Langley bypass – 31000 square feet, 30 emergency beds (8 for women), 25 transitional supportive independent living beds (13 for women), 104 seat dining room and community family services referral process for alcohol and drug addiction, place for people to come and access services, financial support from province, City is supportive and we're waiting on township
- Won't open until spring 2009 and we have to go through two more winters and we don't have any extreme wet weather beds
- Wet weather programs depend mainly on volunteers, there is limited staff support – only open 9 nights last year, which was lowest in Lower Mainland.
- Another gap – no input from youth or about youth. We used to have some presence of youth reps and this is a gap. There is a lot we don't know about their needs. This is an area that is uncharted. We don't have a youth advocate who is banging on doors. More work on this area.
- Mental health – Langley report (specialized housing for those who are hard to house and this is still an issue). People I'm talking about are extremely hard to house – need low barrier facilities for them.
- Shelter will be there but there will still be people who don't access it.
- Cold wet weather – number of beds (official count identified 52 and RCMP know there is about 95 identified but we know the number is larger – 125 to 175 in the Langleys)
 - They've done away with cold wet weather but we still have extreme wet weather program
 - We use church facility – Southgate was at capacity last year but being moved this year so we won't be at capacity this year
 - BC Housing is open to opening more nights if the need is there
 - Issue for us is not the money – it's there, but our challenge is training volunteers and they're also being subject to burnout
 - Sometimes it's not worth it to open when there are only one or two people because you have to operationalize the whole thing – we need money to pay people
- Outreach to homeless – only one person doing grassroots outreach and the majority of it is on the streets. One of the churches had a person for a while because it's good to have someone with another approach and another personality. BC Housing funds his position as a pilot project. We need to have a female out on the street. There is someone on Thursday nights that does outreach to youth.
- How many more? You could have one in City and one in Township. Aldergrove is becoming a community with its own issues.
- Other factor – there needs to be enough personnel to do advocacy and we'll be looking at hiring two outreach workers when our facility is up and running

- Youth shelter and showers – new facility won't have youth but we do have a shower.
- Youth safe house – talk over the years and this is something we should be looking at in Langley. We could justify it in Langley. Could start with a fourplex (two beds in Chilliwack and it's 50% occupied).
- We're giving hampers to people who are couch surfing.

Affordable Housing – Discussion of Gaps

- Over 50% of people living in Langley are at risk of homelessness
- I'd like to get through to council that affordable housing isn't rental housing. When land is going to be worth more than buildings, they're going to go too.
- When a family is bringing in \$75 000 a year and have a hard time buying a house, there is a problem
- When we open new building we know that there will be working poor staying in it. Sustainable affordable housing is big.
- We need more rent supplements – they're \$100 a month and difficult to qualify for. It's practically impossible.
- Most affordable housing I can find for people is a boarding house and they're going for \$450 a month.
- Langley hotel now require people to pay for their night's stay with a credit card and mental health consumers had been staying there, so that option is gone.
- There needs to be a major shift in the thinking and commitments in all three levels of government to seriously address affordable sustainable housing. They have to allow free enterprise companies to build housing – there needs to be a return on the dollar and the word profit becomes a dirty word. You need to include free enterprise to address it.
- Seek to have housing – issue is not affordable housing, it's income security that is fundamentally the issue that makes them rely on state funded supports. Poverty needs to be addressed.
- Minimum wage increase \$10 an hour immediately.

Second Stage Housing – Discussion of Gaps

- One of things that existing providers are doing – agreement that women coming out have priority housing. That would become their home. That's all that we have.
- Different interpretations – Salvation Army is doing transitional housing around a program model where individual comes in and they have to be working through personal development plan. They can stay 6 months to 2 years if they stay with their plan. The key to this is the program side of it so that we don't get stuck in landlord/tenancy act (supportive independent living transitional housing).
- Newer model – housing first. My experience is with people with severe disabilities, if you can get them in a home and offer them supports it will work out for them but the housing has to be there to make it work.
- New facility won't meet the need – it's a growing community.

Municipal Engagement with Homelessness, Affordable Housing and Second Stage Housing

- City is represented on Homelessness SC

- Inventories of properties – Tourist Inn (Coleman could buy this like they did in Vancouver and run low cost housing). Initiative came from province, but City could do inventories to initiate this process.
- City hire a social planner – trained person would be a great asset to the City. Maple Ridge has been proactive (Sue Wheeler) – who has a pulse on community. They could coordinate and help educate Council.
- Create a mandate for City to engage with these issues – a policy statement: assigning resources necessary to engage with social issues...
- I've appreciated that this has elevated the awareness of homelessness – “we have mechanisms in place to allow City to seek to understand what social issues are rather than be moved to respond to flashpoints”. It's reactionary. We need them to understand the issues. Council formed a social issues committee and the only members are Councillors rather than consulting with community. For example, the folks I deal with don't have the significance right now that homelessness does and as long as homelessness is a flashpoint issue, they needs of others are not going to be met.
- Let's recommend that we consider retaining a social planner (we keep talking around it). As a resident I want my Council and service providers here to be proactive and anticipating what the issues are going to be. We don't have time to wait. All sorts of people are going to be offloaded from Vancouver here with Olympics. It needs to happen now. Members of the public need to be involved in this because we see things from a slightly different point of view.
- A social planner becomes another bureaucrat within the system. We tried to start a social planning council and we need to ask how we give maximum voice to citizens rather than give someone a voice within the machinery.
- Social planner will need input from all the various groups in the City. There needs to be more than something in the paper.
- Homeless wasn't a problem five years ago and now it's critical – and I'm cynical that other issues won't be addressed until they're in your face
- Homeless shelter doesn't address issue of homelessness. Core issue is still present.
- How do we make it a poignant enough issue to get a response?
- There is going to be a loss of housing in next few years with older apartment buildings being knocked down. “Develop strategies to mitigate and address the loss of low-end market housing over time.”
- City needs to work with us – when we go to them we're not saying, “you need to fix this” but we want them to work collectively with us. We have a greater likelihood of addressing issues with the City on board.
- Doing an inventory of properties in community and someone championing the cause of a low cost housing project.

Detox and Residential Treatment

Discussion of Gaps

- Immense frustration with men and women in detox centres – many that we deal with are homeless. Many of the services are wonderful for those who have a home. If you're homeless it's a tough go. We have detox through Salvation Army

in other locations and they're all tied in with Health Authority and they control who gets in. We could have another 50 beds in the Fraser Valley but we still wouldn't have enough.

- City can be involved in initiating and advocating for some of these things. It's very expensive. It's pandemic in this country the shortage of beds.
- We need someone from Fraser Health to talk about this.
- In Surrey they were having a day detox so that would add more capacity (medical condition so home visits are not an option).
- I can get them into treatment immediately if they were clean for three days, but the challenge is getting them sober for three days. The desire is there.

Municipal Engagement

- They need connection with community to know what the issues are.
- I'd like to see the City engage more fully in public education about the huge overlapping issues that all of these things represent. People get up in arms and someone needs to address the NIMBYism. There is nothing ever to communicate the collective contribution to these issues. If you have the public pushing their officials to take action rather than piecemeal efforts to draw attention to their issues. The City needs to be the primary force behind the public education. There is such overlap on this issue – they touch every population.

Public Education about Social Service Issues

Discussion of Gaps

- People are aware of homelessness. There are lots of issues that are not getting the focus because of homelessness. It's our responsibility to make sure the community understands a range of issues.
- City has to have finger on pulse of what's happening in the community. When I started working in mental health, that was as scary as homelessness is now and the City came on board after a long battle. Now I'm an ambassador for Langley because of their support. They even built a park for children right next to us – and it's been seen as a model. However, I'm not confident that if I was building another facility in the city that the fear wouldn't still be there. It would still be a battle if we had to do it again.
- Fear. When people don't understand who homeless are and issues they face – they have a right to be fearful if they don't understand. We have to show them. When it comes to the City, councillors and staff need to understand community and take a leadership role and going out there and doing something about it otherwise they'll be criticized.

Municipal Engagement

- I assist families – you have to have additional insurance because your child has a disability. Continue to promote a culture of citizenship – it's not only about what we're entitled to but our responsibility to give back – collective responsibility to include everyone. City leadership to promote civic engagement to help us understand better how we can support each other.
- “City taking an active role in engaging the community address concern.” (Nick) There has been this in the past from the City. When City sees a need they have

- filled it in the past. There is a hazard in them advocating if there isn't community buy-in.
- I'm reading my local paper and I'm waiting with interest for the announcement on the new Salvation Army facility and all of a sudden they've decided on a location and all the details without any public process. There needs to be a better process – there appears to have been a lack of process.
 - But it's also touchy because if you go to the public too soon, people get really mad too and you might never have these facilities built.
 - If there was leadership from the City and they had been providing education to the public and they were showing people how needs can be taken care of and how we're all a part of this. Then there wouldn't be teeth-gnashing about new facilities because the process would have created awareness.

Education and Awareness of all Elements of Safety

Discussion of Gaps

- There is a senior coalition against elder abuse (Langley Coalition for the Prevention of Abuse of Seniors)
- I don't know what the answer is. Seniors' facilities exist but people fall through the cracks.
- Safety on the streets for everybody, not just seniors.
- A lot of scooters on the street.
- Public trustee started a program initiated community based coalitions and collective education (funded for six months and then left us to figure it out – there were no additional resources although we meet on monthly basis)
- Lots of abuse that seniors experience is at the hands of family members. Lots of services and we need resources to help them collaborate and work together.
- We're going through CPTED process with the new Salvation Army facility (it's a requirement in all larger projects)
- Safety in the parks – City will be doing a review of all parks for CPTED.

Municipal Engagement

- We're active in township and bring community wide strategy for public safety. It's also about education and public awareness – fight social exclusion and racism. Much of what they address is in the City – broaden this initiative and collaborate between the two municipalities.
- There is the police committee but it doesn't have broad representation

Social Agency and Not-for-Profit Capacity

Discussion of Gaps

- We talked about the Province giving funding for agencies to have new initiatives and it's just start-up money. How do we sustain it?
- Each community needs to have resources available – they need to be stable in order to serve community. Any funding that limits ability of agency to meet the need is a problem. It's disturbing that we have national and international agencies moving in because Langley's problems need to be solved in Langley. MEIA is

moving in this direction. The City needs to work with us and fight with us to make sure we have resources to solve problems in the community.

Municipal Engagement

- If a City chooses one or two agencies to core fund, it's too restrictive. In Burnaby the City gives a small subsidy for their volunteer program to subsidize gas (for Meals on Wheels). Social agencies can do fundraising – it's being too selective.
- Grants in Aid program has \$150 000 available, which is a huge increase and only a few applications are from social service agencies. It's not on the website.
- I don't think it's the City's mandate to be funding.
- There has been a reticence on part of City to advocate with us because they were worried they would own it. This isn't the case at all. Mechanisms with City so that they are aware of the issues going on.
- I don't want to fundraise to provide core services.
- I don't know that it is an issue of not-for-profit capacity anymore – 50% of Federal funds for social agencies are going to private organizations. The money we make sustains our programs, it doesn't go to shareholders.
- I've worked in DTES and if someone mentioned the word "pilot project" everyone would go running. People think that the money will be there forever. There are big expectations and then it becomes political. Services were duplicated to such an extent that it became unethical.

Connecting Diverse Communities through a Volunteer Services Centre

Discussion of Gaps

- Used to be one. Populations that we serve are undervalued and the centre could connect them to where they could volunteer.
- We have a strong volunteer program at Langley Stepping Stone and they go out and volunteer in all agencies but there is nothing connecting volunteers in the city.
- Is the issue that we have isolated citizens or that we don't have a volunteer centre? We already have You've Gotta Have Friends, so we need to be careful about duplicating efforts.
- People aren't isolated because they don't have a place to volunteer – they can't get out their front door because of issues that need to be addressed.
- When we talked about isolated populations before it wasn't necessarily about individuals, but about groups of people who were isolated – such as First Nations groups and newcomer groups

Municipal Engagement

- Parks and Recreation services to bring people together. A lot of the programs do that to a certain degree.
- It could be health related and it could also be poverty related. It's very difficult for people to be able to access services. The challenge is to make the recreation facilities accessible to people who are isolated.
- Part of this might be identifying who these people are? "Have you seen your neighbour lately?"

- Transportation is a big part of why people are isolated
- It's the local government's responsibility to press for public transit
- Some countries have a 30 minute on-demand service for people with disabilities, because mobility is considered a human right
- This is a vital social responsibility
- With subsidy programs for recreation/services, even paying anything is difficult for people in poverty
- It's hard for people to go and ask for things
- Why doesn't the City run the volunteer services centre? It would help Langley solve Langley's problems.

Community-Based Health Services

Discussion of Gaps

- In mental health there is a good continuum of care through not-for-profit agencies and the Province but the City should support specific initiatives
- We need a youth health centre that's a one stop shop – expanded from what it currently offers
- People with disabilities are missing from the list

Municipal Engagement

- Advocacy is the only way to make a difference. We need to work with the Health Authority but it's hard to get them to the table
- Access to health services for the working poor? When you're on social assistance you get additional benefits but you don't get them if you're working for minimum wage.
- One of the best ways to provide services to youth is through the high school and Langley is about to lose its only secondary school. The City has a key role in advocating to keep the school.
- Communities are structured around our schools and we'll feel this down the road. The City has been playing an advocacy role.

Appendix H: 2007 Community Grant Recipients

2007 Community Grants Recipients

Organization	2007 Grant Awarded
Arthritis Society	\$5,000
BC Farm Machinery and Agricultural Museum Association	\$2,000
BC Songwriters Showcase Association (rent)	\$857
Best Babies of the Langleys	\$1,500
Big Brothers Big Sisters of Langley	\$2,500
Brookswood Baptist Church (rent)	\$500
Canadian Animal Rescue and Extended Shelter Society	\$4,000
Critter Care Wildlife Society	\$3,000
Douglas Park Community School	\$2,500
Douglas Park Community School/YMCA	\$2,500
Downtown Street Sounds	\$2,500
HD Stafford Secondary School PAC	\$250
Heritage Society of BC Conference	\$2,500
Kiwanis Fraser Valley Music Festival Society	\$4,000
Langley Arts Council (rent)	\$3,000
Langley Association for Community Living	\$1,000
Langley Canada Day Celebrations Society	\$2,500
Langley Children's Society	\$10,000
Langley Christmas Parade	\$3,000
Langley Community Awareness Team	\$1,000
Langley Community Chorus	\$300
Langley Curling Club	\$2,500
Langley Family Services	\$2,100
Langley Lawn Bowling Club	\$4,000
Langley Lions Club	\$10,000
Langley Literacy Association	\$2,000
Langley Lodge	\$9,300
Langley Memorial Hospital Auxiliary	\$5,000
Langley Scholarship Committee	\$3,200
Langley Seniors Resources Society	\$23,743
Langley Ukulele Association	\$2,100
Miss World Canada Pageant	\$1,000
Multicultural Festival	\$1,500
Nicomekl Elementary School	\$2,500
Nicomekl Enhancement Society	\$2,500
Pitch-In British Columbia	\$425
Royal Canadian Legion (security camera)	\$2,875
Royal Canadian Legion (Remembrance Day stage)	\$156
Swing in the Park (insurance)	\$130
Youth Parliament of BC	\$310
TOTAL GRANTS DISTRIBUTED IN 2007	\$129,746

Appendix I: Permissive Tax Exemptions

Permissive Tax Exemptions for Not-for-Profit Agencies²²

Owner/Tenant	Permissive Exempt School/Other	Permissive Exempt City Taxes	Permissive Exempt Total Taxes
Ishtar Transition Housing	\$1,562	\$2,055	\$3,618
Langley Care Society	\$18,691	\$24,591	\$43,283
Langley Seniors Resource Society	\$2,193	\$2,885	\$5,078
	\$11,274	\$25,459	\$36,733
Langley Stepping Stone	\$3,324	\$4,373	\$7,697
Langley Community Music School	\$35,162	\$32,587	\$67,749
Langley Lawn Bowling (Outdoor)	\$6,078	\$13,725	\$19,803
Langley Family Services	\$9,565	\$8,864	\$18,429
TOTAL PERMISSIVE EXEMPTIONS	\$87,849	\$114,541	\$202,390

²² Permissive tax exemptions are also extended to churches in the amount of \$81,250 and to the Montessorri School in the amount of \$5,085.

Appendix J: Additional City of Langley Social Supports

The City of Langley provides the following social supports in addition to permissive tax exemptions and Community Grants:

Langley Community Services: \$1.5 million (building and land)

Stepping Stone Community Services Society: \$1 million (land)

Langley Community Music School: \$1 million (land)

Salvation Army “Gateway of Hope” (pending Council approval): \$1 million (land)

Langley Seniors Resources Society: \$40,000/year for 10 years (land)

Leisure Access Grants for Low Income Families: \$4,000/year

Appendix K: Social Responsibility Matrices

Social Responsibility Matrix – City of Langley

The Social Responsibility Matrix outlines the varying scope of responsibility for each of the three levels of government, as well as the Community service sector and other potential interests (i.e. private foundations, business community etc.).

Responsibilities have been divided into three general categories:

- **Planning** – Involving the coordination, participation and development of planning for services in a community. The form of planning processes may vary significantly, depending on the type of project or program. For example, planning for the construction of a facility is significantly different than planning for recreational services within existing facilities.
- **Construction & Siting** – This category includes responsibilities for financing and organizing construction of new facilities as well as identifying locations and siting for specific programs
- **Operations** – The day-to-day operation of the social service in question.

Each general category is further subdivided into three responsibility categories:

- **Legislative** – Legislative responsibility identifies when a government has either specific responsibilities in an area, or has assumed some role in addressing a specific social element
 - **Financial** – Financial responsibility outlines financial obligations of each government or agency, including roles various levels of government have voluntarily assumed.
 - **Implementation** – Implementation responsibility identifies the varying degrees of responsibility for actual implementation of the planning, construction or operations of programs.
- Each level of government or service agency has differing scope of responsibilities in each area. Scope of responsibility is represented in the following categories:
- **Primary responsibility** – A specific agent has the primary responsibility for this aspect of the element. For example, provincial governments have the primary responsibility for the creation and operation of homeless shelters, though they often delegate day-to-day implementation to a community service agency.
 - **Secondary responsibility** – Differing agents share responsibility for this item. Due to the overlapping and varying nature of many governmental responsibilities, this term is necessarily vague. A government or agent with secondary responsibility has a role in addressing the issue, but is not primarily responsible.
 - **Limited responsibility** – The government or agent has limited involvement and responsibility for the item. Often they take on a small or contributing role, but they are not directly responsible for the provision or planning of services.
 - **None or Not Applicable (N/A)** – The agent has no responsibility for this item (i.e. Community groups have no legislative responsibilities).

The tables identify appropriate Ministries or agencies when that information is readily available. The overlapping nature of many social service responsibilities indicates potential for partnerships and collaboration to address social needs, though overlaps may also be contentious. The elements are not listed in order of priority.

IMPORTANT NOTE: The social responsibility matrices can collectively seem somewhat overwhelming. These matrices are meant to be dealt with individually. While there are some overlaps, a person or group that is active in one area may have no role in another. As such, each social responsibility matrix should be considered separately, as an individual matrix, which will serve as a reference tool for developing action plans to meet identified gaps in services.

Champions: Each level of government, as well as the various community agencies and programs have a range of responsibilities. Due to the complexity of social issues, and the many demands on the attention and funds of every level of government, many responsibilities are not fully assumed without outside pressure. The pressure can come from any other level of government, or from the community. These ‘champions’ advocate for the responsible parties to address an identified need for services or programs.

Responsibilities vs. Roles – Significant confusion exists about the difference between the responsibilities of a government or agency, and the roles that each can play in addressing social needs. This is a particularly challenging issue in Canada, where the constitution delineates various overlapping responsibilities between the federal and provincial governments. The situation is further complicated with the inclusion of municipal governments, which are delegated a range of responsibilities by their respective provinces. For example, the provincial government is primarily responsible for the provision of youth shelter services. However, the federal government has chosen to involve itself in addressing homelessness through various approaches and funding initiatives. Homelessness ultimately occurs in municipalities, and municipal governments have zoning, land-use and bylaw considerations. The municipal government also has a direct interest in ensuring that measures are taken by senior levels of government to address homelessness, which could include the provision of shelter services. Each level of government has different financial capacities and legal mandates. A result of this confusion is that the roles of each government are not clear. However, the primary responsibility for a given social service element is normally clear, and the Social Responsibility Matrices seek to identify and outline the various responsibilities of the other governments and agencies involved.

Green spaces

Including community gardens, maintenance of public space, accessible play spaces for children & pets, amenities through development

Responsibility	Federal Government	Provincial Government	Municipal Government	Health Authority	Community Groups & Agencies	Other
<i>Planning responsibility</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative – None • Financial – Limited responsibility: potential responsibility concerning any federal lands and buildings in Langley; possible funding opportunities through the National Crime Prevention Strategy • Implementation – Limited responsibility: potential responsibility concerning any federal lands and buildings in Langley 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative – None • Financial – Limited responsibility: some opportunity for funding of specific initiatives • Implementation – Limited responsibility: participation in planning strategies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative – Primary responsibility: Parks and Recreation; local by-laws; urban design, zoning and planning strategies for revitalization; public works and infrastructure maintenance. • Financial – Primary responsibility: planning and local infrastructure and public works maintenance; parks and recreation. • Implementation – Primary responsibility: planning support for specific community clean-up initiatives, crime prevention centres, convening inter-sectoral planning committees, local environmental programs, establishing partnerships etc. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative – None • Financial – None • Implementation – None 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative – None • Financial – Secondary responsibility: participation of community and environmental groups on planning and revitalization committees. • Implementation – Secondary responsibility: community and environmental groups, business community, BIA sponsorship and involvement with local clean-up, litter and beautification programs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative – Secondary responsibility (School Board) • Financial – Secondary Responsibility (School board): community policing initiatives through RCMP; business community sponsorship of local clean-up programs and beautification initiatives. Parks operated by schools • Implementation – Secondary responsibility: community policing initiatives through RCMP; business community sponsorship of local clean-up programs and beautification initiatives. Parks operated by school boards.
<i>Construction & Siting responsibility</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative – Limited Responsibility (Heritage sites, National Parks, Endangered Species Legislation). Waterways • Financial – Limited Responsibility – See above • Implementation – Limited Responsibility – Heritage sites, National Parks, Endangered Species, Waterways 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative – Secondary Responsibility. ALR, Provincial Parks, Environmental protection. • Financial – Secondary Responsibility. Support for parks, ALR. • Implementation – Secondary Responsibility. Parks, ALR, Environment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative – Primary Responsibility. Parks & Recreation, Parks planning & development. • Financial – Primary Responsibility. Creation and Development of new parks and green spaces, playgrounds. • Implementation – Primary responsibility. Creation, maintenance and operation of green spaces & parks within the municipality. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative – None • Financial – None • Implementation – None 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative – None • Financial – Limited responsibility. Creation of some playgrounds and other recreation spaces. • Implementation – Limited responsibility. Operation and maintenance of some community playgrounds and other sites. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative – Secondary responsibility (School board) • Financial – Secondary responsibility (parks and green spaces on school property) • Implementation – Secondary responsibility. Maintenance and upgrading of parks and green spaces on school property. Development of new parks and green spaces by school board.
<i>Operational responsibility</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative – None • Financial – Limited responsibility: potential concerning federal lands and buildings in Langley • Implementation – Limited responsibility: potential concerning federal lands and buildings in Langley 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative – None • Financial – Limited responsibility: some sponsorship or funding potential for specific programs • Implementation – None 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative – Primary responsibility: specific revitalization programs through parks and recreation, by-laws, zoning, infrastructure and public works • Financial – Primary responsibility: through departmental budgets and support of community planning processes. Tools to facilitate green spaces & others through tax incentives and density bonusing. • Implementation – Primary responsibility: working with developers and community groups on revitalization, park initiatives and crime preventative through environmental design (CPTED). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative – None • Financial – None • Implementation – None 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative – None • Financial – Secondary responsibility: resources from environmental and business groups. • Implementation – Secondary responsibility: community, environmental and business community involvement in carrying out specific projects 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative – None • Financial – Limited responsibility: RCMP commitment of funding for community policing initiatives; private development. • Implementation – Limited responsibility: RCMP community policing initiatives; business community initiatives.

***Homelessness – youths, women, men, seniors and people suffering from mental health issues
Including cold wet weather/barrier free beds***

Responsibility	Federal Government	Provincial Government	Municipal Government	Health Authority	Community Service Groups	Other
<i>Planning responsibility</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative – Limited responsibility: policymaking related to funding etc. • Financial – Secondary responsibility: support for planning processes HRSDC (HPI/HPI), National Homelessness Initiative/Homelessness Partnering Strategy • Implementation – Limited responsibility: support of local and regional planning (HPI, Regional and Local Homelessness Plans and Committees) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative – Primary responsibility: coordination & planning of shelter & other social services (MEIA). MCFD for youth homelessness • Financial – Primary responsibility: support for planning processes. • Implementation – Primary responsibility: implementation of planning processes. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative – Secondary responsibility: community planning (OCP). Zoning and land use planning. Support of homelessness planning. Also a limited role in coordinating community services. • Financial – Limited responsibility: support planning processes. • Implementation – Secondary responsibility: support of planning processes. Participation in planning processes. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative – N/A • Financial – Limited responsibility: support for planning of emergency shelters. • Implementation – Limited responsibility: participation in planning processes, contribution of knowledge and expertise 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative – N/A • Financial – Limited responsibility: fundraising, participation in planning processes. • Implementation – Secondary responsibility: participation in community plans, implementation of plans and coordination of planning with internal goals. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative – N/A • Financial – Limited responsibility: fundraising, community funding for planning processes (foundations, donations). • Implementation – Limited responsibility: participation in planning processes. Volunteer support for community plans.
<i>Construction & Siting responsibility</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative – Limited responsibility: policymaking, some capital funding. • Financial – Secondary responsibility: capital funding for some shelters - CMHC; HRSDC (HPI/HPI); NHI/HPS; Urban Aboriginal Strategy. • Implementation – None 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative – Primary responsibility: some oversight and regulation responsibilities (MEIA). Also BC Building Code, Community Care Licensing. • Financial – Primary responsibility: funding and MEIA. • Implementation – Primary responsibility: construction of shelters, provision of shelter services. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative – Secondary responsibility: zoning; land use. Licensing. • Financial – Limited responsibility: possible provision of sites, land use decisions. • Implementation – Limited responsibility. Oversight and inspection of sites as constructed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative – N/A • Financial – None • Implementation – Limited responsibility: contribution of expertise and knowledge to design of shelters. Support for shelter and program creation and possible provision of facilities. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative – N/A • Financial – Limited responsibility: fundraising, coordination of funding. • Implementation – Primary responsibility: design of shelter, community outreach, building support. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative – N/A • Financial – Limited responsibility: capital funding support for emergency shelters (Foundations etc.) • Implementation – Limited responsibility: building community support for shelters, volunteering.
<i>Operational Responsibility</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative – Limited responsibility: regulation and policymaking. • Financial – Secondary responsibility: financing (HPI/HPI, Urban Aboriginal Strategy, HRSDC, NHI/HPS) • Implementation – None Oversight of funded programs and facilities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative – Primary responsibility: oversight and regulation (MEIA). • Financial – Primary responsibility: MEIA funding for some shelters. • Implementation – Limited responsibility: regulation of shelters. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative – Limited responsibility. Licensing & bylaw enforcement. • Financial – Limited responsibility: indirect(zoning, land use, various tools) May provide very limited financial support to not-for-profit operators through grants for supplementary programs (outside of provincial core mandates) • Implementation – None 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative – Limited responsibility: enforcement of health regulations. Provision of health-related services. • Financial – Limited responsibility: coordination with shelters to provide health services to residents. • Implementation – Limited responsibility: support of shelters through health services. Community Care Licensing. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative – N/A • Financial – Limited responsibility: some fundraising. • Implementation – Secondary responsibility: operation of most shelters. Regulation and training of staff. Program operation (support & outreach). Often delegated by provincial government. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative – N/A • Financial – Limited responsibility: some financial support for capital and operational costs (Foundations, donations, capital campaigns). • Implementation – None

Affordable housing
Including housing options in both the social and market sectors

Responsibility	Federal Government	Provincial Government	Municipal Government	Health Authority	Community Service Groups	Other
<i>Planning responsibility</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative – Secondary responsibility: planning and partnership building for affordable housing development. • Financial – Limited responsibility: supporting planning for new affordable housing, as well as planning maintenance of existing affordable housing. • Implementation – Limited responsibility: supporting and participating in planning for affordable housing. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative – Primary responsibility: development of affordable housing policies and regulations in BC Housing; Homes BC. Building standards and practices, regulation (BC Building Code). • Financial – Primary responsibility: supporting planning for affordable housing. Participating in affordable housing planning. • Implementation – Primary responsibility: developing planning for affordable housing, identifying and prioritizing needs and resources. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative – Limited responsibility: Building standards and zoning for affordable housing. Planning for creation and land use re: affordable housing. • Financial – Limited responsibility: some tools to support planning for the creation and maintenance of affordable housing developments. Affordable Housing Fund. • Implementation – Primary responsibility: Support for implementation and development of planning processes at the local level. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative – N/A • Financial – None • Implementation – None 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative – N/A • Financial – Limited responsibility: some financial support to participate in planning processes. • Implementation – Secondary responsibility: participation in planning for affordable housing, particularly the not-for-profit and co-operative sector. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative – N/A • Financial – Limited responsibility • Implementation – Limited responsibility: participation by community in planning for affordable housing.
<i>Construction & Siting responsibility</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative – Secondary responsibility: maintenance of existing affordable housing developments and programs. Construction of new affordable housing developments. • Financial – Secondary responsibility: creation and development of new affordable housing. Financial support and subsidization of affordable housing, including co-operative housing. • Implementation – Secondary responsibility: maintenance and operation of affordable housing (CMHC, Urban Aboriginal Strategy). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative – Primary responsibility: creation and development of new affordable housing (BC Housing, Homes BC). Maintenance and support of existing affordable housing developments. Also BC Building Code for safety and quality of affordable housing. • Financial – Primary responsibility: creation and development of new affordable housing. Financial support and subsidization of affordable housing initiatives and programs, including co-operative housing. • Implementation – Primary responsibility: construction of affordable housing (BC Housing). Support for construction of affordable housing developments (BC Housing, Homes BC). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative – Limited responsibility: zoning for affordable housing. Density bonusing. Secondary suite policies. • Financial – Limited responsibility: some tools to support the creation of affordable housing (land provision). Affordable Housing Fund. • Implementation – Limited responsibility: support for affordable housing developments, encouraging the construction of affordable housing through various tools. Zoning and land-use support. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative – N/A • Financial – None • Implementation – None 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative – N/A • Financial – Limited responsibility: some capital fundraising and support of affordable housing developments. • Implementation – Limited responsibility: building community support for affordable housing developments. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative – N/A • Financial – Limited responsibility: some financial support through donations and foundations. Some construction and maintenance of low-income housing in the private sector. • Implementation – Limited responsibility: operation of low-rent apartments and properties. Identification of appropriate sites.

The affordable housing matrix is continued on next page.

Continued from previous page...

Affordable housing
Including housing options in both the social and market sectors

Responsibility	Federal Government	Provincial Government	Municipal Government	Health Authority	Community Service Groups	Other
<i>Operational responsibility</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative – Secondary responsibility: legislating for affordable housing programs. Creation and maintenance of affordable housing programs (CMHC). • Financial – Secondary responsibility: operation and maintenance of affordable housing programs. Financial support and subsidization of affordable housing. • Implementation – Secondary responsibility: maintenance of affordable housing. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative – Primary responsibility: regulation and creation of affordable housing. • Financial – Primary responsibility: funding for subsidized housing units (BC Housing). Subsidies to not-for-profit & cooperative housing. Rent supplement assistance. Operation and maintenance of affordable housing. • Implementation – Primary responsibility: management of affordable housing programs in BC. Health inspections etc. (via Health Authority) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative – Limited responsibility: zoning for affordable housing. Density bonusing. Secondary suite policies. • Financial – Limited responsibility: some tools to support the creation of affordable housing (land provision). Affordable Housing Fund • Implementation – Limited responsibility: enforcement of bylaws and secondary suite policies. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative – N/A • Financial – None • Implementation – Limited responsibility: enforcement of health regulations. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative – N/A • Financial – Limited responsibility: some fundraising and creation of affordable housing (i.e. Habitat for Humanity). • Implementation – Secondary responsibility: operation of co-operative housing, possibly some affordable housing programs. Primary responsibility when delegated by the provincial government. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative – N/A • Financial – Limited responsibility: private financial contributions through foundations and donations. • Implementation – Secondary responsibility: private operation of low-cost housing options (i.e. apartment buildings). Operation of secondary suites and co-operative housing units.

Detox and residential treatment
Including addictions services for seniors, drug use and treatment centres

Responsibility	Federal Government	Provincial Government	Municipal Government	Health Authority	Community Service Groups	Other
<i>Planning responsibility</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative – None - • Financial – Limited responsibility –support of local planning and consultation processes. HPI funds. • Implementation – Limited responsibility – option to participate in planning for recovery houses. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative - Primary responsibility – Planning and designing regulations/licensing of recovery houses. Setting licensing regulations. • Financial – Primary responsibility – coordinating planning of treatment facilities where necessary. Support for planning processes. • Implementation – Primary responsibility – coordination of planning for treatment facilities. Liaising with local governments and community agencies for planning. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative – Secondary responsibility – land use planning and zoning • Financial - Limited responsibility – participation in planning for treatment facilities. Land use planning and zoning. • Implementation – Secondary responsibility - Participation in planning regulation. Location guidelines, if appropriate. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative – Secondary responsibility –participation in planning and regulation of treatment facilities • Financial – Secondary responsibility – support for planning of treatment facilities • Implementation – Secondary responsibility – Planning for the regulation of treatment facilities. Community Care licensing implementation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative – N/A • Financial – Secondary responsibility – coordination with provincial and municipal governments to develop appropriate guidelines and zoning. • Implementation – Secondary responsibility – participation into treatment facility planning, zoning and land use guidelines, location guidelines. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative - N/A • Financial – Limited responsibility – some private operators of recovery houses. Participation in planning processes. • Implementation - Limited responsibility – Participation by private operators and the public in planning zoning and location guidelines.
<i>Construction & Siting responsibility</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative - None • Financial – Limited responsibility – option to finance creation of treatment facilities • Implementation – Limited responsibility – supervision of federally funded facilities, if they are created. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative – Primary responsibility – Regulation and licensing of recovery houses. Health and safety inspections. • Financial – Primary responsibility – financing creation of treatment facilities. • Implementation- Primary responsibility - Supporting, through regulations, the creation of treatment facilities. Option to build and operate treatment facilities, alternatively to delegate to community groups, or create conditions for private operators. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative – Secondary responsibility – zoning and land use of treatment facilities. Possible development of location guidelines. • Financial – Limited responsibility – tools to support creation of treatment facilities, such as zoning, bylaws etc. • Implementation – Limited responsibility – Bylaw enforcement. Zoning and land use guidelines. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative – None • Financial – Limited responsibility – Financial support for treatment facilities an option. • Implementation – Secondary responsibility – Option to create or support the creation of treatment facilities. Community Care licensing. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative – N/A • Financial – Secondary responsibility – Acquisition of property for treatment facilities. Fundraising. • Implementation – Secondary responsibility – ensuring treatment facilities conform to guidelines and zoning. Development of treatment facilities, if delegated by the provincial government. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative - N/A • Financial – Secondary responsibility –Privately operated recovery homes are responsible for siting and acquisition of property. • Implementation- Secondary responsibility – privately operated recovery homes, responsible for ensuring homes meet licensing guidelines.
<i>Operational Responsibility</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative - None • Financial – Limited responsibility – option to provide operational funding to facilities through time limited funding programs (minimal). • Implementation – Limited responsibility – oversight of any federally funded programs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative – Primary responsibility – regulation and licensing of treatment facilities • Financial – Primary responsibility – direct funding of treatment facilities treatment facilities. Option to run directly, or delegate operations to community or private agencies. MEIA, Ministry of Mental Health & Addictions. • Implementation- Primary responsibility –regulation of treatment facilities. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative – Limited responsibility – bylaw, zoning and land use regulation. Location guidelines enforcement. Business licensing. • Financial – None - • Implementation – Limited responsibility – Enforcement of bylaws. Business license regulation. Addressing local concerns. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative – Limited responsibility – health regulation and inspections. • Financial – Secondary responsibility – Support for treatment facility operations • Implementation – Secondary responsibility – health inspections. Provision of health services to residents. Community care licensing. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative – N/A • Financial – Secondary responsibility – management of treatment facilities. Fundraising, fee for service. • Implementation- Secondary responsibility – operation of treatment facilities, when delegated by provincial government. Ensuring conformity to bylaws and regulations. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative - N/A • Financial – Secondary responsibility – privately operated recovery homes. Management and maintenance of recovery homes, within budgets. • Implementation – Secondary responsibility –Private recovery homes. Ensuring conformity to bylaws and regulations.

Public education of social service issues

Including ongoing support for vulnerable populations to access info and services, public awareness of existing programs and services

Responsibility	Federal Government	Provincial Government	Municipal Government	Health Authority	Community Service Groups	Other
<i>Planning responsibility</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative – Limited Responsibility – Option for public consultation process on other social planning issues. • Financial – Limited Responsibility – Option for public consultation process on other social planning issues. • Implementation – Limited Responsibility – option for public consultation process on other social planning issues. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative - Limited Responsibility – option for public consultation process on social planning issues • Financial – Limited Responsibility - option for public consultation process on social planning issues. Support for awareness building and planning in the community. • Implementation – Limited Responsibility - option for public consultation process on social planning issues. Support for planning processes. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative – Secondary Responsibility – Public hearings on zoning and planning process (Local Government Act) • Financial - Secondary Responsibility - Funding for public hearing processes. Support for processes that build public awareness, staff participation and support for awareness efforts. • Implementation - Secondary Responsibility – Public hearing process (planning and zoning); Information referral and dissemination via libraries, community centres and community networks. Support for public education, use of publications & other avenues. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative - None • Financial - None • Implementation – Limited Responsibility – potential to consult with or inform public on issues connected with social planning 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative - None • Financial – Primary Responsibility - Community group fundraising around advocacy work for social planning initiatives • Implementation - Primary Responsibility – Community group activities around social and urban planning initiatives; networking and information sharing; mobilization and engagement. Planning to build public awareness and communications around key social issues. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative - None • Financial – Secondary Responsibility – local and regional media (focus on social issues) • Implementation – Secondary Responsibility – local and regional media (focus on social issues)
<p>Construction & Siting responsibility Not applicable to this element</p>						
<i>Operational Responsibility</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative - None • Financial - None • Implementation None <p>Federal, Provincial, and Municipal Governments and Health Authorities are generally not a part of this element, though each have <u>options</u> to develop programs to foster engagement and public awareness in the community.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative - None • Financial - None • Implementation None <p>Federal, Provincial, and Municipal Governments and Health Authorities are generally not a part of this element, though each have <u>options</u> to develop programs to foster engagement and public awareness in the community.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative – Secondary Responsibility – duty to consult with public on planning related issues • Financial - Secondary Responsibility - Funding for public consultation processes, public awareness efforts. • Implementation - Primary Responsibility - Funding for public consultation processes; information referral and dissemination via libraries, community centres and community networks 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative - None • Financial - None • Implementation – Limited Responsibility – potential to consult with or inform public on issues connected with social planning 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative - None • Financial – Primary Responsibility - Community group fundraising around advocacy work for social planning initiatives • Implementation - Primary Responsibility Community group activities around social and urban planning initiatives; networking and information sharing; mobilization and engagement. Ongoing public awareness and advocacy. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative - None • Financial – Secondary Responsibility – local and regional media (focus on social issues) • Implementation – Secondary Responsibility – local and regional media (focus on social issues)

Education and awareness of all elements of safety
Including: CPTED, safety and prevention of family abuse, senior safety in the streets, senior abuse

Responsibility	Federal Government	Provincial Government	Municipal Government	Health Authority	Community Service Groups	Other (Foundations, Business Community)
<i>Planning responsibility</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative – Primary Responsibility (crime) – Criminal Code & enforcement. Ministry of Public Safety. • Financial – Primary responsibility (crime). Criminal code. Funding of planning processes to reduce crime. Support for awareness safety issues. • Implementation – Secondary responsibility – participation in planning processes to reduce crime & build safety awareness. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative – Primary responsibility (drug treatment). Health Ministry, Attorney General. • Financial – Primary responsibility (drug treatment) – Health & social services. Funding & support for planning processes to build awareness • Implementation – Primary responsibility – support & initiation of planning to reduce drug use and drug related crime and to build awareness. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative – Limited responsibility. Zoning & land use decisions re: treatment. Policing & enforcement at the local level. • Financial – Limited responsibility. Support and participation in planning to build awareness • Implementation – Limited responsibility. Participation in planning processes. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative – Secondary responsibility (treatment). As delegated by the provincial government. • Financial – Secondary responsibility – planning to build awareness • Implementation – Secondary responsibility – participation in planning to build awareness 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative – None • Financial – Limited responsibility – participation in planning processes where appropriate • Implementation – Limited responsibility – participation & advocacy for planning processes & creation of programs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative - None • Financial – Limited responsibility. Foundations & other sources funding planning for prevention & treatment. School board participation in youth oriented program planning • Implementation – Limited responsibility – participation in planning processes by private sector. School board participation in planning for youth programs
<i>Construction & Siting responsibility</i> Not applicable to this element						
<i>Operational Responsibility</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative – Limited responsibility. Enforcement of criminal code & crime prevention where possible. • Financial – Secondary responsibility. Funding of treatment & related programs & facilities, directly or through homelessness & other initiatives. Support for awareness efforts. • Implementation – Limited responsibility (often delegated to community agencies & health authorities). Oversight of federally funded programs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative – Primary responsibility. Ministry of Attorney General. Ministry of Health • Financial – Primary responsibility. Funding & support for treatment, prevention & other programs. Also financial support for enforcement & prevention efforts • Implementation- Primary responsibility (often delegated to community groups). Operation of treatment & prevention programs and awareness building efforts. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative – None • Financial – Limited responsibility. Use of tools available (bonusing, grants etc) to encourage & support programs & prevention. Funding of RCMP & other enforcement. • Implementation – Limited responsibility. May use tools available to support programs where appropriate. Enforcement 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative – Secondary responsibility. As delegated by province. • Financial – Secondary responsibility, as delegated by province. • Implementation – Limited responsibility – participation in awareness building efforts. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative – None • Financial – Secondary responsibility. Fundraising & operation of funded projects • Implementation- Secondary responsibility (as delegated by province & other funders). Operation of awareness efforts. Collaboration with other agencies & governments 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative - None • Financial – Limited responsibility. Funding of programs in the community through grants & other support • Implementation – None

Social agency/non profit capacity with core funding and adequate resourcing

Responsibility	Federal Government	Provincial Government	Municipal Government	Health Authority	Community Service Groups	Other
<i>Planning responsibility</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative – Primary Responsibility – Planning of various initiatives - HRSDC (job-search information, grants, CED project assistance); Industry Canada (IC) (grants); Western Economic Development (WED) (CED information and funding); Indian and Northern Affairs (INA) (CED initiatives and grants for First Nations); Fisheries and Oceans Canada (FAO) (CED – fisheries related) • Financial – Primary Responsibility – HRSDC (grants & support); IC (grants & support); WED (grants & support); INA (grants & support); FAO (grants & support) • Implementation - Primary Responsibility – HRSDC (job-search information, grants, CED project assistance); IC (grants); WED (CED information and funding); INA (CED initiatives and grants for First Nations); FAO (CED – fisheries related) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative - Secondary Responsibility – Planning of various initiatives - Ministry of Employment & Income Assistance (MEIA) (job-finding, employment information); Ministry of Small Business & Economic Development (MSBED) (entrepreneurialism, limited tax credits; business start-up information); Ministry of Community, Aboriginal and Women’s Services (MCAWS) (Aboriginal Employment); Ministry Responsible for Treaty Negotiations (MRTN) (Aboriginal Employment); Ministry of Advanced Education (MAE) (Apprenticeship programs) • Financial - Secondary Responsibility –MEIA (job-finding, employment information; MSBED (entrepreneurial activation, limited tax credits; business start-up information); MCAWS (Aboriginal Employment); MRTN (Aboriginal Employment); MAE (Apprenticeship programs) • Implementation – Secondary Responsibility – MEIA (job-finding, employment information); MSBED (entrepreneurial activation, limited tax credits; business start-up information); MCAWS (Aboriginal Employment); MRTN (Aboriginal Employment); MAE (Apprenticeship programs) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative – Limited Responsibility –related bylaws • Financial – Limited Responsibility –Small Community grants program; sponsorship of community events and festivals • Implementation – Limited Responsibility – Business licensing; small Community grants program; Parks and Recreation courses 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative - None • Financial - None • Implementation - None 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative - None • Financial – Limited Responsibility – staff involvement of community groups in planning local CED initiatives • Implementation – Secondary Responsibility – staff involvement of community groups in planning local CED initiatives; Development of social enterprise initiatives 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative - None – BIAs activities within designated areas • Financial – Limited Responsibility – BIAs –activities within designated areas; Chamber(s) of Commerce; Business Community and Financial Services - sponsorship of local CED initiatives • Implementation – Limited Responsibility – BIAs activities within designated areas; Chamber(s) of Commerce (business development and marketing initiatives)

The social agency capacity matrix is continued on the next page.

Social agency/non profit capacity with core funding and adequate resourcing

<p><i>Construction & Siting responsibility</i> Not applicable to this element</p>						
<p><i>Operational Responsibility</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative – Primary Responsibility – HRSDC (job-search information, grants, CED project assistance); Industry Canada (IC) (grants); Western Economic Development (WED) (CED information and funding); Indian and Northern Affairs (INA) (CED initiatives and grants for First Nations); Fisheries and Oceans Canada (FAO) (CED – fisheries related) • Financial – Primary Responsibility – HRSDC (grants & support); IC (grants & support); WED (grants & support); INA (grants & support); FAO (grants & support) • Implementation - Primary Responsibility – HRSDC (job-search information, grants, CED project assistance); IC (grants); WED (CED information and funding); INA (CED initiatives and grants for First Nations); FAO (CED – fisheries related) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative - Secondary Responsibility – Ministry of Employment & Income Assistance (MEIA) (job-finding, employment information); Ministry of Small Business & Economic Development (MSBED) (entrepreneurialism, limited tax credits; business start-up information); Ministry of Community, Aboriginal and Women’s Services (MCAWS) (Aboriginal Employment); Ministry Responsible for Treaty Negotiations (MRTN) (Aboriginal Employment); Ministry of Advanced Education (MAE) (Apprenticeship programs) • Financial - Secondary Responsibility – MEIA (job-finding, employment information MSBED (entrepreneurial activation, limited tax credits; business start-up information); MCAWS (Aboriginal Employment); MRTN (Aboriginal Employment); MAE (Apprenticeship programs) • Implementation – Secondary Responsibility – MEIA (job-finding, employment information); MSBED (entrepreneurial activation, limited tax credits; business start-up information); MCAWS (Aboriginal Employment); MRTN (Aboriginal Employment); MAE (Apprenticeship programs) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative – Limited Responsibility – designation of BIA and related bylaws • Financial – Limited Responsibility – BIA levy; Economic Development (ED) office; small Community grants program; sponsorship of community events and festivals • Implementation – Limited Responsibility – BIA levy; information and outreach; ED Office; business licensing; small Community grants program; Parks and Recreation courses 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative - None • Financial - None • Implementation - None 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative - None • Financial – Limited Responsibility – staff involvement of community groups in planning local CED initiatives • Implementation – Secondary Responsibility – staff involvement of community groups in planning local CED initiatives; Development of social enterprise initiatives 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative - None – BIAs activities within designated areas • Financial – Limited Responsibility – BIAs –activities within designated areas; Chamber(s) of Commerce; Business Community and Financial Services - sponsorship of local CED initiatives • Implementation – Limited Responsibility - BIAs activities within designated areas; Chamber(s) of Commerce (business development and marketing initiatives)

Second Stage Housing

Including supports for women in transition to address alcohol and drug addictions

Housing services for people re-integrating into mainstream society (30 days-2 years), some support provided. Includes second stage housing for women & children fleeing abuse.

Responsibility	Federal Government	Provincial Government	Municipal Government	Health Authority	Community Service Groups	Other
<i>Planning responsibility</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative – Secondary responsibility – support for housing programs – CMHC, HPI, others • Financial – Secondary responsibility – monetary support for planning processes • Implementation – Limited responsibility – support for and participation in planning for 2nd stage and transitional housing. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative – Primary responsibility – housing programs for women & children fleeing abuse, addictions & mental health. • Financial – Primary responsibility – financial support for planning for 2nd stage and transitional housing. MCAWS. BC Housing • Implementation – Primary responsibility – planning for 2nd stage and transitional housing programs and services 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative – Limited responsibility – participation in planning & identifying needs for transitional housing services • Financial – Limited responsibility – participation and support of planning for transitional housing. OCP, homelessness plans and other. • Implementation – Limited responsibility for developing local plans for 2nd stage and transitional housing. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative – N/A • Financial – N/A • Implementation – Secondary responsibility – participation in planning processes, contribution of knowledge and expertise, especially around addictions and mental health services. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative - N/A • Financial – Limited responsibility – some fundraising. Participation in planning processes. • Implementation – Secondary responsibility – participation and support of planning processes for 2nd stage and transitional housing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative - N/A • Financial – None • Implementation – Limited responsibility – community participation in planning processes. Private sector may have a role where there may be ‘scattered units.’
<i>Construction & Siting responsibility</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative – Limited responsibility – some support of transitional housing programs • Financial – Secondary responsibility – capital funding for transitional and 2nd stage housing programs • Implementation – Limited responsibility – oversight of capital expenditures 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative – Primary responsibility – Social services, allocation of resources to support transitional and 2nd stage housing programs. BC Building Code • Financial – Primary responsibility –capital funding for creation of transitional and 2nd stage housing • Implementation- Primary responsibility – oversight of creation, option to build and run programs. Often delegated to community groups. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative – Limited responsibility – zoning, land-use. Building inspections. Development hearings etc. • Financial – Limited responsibility – tools to encourage the creation of 2nd Stage/transitional housing. • Implementation – None – zoning and bylaw enforcement. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative – Limited responsibility – Community care licensing. • Financial – Limited responsibility – coordination of facilities and services with 2nd stage and transitional housing sites. • Implementation – Limited responsibility – community care licensing, health inspections. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative – N/A • Financial – Limited responsibility – Fundraising • Implementation – Secondary responsibility – coordination and implementation of construction, ensuring design appropriate etc. Primary responsibility when delegated by the provincial government. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative - N/A • Financial – Limited responsibility – donations, public participation. • Implementation – None
<i>Operational responsibility</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative – Limited responsibility – Some role in oversight of federally funded programs • Financial – Limited responsibility – oversight and financing of operation costs in the case of some time-limited funding programs. • Implementation – Limited responsibility – oversight of federally funded programs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative – Primary responsibility - social programs, organization and oversight of transitional and 2nd stage housing programs • Financial – Primary responsibility – funding of operations • Implementation – Primary responsibility – option to run programs in desired, otherwise oversight of delegated community agencies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative – Limited responsibility – ensuring zoning compliance, policing etc. • Financial – None • Implementation – Limited responsibility – support of programs, access to recreational programs by residents. Some oversight re: Building code, bylaw enforcement, and zoning. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative – N/A • Financial – Secondary responsibility – health care related support services for ongoing programs • Implementation – Secondary responsibility – Provision of health care services, health related supports to residents of second-stage/transitional housing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative – N/A • Financial – Limited responsibility – some fundraising. Management of budgets for transitional and 2nd stage housing • Implementation – Secondary responsibility – in most cases, operation of transitional/second stage housing programs when delegated by the provincial government. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative –N/A • Financial – Limited responsibility – donations and other forms of financial support • Implementation – Limited responsibility – some community volunteers etc.

Connect isolated populations through volunteer services centre

Responsibility	Federal Government	Provincial Government	Municipal Government	Health Authority	Community Service Groups	Other
<i>Planning responsibility</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative – Limited responsibility – role in supporting planning processes, prioritizing planning options on a national scale • Financial – Limited responsibility – financial support for planning processes at all levels • Implementation – Limited responsibility – participation in planning processes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative – Primary responsibility – coordination of planning processes • Financial – Primary responsibility – financial support for planning & service coordination to meet community needs • Implementation – Primary responsibility – participation in and support of local planning processes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative – Limited responsibility – support of local efforts to plan for service coordination • Financial – Secondary responsibility – participation and support in planning for service coordination • Implementation – Secondary responsibility – planning for local service coordination & social planning. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative – N/A • Financial – None • Implementation – Limited responsibility – participation in planning for service coordination 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative - N/A • Financial – Limited responsibility – staff participation and support of service coordination planning • Implementation – Secondary responsibility – participation in planning processes for service coordination. United Way, Community service teams. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative - N/A • Financial - None • Implementation – Limited responsibility – support and participation by the community in service coordination planning. Business Improvement Association.
<i>Construction & Siting responsibility</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative – None • Financial – Limited responsibility – support of service coordination, possible capital funding for some sites • Implementation – Limited responsibility – possible support and oversight if federal funds involved 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative – Primary responsibility – coordination of social services, prioritization of needs and efforts • Financial – Primary responsibility – capital funding for services, support for siting of coordination services • Implementation- Primary responsibility – support for siting. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative – Secondary responsibility – zoning, land-use in the case of construction. Business licensing in the case of rentals etc. Possible advocacy for construction or siting • Financial – Limited responsibility – support of service coordination efforts • Implementation – Limited responsibility – participation in support of siting or construction 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative – Limited responsibility – coordination of health services • Financial – Limited responsibility – contribution to construction of service coordination facility/facilities where appropriate • Implementation – Limited responsibility – creation of health care aspects of service coordination facilities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative – N/A • Financial - Limited responsibility – management of funds, some fundraising • Implementation – Secondary responsibility – identification and development of site for service coordination / one-stop services, when appropriate 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative - N/A • Financial – Limited responsibility- donations, some volunteer support. • Implementation – None
<i>Operational responsibility</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative – None • Financial – Limited responsibility – possibility of financial support for service coordination and program development • Implementation – Limited responsibility – possible oversight if federal funds involved 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative – Primary responsibility – option to run programs and coordination, or delegate services to community agencies. • Financial – Primary responsibility – social services- responsibility for provision of social services, supporting operating costs • Implementation – Primary responsibility – option to run or delegate service coordination and programs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative – Limited responsibility – building code inspections, zoning where applicable. • Financial – Limited responsibility – support for service coordination through zoning and bylaws. Possible provision of locations in community space. • Implementation – None – May be able to provide some support through publications, libraries or other facilities. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative – Limited responsibility – Health related service coordination • Financial – Limited responsibility – ongoing funding of health care related program coordination • Implementation – Limited responsibility – ongoing operation of health services, coordination of services 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative – N/A • Financial – Limited responsibility – some fundraising. Budget management etc. • Implementation – Secondary responsibility – Volunteer centre can be delegated to community service agencies. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative-N/A • Financial – Limited responsibility – donations, some volunteer support • Implementation - None

Community-based health services for various populations

Including mental health supports, multilingual access to health services, access to health services for the working poor, access to supports for people with brain injuries, access to pre-natal and post-natal health services, in-school meal services in inner-city schools, coordination and integration of services and coordinated youth services

Responsibility	Federal Government	Provincial Government	Municipal Government	Health Authority	Community Service Groups	Other
<i>Planning responsibility</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative – Secondary Responsibility –Health Canada. Canada Health Act. Funding (transferred to provinces) for health services • Financial - – Secondary Responsibility – Funding of health services through transfers to province. Primary responsibility for on-reserve First Nations health costs • Implementation - – Secondary responsibility – participation in health planning and prevention efforts. Support through transfer funding. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative – Primary Responsibility. Ministry of Health. Much is delegated to Health Authorities. • Financial –Primary Responsibility. Funding & planning for all health related concerns. Some financial support received from federal government through transfers. • Implementation – Primary responsibility. Province is primarily responsible for health planning 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative –Limited responsibility. Infrastructure planning and advocacy • Financial – Limited responsibility. Including health issues in land use and other planning initiatives. Support and participation in health care planning processes. • Implementation – Limited responsibility. Participation in health planning initiatives. Advocacy for improved health services in the community. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative - None • Financial – Secondary responsibility – as delegated by the province. • Implementation – Secondary responsibility. – as delegated by the province. Planning for the delivery of health services in the region. Engaging with other partners to ensure health services are appropriate 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative - None • Financial – Limited responsibility – participation and advocacy in health planning processes. • Implementation – Limited responsibility – participation and support for processes. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative - None • Financial – Limited responsibility – school board planning for meal services. • Implementation – Limited responsibility – school board participation in planning processes. Community participation.

The community-based health matrix is continued on the next page.

Continued from previous page...

Community-based health services for various populations

Including mental health supports, multilingual access to health services, access to health services for the working poor, access to supports for people with brain injuries, access to pre-natal and post-natal health services, in-school meal services in inner-city schools, coordination and integration of services and coordinated youth services

<p><i>Construction & Siting responsibility</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative – Secondary responsibility. Canada Health Act & enforcement. • Financial – Secondary responsibility. Funding of health infrastructure through transfers to province. • Implementation – Limited responsibility. Input into construction & parameters of development (through negotiation and Canada health Act) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative – Primary responsibility – largely delegated to health authorities. • Financial – Primary responsibility for funding the creation of health infrastructure, with additional support from federal transfers • Implementation- Primary responsibility. Creation and development of new and existing health infrastructure of all kinds, including community level and prevention efforts. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative – Limited responsibility. Land use and zoning issues. Licensing where appropriate. • Financial – Limited responsibility. Option to provide incentives or other options for the creation of health facilities. • Implementation – Limited responsibility. Building code enforcement, bylaws and licensing. Provision of support and advice on development of health infrastructure and community level health services. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative - None • Financial - Secondary responsibility – as delegated by the province. Funding the creation and siting of health infrastructure • Implementation – Secondary responsibility, as delegated by the province. Creation and maintenance of health facilities and infrastructure. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative - None • Financial – Limited responsibility. Where agencies are involved, fundraising and other efforts to support the creation of health facilities. • Implementation – Limited responsibility. When funded by province or others, then oversight of construction/creation of community health facilities or programs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative - Limited responsibility (school boards) – creation of food services in schools. None (community members) • Financial – Secondary responsibility (School boards) – funding creation of food service programs etc in schools. • Implementation- Limited responsibility (school boards) – including food facilities & other health services in schools
<p><i>Operational Responsibility</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative – Limited Responsibility. Enforcement of Canada Health Act. • Financial – Secondary responsibility. Funding of health care through transfers to provinces. • Implementation – None. Federal governments do not provide health care on the ground, though they can be involved in some prevention efforts through Health Canada. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative – Primary responsibility for operation of health care. Largely delegated to health authorities. • Financial – Primary responsibility, with additional support from federal transfers • Implementation- Primary responsibility for operation of health facilities. Largely delegated to health authorities. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative – None. Support for ongoing health services. • Financial – None. Option to provide support to community based health services using available tools (i.e. property tax breaks etc) • Implementation – None. Municipalities do not provide health services. May partner with or provide space for some kinds of community level health services. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative - None • Financial - Secondary responsibility – as delegated by province. Funding of health facilities and community level health efforts. • Implementation – Secondary responsibility- as delegated by province. All operation of health programs, and support for community based efforts. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative - None • Financial – Limited responsibility. Operational fundraising and management when delegated by province or health authority. • Implementation – Secondary responsibility. Operation of community level services, as delegated by health authority or province. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative - Limited responsibility (school boards) – operation of schools where food services may be provided • Financial – Limited responsibility (school boards) – funding of school meal programs • Implementation – Limited responsibility (school boards) – operation of school meal programs.