1. CALL TO ORDER

2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

3. ADOPTION OF PREVIOUS NOTES

   3.1 Approval of Notes of the Committee-of-the-Whole
       Meeting held Monday, November 18, 2019

4. DELEGATIONS & PRESENTATIONS

5. BUSINESS ARISING FROM PRESENTATIONS

6. CLOSED SESSION

   6.1 Market Compensation

       FOIP s. 24 and 25

       (P. Benedetto - 10 minutes)

7. RISE AND REPORT FROM CLOSED SESSION

8. REPORTS FROM COMMITTEE & ADMINISTRATION

   8.1 Social Service Delivery Review

       (D. Brock / G. Sidhu-Virdi and D. Howery, Applications Management Consulting
        Ltd. - 30 minutes)

       TIME SPECIFIC 5:00 PM

       (Presentation Attached)

   8.2 Reserve Workshop #2

       (Metrix Group - 1.5 hours)

       (Presentation Attached)
9. INFORMATION ITEMS

10. ADJOURNMENT
NOTES OF THE CITY OF LEDUC
COMMITTEE-OF-THE-WHOLE MEETING

Monday, November 18, 2019

Present: Mayor B. Young, Councillor B. Beckett, Councillor G. Finstad, Councillor B. Hamilton, Councillor L. Hansen, Councillor T. Lazowski, Councillor L. Tillack

Also Present: P. Benedetto, City Manager, S. Davis, City Clerk

1. CALL TO ORDER
   Mayor B. Young called the meeting to order at 5:03 pm.

2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA
   
   MOVED by Councillor L. Hansen
   That the Committee-of-the-Whole approve the agenda as presented.

   Motion Carried Unanimously

3. ADOPTION OF PREVIOUS NOTES

   3.1 Approval of Notes of the Committee-of-the-Whole Meeting held Tuesday, November 12, 2019

   MOVED by Councillor B. Beckett
   That the notes of the Committee-of-the-Whole meeting held on Tuesday, November 12, 2019, be approved as presented.

   Motion Carried Unanimously

4. DELEGATIONS & PRESENTATIONS
   
   There were no delegations or presentations.

5. BUSINESS ARISING FROM PRESENTATIONS
6. CLOSED SESSION

MOVED by Councillor G. Finstad

That Committee-of-the-Whole move into Closed Session at 5:04 pm.

Motion Carried Unanimously

6.1 Leduc Golf Club Agreement Update

FOIP s. 16, 24 & 25

MOVED by Councillor B. Beckett

That Committee-of-the-Whole move into Open Session at 5:25 pm.

Motion Carried Unanimously

7. RISE AND REPORT FROM CLOSED SESSION

7.1 Leduc Golf Club Agreement Update

FOIP s. 16, 24 & 25

Also in attendance:

Executive Team

B. Knisley, Special Projects Manager, Facilities

G. Klenke, City Solicitor

S. Davis, City Clerk

D. Melvie, General Manager, Community and Protective Services, made a PowerPoint presentation (Attached to Revised Closed Session agenda).

D. Melvie, G. Klenke, B. Knisley, Mayor B. Young, P. Benedetto, City Manager, and I. Sasyniuk, General Manager, Corporate Services, answered the Committee's questions.

8. REPORTS FROM COMMITTEE & ADMINISTRATION

8.1 Recreation Cost Sharing Agreement Update

J. Kamlah, Director, Recreation Services, made a PowerPoint presentation (Attached to agenda), which highlighted proposed changes to the Recreation Cost Sharing Agreement with Leduc County.
J. Kamlah and P. Benedetto, City Manager, answered the Committee's questions.
Committee requested that this item be brought forward to the December 2, 2019, Council meeting for Council consideration.

8.2 **Legislated Advertising Requirements**

S. Davis, City Clerk, made a verbal presentation and answered the Committee's questions.

**MOVED by** Councillor L. Hansen

That Administration be directed to bring forward, for Council's consideration, a Bylaw relative to legislated advertising requirements as permitted under the *Municipal Government Act.*

*Motion Carried Unanimously*

9. **INFORMATION ITEMS**

There were no information items.

10. **ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting adjourned at 5:49 pm.

________________________________________

B. YOUNG, Mayor

________________________________________

S. DAVIS, City Clerk
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1. Introduction

The City of Leduc Social Research Project aims to understand local social service challenges and opportunities for stakeholders and residents, and to identify direction for improved and efficient service provision in the future.

This project focuses on City of Leduc Family and Community Support Services (FCSS), which is the functional area within the City structure that provides preventative social services to Leduc residents. As part of their role, Leduc FCSS works closely with local agencies and regional service providers to deliver high quality people centred services. Client needs are often complex, necessitating them to require assistance to navigate through the social service system to access the appropriate programs for their individual needs from various service providers. Meeting these needs requires Leduc FCSS to build and sustain effective communication and collaboration with stakeholders through establishing and continuing strong relationships. A priority for Leduc FCSS is to ensure access to human services for residents by strengthening the capacity of local agencies to provide effective services, working with other organizations to provide comprehensive services, identifying and addressing service gaps and overlaps in services, and promoting awareness of what FCSS does and who FCSS is.

This project undertook a detailed background review of community assets and demographic trends and consulted with stakeholders and residents through various engagement methods to explore the following key research questions:

- What are the human service needs in Leduc? What are the human service gaps, overlap of services, and strengths?
- Is there a clear understanding among community service providers about FCSS and its role in service provision?
- What are the relationship needs in order to improve interagency communication and collaboration? Does commitment exist among local providers to build and sustain relationships?
- What are the internal and external relationships like in the City and among local service providers?
- What service delivery solutions, strategies or modifications could be suggested that could be feasibly implemented to maximize positive impacts and minimize negative ones?
- What evidence exists from the social research conducted during the project to support various courses of action?

The recommendations within this are solution focused and considerate of current resources moving forward. This work will also inform the City’s 2020 Social Needs Assessment.
2. Project Process


The Background Review phase undertook a thorough environmental scan to examine the current landscape in Leduc. A current inventory of programs and services, including those that are currently supported by FCSS, created a baseline for an assessment of the social services in Leduc. A demographic analysis shaped an understanding of the current population trends in Leduc. An exploration of relevant municipal and provincial documents provided context about local, regional and provincial social sector priorities. This information served as a starting point for identifying the needs and assets of social service stakeholders in Leduc.

For further information about Phase 1 of the project, see Appendices A, B and C.

The Needs Identification and Recommendations phases included a cross-section of stakeholders and residents in Leduc. In total, we heard from 141 respondents through four main engagement methods. The main focus of the project was to engage with stakeholders, with widespread representation from 107 respondents contributing through a stakeholder survey, workshop sessions, and key informant interviews. The project also included a limited amount of resident engagement, with 34 respondents participating through a community event and lived experience workshop.

Engagement Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Engagement Method</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Breakdown by Engagement Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder Survey</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>Online Surveys - 59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*includes partial survey completion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop Sessions</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Council - 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*count of all participants</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lived Experience - 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Informant Interviews</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Council &amp; Administration - 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*in person and telephone conversations</td>
<td></td>
<td>FCSS Staff - 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Event</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Social Service Stakeholders - 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*count of event board responses</td>
<td></td>
<td>Party in Alexandra Park - 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>141</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For further information about Phases 2 and 3 of the project, see Appendix D.
The Final Reporting includes observations, suggestions, options and recommendations for Leduc FCSS to consider moving forward. A detailed, organized analysis of the key research questions for this project is presented. What we learned from the background review and what we heard during the engagement process served as evidence for the formulation of the recommendations in this final report. These are informed by the social research, analysis and review undertaken throughout the course of this project.
3. Local Human Services

The social needs for residents and communities are always evolving based on demand for and supply of local human services. This is especially true for Leduc, where the economic and demographic trends have changed dramatically in recent years.

The recent downturn in the economy and drop in oil prices has negatively impacted Alberta, and Leduc specifically. The oil and gas industry is a key sector for Leduc and the economic and employment impacts have resulted in an increase in residents requiring social supports.

Leduc’s population has more than doubled since 2001, from a population of 15,032 to 33,032 in 2019. This represents an average annual growth rate of 4.5% over this period.

Between 2010 and 2019, the age distribution of the population of Leduc shifted. The proportion of children and seniors in Leduc has grown. Children ages 0-14 comprised 20.9% of the population in 2010, compared to 21.6% in 2019. Seniors ages 65 and over made up 10.7% of the population in 2010, compared to 14.5% in 2019. Meanwhile, the proportion of the working age population ages 15-64 decreased from 68.4% to 63.9% over the same period.

Between 2011 and 2016, the family composition in Leduc shifted as well. The proportion of individuals not in families declined, from 32.8% in 2011 to 32.4% in 2016. The proportion of couple families with children decreased, from 32.7% to 32.0%, as did the proportion of couple families without children, from 25.8% to 25.7%. Conversely, the proportion of lone parent families increased, from 8.7% in 2011 to 9.9% in 2016.

The prevalence of low income in Leduc increased between 2005 and 2015, based on the Low Income Measure, after tax (LMI-AT). Between 2005 and 2015, the overall proportion of Leduc’s population that are low income increased from 4.2% to 6.8%. The proportion of children ages 0 to 17 years old that are low income increased from 5.8% to 8.9%.

The population of Leduc comprises a range of individuals and families that require supports that encompass a diversity of age, family composition, income, housing and human service needs.
3.1. Existing Programs and Services

Human services are provided within Leduc by Leduc FCSS and various other local, regional and provincial social service organizations.

Leduc FCSS directly offers a variety of preventative social support services, as well as access to assistance programs for Leduc residents of all ages and walks of life. FCSS engages children and youth in Leduc in healthy activities and works one-on-one with them to increase their assets and connection to the community. FCSS works directly with families and individuals to help them access resources and develop skills and strategies in response to life struggles. FCSS provides information on services, programs and events for older adults and families caring for older adults in Leduc. FCSS works with local and regional organizations as well as residents to build partnerships and create a greater sense of belonging for the community. FCSS also advances community and social development in Leduc.

Leduc FCSS offers around 50 regular programs and services for a range of service delivery types, including community, adult and family, child and youth, and seniors. The highest number of programs and services are geared towards the community, while the lowest number are designed for seniors.

**FCSS Program/Service Summary by Service Delivery Type**

More details about these FCSS programs and services are captured in the table on the following page.
## FCSS Programs/Services by Service Delivery Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program/Service</th>
<th>Target Demographic Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addictions Support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Learning Initiative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-Bullying Initiatives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asset Building</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Babysitter Referral Service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Block Party</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bringing Baby Home Workshop</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canadian Tire Jumpstart - Leduc Chapter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannabis Awareness and Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children in Change Workshop</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-Parenting Workshop</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative Culture Connections Program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Social Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everybody Gets to Play</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Support Program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feintanyl Information Session</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good Neighbour Day</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good Neighbour Initiative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harm Reduction Workshop</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthy Hearts Leduc</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heroes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Alone Workshop</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homemaking Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Advocate Program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information &amp; Referral Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interagency Brown Bag Sessions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leduc &amp; District Family Violence Prevention Team</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leduc Community Drug Action Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leduc Unplugged</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meals On Wheels Program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meet the Parents Dinner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MNP Kids for Kids</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naloxone Training Information Session</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbour Challenge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbour Connector Initiative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older Adult Services Program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opioid Crisis Response</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panorama Newsletter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Disaster Preparedness Information Session</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pitch in Week</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raising Confident and Competent Children Parent Education Session</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation Assistance Program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Cross Volunteer Recruitment Information Session</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rock Your Block Bootcamp</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soup Night</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsidized Counselling Program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer Income Tax Program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer Leduc</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Outreach Program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annual FCSS Program Reports identify expenditures for service delivery types for Leduc FCSS and FCSS programs across Alberta. Based on this data, the City of Leduc is allocating a lower share of its FCSS program expenditures to families, seniors, and children and youth. A higher share of City of Leduc FCSS program expenditures are going towards community development, FCSS management, and adults. The total for Leduc FCSS is over $1,775,000.¹

Percent of FCSS Program Expenditures by Service Delivery Type²

The FCSS provincial comparison above is provided as information, and should not be considered to be indicative of an ideal share of expenditures by service delivery type. There are variations in community demographics across Alberta to consider, as well as differences in the community’s social needs and issues.

¹ The total expenditures for Leduc FCSS is $1,315,031, based on the 2018 Annual FCSS Program Report. We have added approximately $460,000, which represents the funding for social services related to FCSS.

There are also 27 local service providers that offer programs and services within Leduc. These local service providers operate in a range of human service areas.

Other service areas reported included Child and youth programming (2), Clothing (2), Seniors programming (2), Child and youth protection services, Correctional services, FASD support, Furniture, Income support, Intimate partner violence counselling, Library services, Life skills, Protection services, Social development, and Victim assistance.

In addition to these identified service areas, many of the organizations provide information and referral to their clients to assist them in accessing other service providers relevant to their unique situations. A number of these organizations also provide impactful, rewarding volunteer opportunities to the community.

**Service Areas Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Area</th>
<th>Number of Organizations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recreation &amp; leisure opportunities</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental wellness &amp; addiction supports</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing supports</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job &amp; training programs</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parenting programs/ services</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early childhood programs</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical health supports</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childcare</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food access</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>74</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

More details about these local service providers are captured in the table on the following page.
In addition to the human services offered within Leduc, Leduc residents access programs and services in the City of Edmonton and other municipalities in the Edmonton Metropolitan Region.
3.2. Current Social Needs

For a municipality to function and be sustainable, the basic needs of its residents and communities must be met. A socially sustainable city must have the ability to maintain and build human services capacity, and have the resilience to prevent and address social issues in the future.

The City of Leduc’s 2015 FCSS Needs Assessment identified the following as key social needs to be addressed:

- Improve transportation services;
- Expand housing and social services for seniors;
- Create more social engagement opportunities for youth;
- Connect newcomers with immigration and ESL support services;
- Improve availability of affordable and low-income housing; and
- Increase resident volunteerism.

In order to fully assess the current social needs in Leduc, a comprehensive public engagement process should be undertaken to consult with residents and stakeholders about needs identification. This project undertook a more focused engagement approach to answer the key research questions outlined in the Introduction of this report. Therefore, what is presented here should be considered a starting point to determining what the current social needs are.

Leduc residents identified their most important social issues. There are number of specific and specialized programs and services that residents said are lacking in Leduc.

Resident Engagement - What We Heard

**Most Important Social Issues**

- There is a lack of affordable/free activities for residents of all ages, particularly seniors and youth.
- Residents would like more information about the programs and services available that are relevant to them.
- Social supports are not available on weekends or holidays.
- There is a lack of programs and services provided on the west side of Leduc.
- There is a lack of programs and services for special needs (e.g. ADHD, physical mobility challenges).
- The local specialized physical health services are limited (e.g.: OBGYN, cancer care).
- Limited availability to local specialized mental health services (e.g.: children’s, geriatric).
- There is a lack of other language programs and supports.
- Need more local crisis and support groups.
- Limited transportation options (e.g. Leduc Transit limited hours/routes, areas without accessible sidewalks).
Stakeholder survey participants were asked to identify the top 5 social issues in Leduc by highest priority. Overall, Depression or other mental health concerns was reported the most times. Substance use/addiction, Availability of low income/subsidized housing and Domestic and family violence were also identified frequently.

Other social issues reported included LGBTQ2S rights and Palliative hospice care.

### Please rank the TOP 5 following social issues from 1-5, with 1 being the highest priority in the City of Leduc. (n=44)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Issue</th>
<th>Ranked</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Depression or other mental health concerns</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance use/addiction</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of low income/subsidized housing</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic and family violence</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homelessness</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isolation and loneliness</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing options for all life stages</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of public transportation</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation and leisure activities for all ages</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility for persons with disabilities</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal activity</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bullying</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsafe communities</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of childcare</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility to physical health services</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrimination</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elder abuse</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Stakeholder survey participants were also asked to identify the top 3 social service areas in Leduc by highest priority. Overall, Mental health and addiction supports was reported the most times. Housing supports, Job and training programs, and Parenting programs/services were also identified frequently.

Other social service areas reported included Community connections, Counselling and therapy, Palliative hospice care, Youth centre, and Youth development.

Please rank the TOP 3 following social service areas from 1-3, with 1 being the highest priority for improving the quality of life for residents in the City of Leduc. (n=50)
Stakeholder survey participants identified the biggest barriers for their clients in the City of Leduc. Overall, Lack of transportation was reported the most times. This was followed closely by Cost of programs/services and Lack of information about programs/services available.

Other barriers reported included the following comments:

- Staff of social service agency are not respectful
- Wait times/wait lists
- No family doctor
- Agency criteria and staff interpretation of who gets to access support is dependant on the staff and person assumptions and bias
- Process that clients have to go through to get to see a Mental Health Therapist or an Addictions Counsellor
- Age related problems such as mobility
- Mental health issues, so counselling should be made available for free or at least at a discounted rate for those who truly need it

What are the biggest barriers your clients in the City of Leduc face to accessing social programs and services? Please check all that apply. (n=39)
3.3. Service Gaps and Overlaps

Identifying and addressing service gaps and duplication is key to ensuring an efficient and effective social service sector that meets the human service needs of residents and communities.

Service Gaps

Stakeholders identified a number of potential service gaps that exist in Leduc. Some key potential service gaps are availability of affordable social and recreation activities for all ages, access to specialized mental health services locally, access to year round emergency shelter, transportation options for residents, and adequate, affordable housing to meet the local demand.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder Engagement - What We Heard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Service Gaps</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▶ Not enough affordable, low income, subsidized and seniors housing in Leduc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▶ Lack of availability of local mental health and addictions services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▶ Need for greater awareness and education around mental wellness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▶ Residents of all ages want greater access to low/no cost social activities and recreational programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▶ Lack of wrap around services to meet the needs of a growing homeless population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▶ Readily accessible information for residents and service providers about local resources available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▶ Transportation is a barrier for residents, especially on the west side of the city</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▶ Engagement and supports for high risk youth to ensure they feel included and connected to their community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▶ Greater access to healthy, nutritious food for those experiencing food insecurity and hunger</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Service Overlaps

Stakeholder survey respondents were asked if they see duplications of service among what Leduc FCSS and other local agencies and service providers are doing. Overall, 61% of survey respondents reported that they do not see duplications of service.

Based on your understanding of what City of Leduc FCSS and other local agencies and service providers are doing, do you see duplications of service? (n=36)

Stakeholder survey respondents were given the opportunity to describe the duplications of service they see.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder Engagement - What We Heard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Service Duplications</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‣ City funds other agencies to do what they presently have their own staff doing (e.g. housing subsidies).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‣ Food Bank clients seek access to food from other agencies to get through the month.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‣ Various agencies provide social work services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‣ Numerous organizations provide financial assistance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‣ Service providers end up dealing with issues outside of their mandate because clients face difficulty navigating the system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‣ Organizations are competing with each other instead of partnering to provide services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‣ Youth engagement is not coordinated between agencies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‣ Some organizations are working outside of their scope of practice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‣ Duplication is positive for clients in Leduc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
While some stakeholders reported duplication of service in Leduc, when we followed up with them the examples they gave were not determined to be redundant programs. There was no substantive evidence of duplication of service or program redundancy in Leduc.

There are similar and complementary services in Leduc, as well as potential service overlaps. However, the existence of choice in human services is often positive for service users. In many cases, one organization may not be able to meet the full breadth of the need in a particular service area. In addition, the demand for services may be such that it necessitates more than one organization delivering programs in that service area.

The stakeholder interviews followed up to hear more about service overlaps in Leduc.

### Stakeholder Engagement - What We Heard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Overlaps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leduc FCSS and Leduc Regional Housing Foundation work to ensure housing subsidies do not overlap.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leduc Hub Association and the Society of St. Vincent de Paul share information and collaborate to meet needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple counselling agencies and mental health providers exist to meet a demand for the same type of service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leduc Community Living Association and Leduc LINX Connect Centre provide similar services in order to meet local demand for supports to persons with disabilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Various interagency groups meet with similar purposes and some of the same faces around the table.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some service providers may not be working together to prevent service overlaps.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some similar and complementary services were observed during the background review and public engagement phases of the project. Stakeholders providing these should be encouraged to communicate better together when program planning to ensure that service overlaps are minimized and duplication of service does not occur. These services include the following examples:

- Boys & Girls Club of Leduc and Leduc Public Library offer after school programs for children and youth.
- Leduc & District Seniors Centre and Leduc Public Library offer programs for seniors.
- Parent Link and Leduc Public Library offer early childhood development programs.
- Leduc & District Food Bank and Santa’s Helpers Society provide food hampers in December.
- Leduc LINX Connect Centre and Leduc Community Living Association provide housing, employment, recreation and leisure, respite care and other supports to persons with disabilities and their families.
- Alberta Supports, Leduc Public Library and Leduc Adult Learning Council provide job and training programs.
Karunia Counselling and Family Counselling Centres provide counselling through Leduc FCSS's counselling subsidy program.

Leduc FCSS, Parent Link and Leduc Public Library offer parenting programs and services.

Various service providers are providing similar financial assistance to clients.

Numerous interagency groups exist among agencies in Leduc.

Black Gold Regional School Division and St. Thomas Aquinas Roman Catholic School Division provide preschool programs, parenting programs and services, and bus transportation for their respective student populations.

City of Leduc FCSS and Leduc Regional Housing Foundation provide financial housing supports to eligible residents. City of Leduc offers an Eviction Prevention Program, where clients are given a loan. LRHF provides housing subsidies, which do not include the expectation of pay back. The two organizations coordinate services to ensure that individuals do not receive both at the same time.

Service providers provide information and referral services to clients to connect them with appropriate programs and services.

Service providers provide volunteer opportunities to interested community members.
4. Understanding & Awareness of FCSS and Local Service Providers

Understanding and awareness of existing programs and services offered across the social sector is important for organizations to adequately support clients in addressing their social needs.

During the engagement process, stakeholders were asked about their understanding of FCSS and local service providers and experiences engaging with FCSS.

Understanding of FCSS Programs and Services

Stakeholder survey participants were asked to describe their understanding of what the City of Leduc FCSS does and what programs and services it provides. Overall, 85% of survey respondents reported that they have a Very Good or Good understanding of the services provided by City of Leduc FCSS.

How would you describe your understanding of what City of Leduc FCSS does and what programs and services it provides? (n=40)
Experience Engaging with FCSS

Stakeholder survey participants were asked to describe their experience engaging with City of Leduc FCSS. Overall, 83% of survey respondents reported their experience as Very Good or Good with City of Leduc FCSS.

How would you describe your experience engaging with City of Leduc FCSS? (n=36)

During engagement, residents also reported their experiences accessing FCSS programs and services throughout the City of Leduc. While residents discussed their individual experiences, some common themes emerged from the discussion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resident Engagement - What We Heard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Awareness of FCSS: Awareness of the range of programs and services offered was identified as a challenge for residents who had not previously accessed any social supports.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiences engaging with FCSS: Residents who identified accessing programs and services through FCSS reported positive experiences and relationships with FCSS staff.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3 Based on findings from Lived Experienced Workshop.
Stakeholders identified both positive and challenging experiences in working with FCSS. Generally, local service providers reported that FCSS was a key resource that they could reach out to for support. However, some agencies reported barriers and roadblocks in their experiences.

### Stakeholder Engagement - What We Heard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience Engaging with FCSS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive experiences engaging with all FCSS broadly in the region.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good working relationship with FCSS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff are friendly and passionate about meeting clients needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easy to work with on referrals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valuable resource to support service providers with administrative work and setting up intake process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficult to approach and not always open to supporting service provider initiatives.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opportunities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regular site visits by FCSS staff to agencies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More opportunities for face to face meetings with FCSS and local service providers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCSS seeks out more information about how to support local service providers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Understanding of Local Service Providers

Stakeholder survey participants were asked to describe their understanding of what other local agencies and service providers do and what programs and services they provide. Overall, 86% of survey respondents have a Very Good or Good understanding of the services provided by local agencies and service providers.
How would you describe your understanding of what other local agencies and services providers do and what programs and services they provide? (n=36)

Follow up discussions with stakeholders identified that service providers have a desire for greater information sharing and building of awareness of existing programs and services in the community.

### Stakeholder Engagement - What We Heard

**Experience Engaging among Local Service Providers**
- Lack of information sharing with some organizations.
- Some organizations are willing to support others more than others.
- Smaller or new service providers can be left out of the loop.

**Opportunities**
- Increased opportunities for sharing information with all organizations through inter-agency and other in person events.
- Find ways to promote organizations and the work that they do.
- Introducing new service providers to the social sector community.
5. Social Sector Collaboration & Communication

Municipal participation in the FCSS program allows for significant local autonomy. This autonomy takes place within the FCSS mandate and guidelines in the Family and Community Support Services Act and Regulation Section 2(c) of the Regulation states that municipalities must "encourage and facilitate cooperation and coordination with allied service agencies operating within the municipality." As such, FCSS programs are legally obligated to cooperate with local service providers and community groups.

Social sector collaboration and communication is vital for FCSS to achieve its program mandate.

According to the FCSS Regulation, in providing for the establishment, administration and operation of a FCSS program, a municipality must do all of the following:

- promote and facilitate the development of stronger communities;
- promote public participation in planning, delivering and governing the program and services provided under the program;
- promote and facilitate the involvement of volunteers;
- promote efficient and effective use of resources; and
- promote and facilitate co-operation and co-ordination with allied service agencies operating within the municipality.

FCSS plays a significant role in community development and building local partnerships to support stronger communities that are able to address the social needs of its residents. FCSS must often collaborate with various stakeholder groups including:

- Non-profit organizations and community groups
- Government agencies
- Schools
- Inter-group committees and Boards
- Local business sector

---

4 Working Together With Community Organizations. Family and Community Support Services Association of Alberta. 1999

5 Family and Community Support Services Act and Regulation
Partnerships and community collaboration often help to prevent duplication of service, reduce service overlaps and increase the sharing of resources, which help support greater efficiency and effective use of resources.

**Stakeholder Engagement**

During the stakeholder engagement process stakeholders were asked about their thoughts around collaboration and communication in the social sector.

### Stakeholder Engagement - What We Heard

**Challenges to Collaboration**
- Capacity of local agencies to engage and collaborate with others in the sector.
- FCSS collaborates better with some organizations than others.
- Many groups meet and have positive discussions but lack prioritization of actions.
- Lack of information sharing across the sector.
- Staff turnover and changes to programs and services makes it difficult for service providers to keep current of everything offered across the sector.
- Non-profit Executive Directors meeting is limited to paid Executive Directors which excludes some agencies.
- Agencies feel competition for funding and volunteer base and this limits collaboration.
- New and smaller organization can face challenges with having opportunities to have meaningful collaboration and communication.
- Relationship challenges between FCSS and agencies in some cases, reduces opportunities for effective collaboration and communication.

### Stakeholder Engagement - What We Heard

**Opportunities for Collaboration**
- Continue to use Interagency as an opportunity to connect FCSS and local agencies and share information.
- Increased opportunities for groups to meet more regularly to collaborate.
- FCSS continue to offer training opportunities for agencies in the community.
- Greater support for initiatives from management and upper levels.
- Regular touch points between FCSS and local agencies.
- Identify new service providers and connect them with existing groups.
- FCSS plays a lead role in coordination and to move the sector forward.
- More coordinated efforts to improve collaboration and communication.
- Increased use of shared space to support clients.
- FCSS should be the role models for the local agencies.
- FCSS should have a better understanding of what everyone is doing.
- FCSS should have more direct contact with agencies.
- Develop a strategy of openness where City of Leduc and FCSS are clear about expectations.
6. Internal & External Relationships

A significant factor of successful municipal management is the ongoing relationship between a municipal council, administration and city staff. There is a need for internal cooperation for organizations to function well and best serve the residents of the community.

Internal cooperation within an organization is supported by a common vision, trust, transparency and information sharing.

During the stakeholder engagement process, internal staff identified challenges and opportunities related to internal relationships within the organization. Generally, relationships were considered to be positive and collaborative in nature within the FCSS department. However, there was expressed need for greater leadership, vision and expectations from higher levels within the organization.

Internal Relationships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder Engagement - What We Heard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FCSS Staff Relationships</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‣ The day-to-day collaboration is wonderful and helpful.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‣ FCSS is a great team that works well together.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‣ Work together well with other City departments, such as Parks and Development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‣ There is a lot of collaboration between FCSS staff. Staff share ideas and support each other.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>City Staff Relationships</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‣ More leadership and vision from top level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‣ Better communication from management.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‣ Continue to focus on a culture that is driven by the desire to meet the needs of clients.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‣ Continue to foster better relations with FCSS; Arts, Culture &amp; Heritage; Parks &amp; Recreation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
External Relationships

During the stakeholder engagement process, internal staff and local service providers identified challenges and opportunities related to FCSS and local service providers and among service providers. This resulted in mixed feelings of both positive and strained relationships across the sector.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder Engagement - What We Heard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Challenges</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‣ There are some person based and personality conflicts, so it becomes hard to work with certain agencies without stepping on toes of management.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‣ Relationship strains exist because agencies have different eligibility requirements for clients and differing ways of delivering programs and services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‣ Lack of trust amongst agencies and with FCSS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‣ Some agencies put up barriers to collaborate on initiatives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‣ Non-profits have problems working together because it can be seen as a threat to their funding and stability.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Opportunities**                       |
| ‣ As an organization FCSS must lead by example with trust and respect. |
| ‣ There could be a better understanding across the social sector of what each agency is doing. |
| ‣ Open communication.                   |
| ‣ More outreach within the community to establish direct relationships with agencies and clients. |
7. Service Delivery Options

7.1. FCSS Service Delivery Model

Social service delivery models vary widely across municipalities. They generally fall along a continuum of direct service (internal) and the indirect service (external) delivery provided by third party providers. The City of Leduc FCSS and related services employ a hybrid of City provided services and funding of community-based non-profit service providers. City of Leduc FCSS internally provides services that include administration of the FCSS program, child and youth development, adult programming, seniors programming, community development and preventive family counselling.

City of Leduc Current FCSS Service Delivery Model

In 2018, the City of Leduc FCSS had total expenditures of $1,315,031, which included $100,000 funding to an external service provider.\(^6\) In addition to this, the City of Leduc also funded 10 additional local service providers with an estimated $460,000.\(^7\) The total estimated expenditures of $1,775,000 includes both internal program and service delivery and providing funding to external (third party providers). Based on the total expenditures, the distribution of expenditures between internal and external is approximately 68% internal and 32% external.

Percent of Internal Expenditures vs. External Expenditures

---

\(^6\) 2018 Annual FCSS Program Report, City of Leduc.

\(^7\) This includes funding provided by the City of Leduc to local service providers that is not included in the FCSS annual budget.
Annual FCSS Program Reports identify internal vs. external expenditures for FCSS Regions across Alberta. Based on this data, there is a range of the percent of internal expenditures from 92% in Yellowhead Region to 30% in Calgary/Bow River Region. The City of Leduc falls within this range of internal expenditures.

Percent of Internal Expenditures vs. Grants to External Groups by FCSS Region

The FCSS Region comparison above is provided as information, and should not be considered to be indicative of an ideal share of internal vs. external expenditures. There are differences in municipality size to consider, as well as the community’s proximity to a larger metropolitan region. In addition, it should be noted that the City of Leduc is part of the Edmonton/Evergreen region.

---

The existence of a range of internal vs. external expenditures is to be expected. FCSS programs are intended to be flexible to address the local needs and social issues. Municipalities have the autonomy and ability to respond to the unique situations in their communities by allocating funds. Each municipality is also expected to have different internal and external capacity and strengths, therefore the types of services and how they are delivered will vary. FCSS programs are designed to allow the municipalities and communities to customize their program through determination of the following:

- What the priorities are;
- What the most effective and efficient ways to deliver services are; and
- How to allocate funds for services.

Currently within the City of Leduc, external agencies are being funded through both the City of Leduc FCSS Department and a Direct Municipal Management structure. The majority of external funding is being approved through the Direct Municipal Management structure which involves Council having a hands on approach and being involved in approving grants to community organizations. This approach is common among smaller municipalities across Alberta.

In Alberta, preventive social services are provided through FCSS programs by direct service delivery or indirectly through external grants, or a combination of both methods (hybrid service delivery model).

Direct Service Delivery includes a FCSS program director (and staff) who deliver services and projects, within the parameters of FCSS legislation. Staff are typically direct employees of the municipality or contracted full-time or part-time service providers. Indirect service delivery is where FCSS funds are granted to local organizations and groups to deliver preventive social services, within the parameters of FCSS legislation. For indirect service delivery to be effective grant applications and year end reporting must be in place for accountability to the municipality and the Province.

As identified on the previous page, the City of Leduc delivers FCSS programming through a hybrid service delivery model which includes direct service (i.e. internal) delivery and granting funds to third party providers within the community (i.e. external). It is not apparent that there is a best practice in the internal or external delivery of FCSS programs and services. Across the social service sector within each municipality there are unique strengths and weaknesses and these should be used to develop an effective approach that builds community capacity and local partnerships so that the community has the ability to respond to the evolving social needs of residents.

The following pages identify some potential benefits and challenges associated with direct and indirect service delivery models.
## Direct Service Delivery

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Benefits</th>
<th>Potential Challenges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Direct managerial, administration and reporting.</td>
<td>• Cost of delivering programs and services may be more. It is expected that non-public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Direct operational control over delivery of programs</td>
<td>service delivery is more efficient than that public service delivery. This is very</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and services. Typically will allow for more timely</td>
<td>circumstance specific.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>operational oversight.</td>
<td>• May not have have the full range of knowledge and expertise internally to deliver the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Maybe more responsive to changes in service needs as</td>
<td>range of programs and services required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>compared to outsourcing. For example, if there are</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>funding requirements or savings these can be more</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quickly reallocated to priorities as opposed to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>having to wait for the next contracting/budget cycle.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Issues with performance and efficiency can be dealt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with more quickly than waiting for the next</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>contracting/budget cycle.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Potential economies of organizational costs and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>space costs of providing services directly as these</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>can take advantage of municipal overhead services and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>facilities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Indirect Service Delivery

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Benefits</th>
<th>Potential Challenges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Potential for more innovation and ingenuity in service delivery.</td>
<td>• Management of contracts with agencies and reporting requirements. Added inefficiencies and overheads associated with managing contracts and overseeing results.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Can build capacity within the community to help address issues/Local expertise/passionate people.</td>
<td>• FCSS will need some administrative oversight to ensure that overall, resources are allocated effectively and service gaps are minimized.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Can create more “champions” out in the community helping to address needs and understanding needs.</td>
<td>• FCSS will need to setup meetings with external agencies/more admin on FCSS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The need for more administrative oversight by FCSS could lead to the potential for greater collaboration between FCSS and local service providers.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Potential for more innovation and ingenuity in service delivery.  

---

7.2. Community Hub

During the engagement process, stakeholders were asked questions about their general understanding of a Community Hub and their willingness as an organization to be involved.

A Community Hub was presented as “a space that brings together community service providers and groups to offer a range of programs, services, activities and events for residents of the community.”

Overall, local service providers were aware of the concept of a Community Hub as a shared space for community service providers to provide programs. Generally, service providers expressed an interest in further engagement around the Community Hub concept.

### Stakeholder Engagement - What We Heard

**Potential Benefits**
- Co-location would facilitate service provider relationships and information sharing.
- Clients would be coming to one place and getting referrals to agencies within the same location.
- Reduce barriers to service.
- Potential cost savings with sharing of administrative and office resources.
- Less likelihood of duplicating services.
- Advertisement of one location is easier and benefits those that are unable to advertise or in difficult to access locations.
- Central location which provides good access for clients.
- Flexible spaces to accommodate the needs of service providers.

**Potential Challenges**
- Needs to resolve some relationship strains before all agencies may feel conformable in the same space.
- Clients rights to privacy and autonomy.
- Some key organizations would still not be located in this potential space (i.e. Alberta Works/Probation/Children & Family Services, AHS Addiction & Mental Health, Service Canada).
- Everyone should be invited to this space, however there may be space limitations.
- Determining the role of agencies and FCSS in this approach.
- Identifying a central location.
- Role of neighbouring municipalities and FCSS programs in this approach.
- Central location for social services can also lead to greater congregation of clients in one area.
- This approach needs to have a common vision among FCSS and the service providers.
7.3. FCSS Board

The City of Leduc has a Family and Community Support Services Advisory Board that was established in 1997 with a purpose to advise Council on a range of appropriate preventive social services that are sufficient to meet the needs of the citizens of the community.  

The current mandate of the Board covers some of the needs identified by this project, as outlined in the commentary below. The mandate for the Board as set out in Bylaw 396-97 includes the following nine key items:

- The said Board shall act in an advisory capacity to the Council in relation to all questions affecting the development of the Family and Community Support Services Programs. Council can benefit from strategic advice related to the development of FCSS programs. The Board could be one of the main avenues of providing this input, along with input from City staff and Administration and external local service providers.

- The Board shall actively seek out information from the general population relating to the perceived community needs and satisfaction with the range and quality of social support services being offered in the City.

It is important that a municipality has a current picture of the social needs and service delivery in the community from the perspective of residents, in order to ensure access to effective programs and services.

- The Board shall hear and consider representations by an individual, organization, or delegation of citizens with respect to Family and Community Support Services Programs.

Many stakeholders identified a desire to collaborate and communicate more with the City and FCSS. The Board could facilitate this through various activities, including through presentations to the Board.

- The Board shall receive monthly reports from the Director, or designate, concerning the various projects in operation and those being considered.

The Board currently receives these monthly reports. This detailed information should be used to inform the Board’s advice to Council.

---

10 Bylaw No. 396-97 Family and Community Support Services Advisory Board, City of Leduc.
The Board shall advise on the formulation of plans and priorities regarding Family and Community Support Services Programs, based on current assessments of community needs, with a view to the establishment of comprehensive services.

This project identified numerous service gaps in Leduc, which could be explored in more detail. The Board should use this and other information to formulate priorities. Future assessments of community needs should be undertaken with the goal of refining priorities and informing funding and development of comprehensive services.

The Board shall advise on the establishment of new programs, public or private, designed to prevent the emergence of social problems or provide support to the family and community.

This project identified a number of service gaps in Leduc. The Board could look at whether new programs are addressing these issues.

The Board shall review and consider Family and Community Support Services projects and applications received through the office of the Director, or designate, and shall recommend approval, deferment or rejection of such projects.

The grants to organization process has changed. The City of Leduc now funds organizations through the base budget, with no requirement of organizations to reapply for funding unless they want an increase. The Board could still play a role in ensuring organizations are remaining accountable for the funding they are receiving.

The Board shall make recommendations to Council as to programs, facilities, or other matters that should be considered in the Family and Community Support Services budget.

The FCSS budget can benefit from review by multiple sources, including the Board.

The Board shall promote cooperation with and encouragement of all organizations - public, private, civic, social and religious within the City, that are involved in any family and community support services.

Collaboration and communication between FCSS and local service providers and among local service providers was identified as an issue through the engagement process. The Board could play a role in promoting and facilitating cooperation in this regard.

As the bylaw states “shall”, the Board is currently required to meet each of these responsibilities. However, based on engagement with FCSS Board members, the Board currently does not appear to be consistently meeting all of these responsibilities. Overall, there appears to be a positive attitude among Board members and the desire and willingness to work towards evolving the Board to have a more effective functional role in the planning of social services in the City.
During the engagement process, FCSS Board members identified some potential challenges with the existing process and some potential opportunities for the future.¹¹

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FCSS Board Members - What We Heard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Challenges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>› Lack of clear direction from Council on the role of the Board.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>› Board meetings do not have identified outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>› Council may be making funding decisions for FCSS and other similar social services in isolation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>› Lack of acceptance and respect for Board and its role by some local service providers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>› Board is currently not meeting regularly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>› Board is currently not meeting its mandate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>› Board turnover.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FCSS Board Members - What We Heard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>› Develop a common vision for FCSS and the Board within the City of Leduc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>› Establish clear expectations for the role of the Board, internally and outside of the City.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>› Board can be used to share information and connect local service providers and FCSS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>› Review existing Board mandate and revise to reflect changing needs of the Board.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>› Align Board goals to the needs outlined in the Community Needs Assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>› Board meetings should all have a set agenda with clear outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>› Establish how Board can be used to support social priorities and service gaps in the community.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹¹ The FCSS Board did not have quorum for October.
7.4. Unified Community Resource Collaboration

The Unified Community Resource Collaboration (UCRC) produced a report titled the Understanding the Complexity of the Social Services System in Leduc & Area.

Based on our understanding of the information provided, deliverables resulting from the proposed additional UCRC phases are:

- A social service system wide database for the Leduc region; and
- A standardized information gathering and referral process to capture user information that would be utilized by service providers.

This initiative appears to address two issues raised by several stakeholders as a part of our consultation process. The issues identified include the need for greater collaboration among FCSS and local stakeholders and among local stakeholders, and information sharing.

Based on our review of the current station based on stakeholder input, collaboration and information sharing is taking place at some level in some instances but could be improved. In addition, recommendations have been made that would help to facilitate greater levels of stakeholder interaction and information sharing. Without more detail about how this UCRC proposal would be developed and implemented it is difficult to ascertain what the benefit may be of this approach vs. recommendations proposed elsewhere in this report. However, it could be expected that there could be some overlap.

Regarding standardization of intake and referrals to users of services, stakeholders have identified this as an area of potential improvement. FCSS have identified activities they are currently undertaking to make some improvements in these areas. Without more detail regarding the UCRC proposal and how standardization of intake and referral would work, it is difficult to know how much overlap there would be between current initiatives undertaken by the City and the deliverables proposed by the UCRC proposal to address these concerns.

Based on our review of the UCRC proposal, we have identified the following issues:

- A substantial funding request would be required to complete Phases 3 - 5 of the UCRC project. It is presumed that this would provide the social service system wide database and standardization of information gathering and referral process. While it would be useful to obtain more definition of the deliverables proposed by UCRC for this project, given the size of the budget and the potential overlap with existing and proposed initiatives it would not appear to be a cost effective means to address the noted need for collaboration and information sharing. In addition, proceeding with a project which has such a potential overlap with other initiatives might be counter productive.
Given the nature of the UCRC proposal it appears the work is directed towards developing a technical solution for capturing and maintaining data about users and services provided by stakeholders. It is noted that some of this information is already currently available via other channels (i.e. 211). In addition it is possible that software exists and is being utilized in other jurisdictions that might serve the same purpose as that proposed by UCRC. It may be cost effective to explore and evaluate these options prior to undertaking an initiative to developing a new technical solution.

The UCRC proposal appears to be aimed towards a broader market than the Leduc sub region. If there are merits to the proposal, the province of Alberta and other regional or municipal social service providers may be interested in partaking in the development of this technology. Based on the proposal it does not appear that if this technology were to be implemented, the City of Leduc would be in a position to internalize the benefit of this broader use. yet they would incur all or most of the development costs.

It is worth noting that the sizeable funding request is similar to the City of Leduc’s current municipal contribution to FCSS as reported in the annual report. This funding request does not appear to include any ongoing operational costs or resource requirements to implement the solution proposed. Given the magnitude of the funding request, it is difficult to envision how the investment in the UCRC proposal could yield ongoing benefits equivalent to direct investment in social services and programs of an equal amount.
8. Recommendations to Address Challenges

Highlights
The following section highlights the key messages identified through stakeholder engagement and the data collection process.

- Stakeholders identified that FCSS should take a stronger leadership role in the coordination of FCSS programs and services as well as build greater collaboration and communication among local service providers.

- FCSS staff and local service providers identified a desire for improved relationships and collaboration to support the social needs of residents. Many stakeholders reported that FCSS should take the leadership role in strengthening relationships and facilitating collaboration.

- A review of the existing programs and services in Leduc did not identify any material direct duplication or overlap of services, effort or funding. There are some organizations that provide similar and complementary services. Where this is the case it appears that the services are targeted to somewhat different client groups or are required to meet the full need for services in the community.

- FCSS Board members are interested in exploring options to make better use of the FCSS Board to support the delivery of social programs and services.

- Funding of social programs and services, internally and externally, should be considered together within a service delivery planning framework that outlines priorities based on identified social needs. Formulating a City wide community plan would help to ensure that available resources are being applied to the highest value services.

- Stakeholders expressed a desire to explore the merits of implementing a Community Hub within the City of Leduc.

- Social issues including mental health, substance use/addiction and housing were identified by stakeholders.
Recommendations

Recommendations have been outlined to reflect the challenges and opportunities identified during this process.

Establish Consistent Strategic Priorities for FCSS

Establish consistent strategic priorities for the role of FCSS in social service delivery, community development and capacity building within the City of Leduc. Ongoing dialogue and conversation are required between the FCSS Department, senior management, and Council/Administration to support this.

FCSS Leadership Role

FCSS should reinforce its leadership role in “capacity building” within the community to effectively and efficiently deliver social service programming to those with the greatest need in the City. This will involve relationship building activities aimed at building greater trust, collaboration, communication and transparency across the service providers in the community.

› FCSS should implement regular one on one visits with local service providers.

› FCSS should coordinate more relationships building opportunities for service providers to create awareness, foster collaboration, build trust, and share information based on a model that works for the stakeholders involved.

› FCSS should promote and facilitate collaboration and partnerships among organizations providing similar and complementary services.

› FCSS should continue to provide information and advisory support for the FCSS Board or any other agency designated with coordinating community input into the design, delivery and funding priorities for social services in the City.

FCSS Outreach

FCSS should partner with local organizations to provide support in the community to help address key social issues in Leduc. This could involve deploying existing FCSS staff off-site to work out of other agency locations, where those clients already are going.

Some examples identified during the stakeholder engagement process are provided below:
The Client Services Coordinator at FCSS plays a housing advocacy role in Leduc. This involves two half days a week at Leduc Regional Housing Foundation. This off-site FCSS support is an asset to addressing community needs. The potential to expand this FCSS support at LRHF could be explored.

Leduc & District Food Bank is where some of the most vulnerable residents are going to access core social services. The possibility of offering FCSS support at the Food Bank could be explored.

Leduc & District Seniors Centre would like to have the Older Adult Services Coordinator at FCSS at Telford House to assist seniors to meet their social needs. The possibility of offering FCSS support at Telford House could be explored.

Leduc Public Library would like to have an FCSS staff member on site at the library to assist residents to meet complex social needs. In particular, there has been an increase in library patrons experiencing or at risk of homelessness and/or facing substance use/addiction concerns. The possibility of offering FCSS support at the library could be explored.

The Youth Outreach Coordinator at FCSS plays a youth advocacy role in Leduc. The possibility of offering FCSS support to high risk youth at the outreach schools or other locations in Leduc could be explored.

**UCRC Proposal**

The URC proposal appears to overlap with existing and proposed initiatives to address stakeholder collaboration and information sharing. The current proposal to complete Phases 3 - 5 of the initiative has not clearly defined the deliverables that would be provided upon completion of Phases 3 - 5 of the project, nor is there an indication of the ongoing financial commitment that would be required to implement the results of this work. As a result of this and the considerable funding request this current proposal demands, it would not be advisable to proceed with the project as presented in the proposal received by the City on October 30, 2019. It is our understanding that a subsequent proposal may be received. At that time, the merits could be re-evaluated by stakeholders such as internal City of Leduc Legal, IT, Finance and FCSS staff.

**Social Services Funding Process**

Council should consider FCSS and other similar social programs and services together when making funding and budgetary decisions. A community planning framework is recommended.

Ensure that the decision making process around social service expenditures and grants considers the entire system of social services.
Funding to individual social service providers and organizations should not be allocated in isolation or on a piecemeal basis.

The community planning framework should outline the priorities based on identified social needs.

Ensure consistent delivery of highest priority FCSS services and programs that meet the needs of the community.

Multi-year allocation based on current social priorities could be guided by the Needs Assessment.

Service Provider Reporting Requirements

To ensure that social service funding is effective, consistent reporting requirements on program activities and results for both internally and externally provided services is recommended.

- Standardized reporting helps to ensure service providers remain accountable for the funding they receive.
- There should be a review of what information is included and what the timeline is for reporting.

Community Hub

Further engagement with stakeholders regarding a Community Hub within the City of Leduc should be undertaken. Establishing a Community Hub should involve a collaborative process to refine details around what is needed and the approaches that would provide the most value and benefit. Key considerations in the process would include the following:

- Services: Identifying the wrap around services that will utilize space in the Community Hub is important. Organizations should represent those that have a required need for space and can benefit from working collectively in a common space.

- Space: It is important that a Community Hub is located in an accessible location appropriate for social programming. When possible, a Community Hub should be located in an existing community gathering place (i.e. libraries, community halls, recreation centres, etc.). In cases where this is not possible, a Community Hub can be located within vacant buildings that are easily accessible and have safe spaces appropriate for programming. When securing a Community Hub location, it is important that there is adequate physical space to meet the demand.

- Financial Structure: The financial structure is important to understand the start up costs and ongoing costs associated with the space. The structure can include funders, capital investment, operating costs, and lease arrangement structure with tenants.
Governance/Organization Structure: It is essential to identify the roles, responsibilities and decision-making structures within a Community Hub. A shared set of principles is needed to ground the diverse set of stakeholders who would come together in the Community Hub to address community needs. There are several governance structures that could be explored.

**FCSS Board**

Explore options to support the FCSS Board in being more effective in supporting the decision making process around priorities and social needs of the community.

- The mandate of the FCSS Board as outlined in the Family and Community Support Services Advisory Board Bylaw\(^{12}\) clearly establishes the roles and responsibilities of the Board. It would appear that the Board has not been consistently meeting these obligations.

- Further examination of how the Board could become more consistently effective in meeting its stated obligations would be useful to determine if the current Board structure could be modified to better meet its obligations, or if an alternative would be more effective.

- A review of the Board mandate is recommended.

- A review of the Board membership structure is recommended. There is potential to pull in expertise from service providers onto the Board.

**Joint Advocacy**

The City should explore how to work with its municipal neighbours to ensure that available funding is applied to where it is needed most and that services are provided both efficiently and effectively. This would include joint advocacy and information sharing activities to other levels of government in the areas of mental health, substance use/addiction and housing.

- Neighbouring municipalities have recently completed social needs assessments and have identified similar key issues across the region.

- Connect with neighbouring municipalities to explore options through further dialogue in the areas of mental health, substance use/addictions and housing. This dialogue could occur through existing committees or groups.

\(^{12}\) Bylaw No. 396-97 Family and Community Support Services Advisory Board, City of Leduc.
9. Recommendations for 2020 Needs Assessment

Recommendation

Integrate Municipal Census data and FCSS Program and Outcome data to inform social planning.

- Integrate current and anticipated demand and service patterns to assist with preparing for emerging social needs and issues.

- Demographic shifts in the population should be considered in the allocation of program funding. This is especially important for the proportional increase in newcomer, children/youth and senior populations.

Recommendation

Further exploration of the current social needs and service gaps identified through this work.

- The City of Leduc's 2015 Needs Assessment identified the following as key social needs to be addressed: Improve transportation services; Expand housing and social services for seniors; Create more social engagement opportunities for youth; Connect newcomers with immigration and ESL support services; Improve availability of affordable and low-income housing; and Increase resident volunteerism. Work should be done to assess what actions have been implemented to address any of these areas and define any modifications to the path forward.

- There have been significant changes to the demographic composition and economic conditions in Leduc in recent years. For example, for the period between 2015 and 2019, Leduc experienced annual population growth of 2.4%. Work should be done to determine how social issues and community needs have changed since the 2015 Needs Assessment.

- Conducting a Needs Assessment in 2020 would reflect the City’s commitment to public engagement and value in having a citizen focus, as stated in the current Strategic Plan. The Needs Assessment is one way to ensure that citizen engagement continues to be integral to shaping and building the community.

Recommendation

Explore reallocation of internal FCSS staffing to meet the priorities identified by residents and stakeholders through a comprehensive engagement process.

- At the time of stakeholder engagement for this project, FCSS was going through a staffing reorganization. Once FCSS staff members have had time in their new positions, they will be in a better able to comment on what’s working and what’s not.
Once social needs have been identified through the 2020 Needs Assessment, FCSS could do follow up work. This could include exploration to determine the appropriate internal operating plans and staffing allocations.

Changes to the organizational structure and work tasks of FCSS staff could be informed by the priorities identified by the community.
Process

Phase 1
Background Review

Phase 1 Report
July 31

Phase 2 Engagement
August 05 - September 24

Phase 2
Needs Identification

Phase 3
Recommendations

Phase 3 Engagement
September 25 - October 25

Draft Report
November 1

Phase 4
Final Reporting

Final Report
November 25 - December 25
## Engagement Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Engagement Method</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Breakdown by Engagement Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder Survey *includes partial survey completion</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>Online Surveys - 59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop Sessions *count of all participants</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Council - 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lived Experience - 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Social Service Stakeholders - 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Informant Interviews *in person and telephone conversations</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Council &amp; Administration - 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FCSS Staff - 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FCSS Advisory Board - 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Social Service Stakeholders - 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Event *count of event board responses</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Party in Alexandra Park - 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>141</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Key Highlights

- Stakeholders identified a need for FCSS to play a greater coordination role in the delivery of programs and services.

- FCSS staff and local service providers identified a desire for improved relationships.

- Review of existing programs and services did not identify any material direct duplication of services, effort or funding.

- FCSS Board is interested in exploring options to make the Board more functional.

- Decision making around funding for FCSS and other related social services and programs should consider social needs and priorities.

- Mental health, substance use/addiction and housing were the key issues identified by stakeholders.
Recommendations:
Establish Consistent Strategic Priorities for FCSS

- Establish consistent strategic priorities for the role of FCSS in social service delivery, community development and capacity building within the City of Leduc.

  - On going dialogue between the FCSS Department, senior management, and Council/Administration to support this.
Recommendations: FCSS Leadership Role

- FCSS should reinforce its leadership role in capacity building within the community to effectively and efficiently deliver social service programming to those with the greatest need in the City.

  - FCSS should implement regular one on one visits with local service providers.

  - FCSS should coordinate more relationship building opportunities for service providers.

  - FCSS should promote and facilitate collaboration and partnerships among organizations providing similar or complementary services.

  - FCSS should continue to provide information and advisory support for the FCSS Board.
Recommendations: FCSS Outreach

- FCSS should partner with local organizations to provide programs and services in the community to help address key social issues in Leduc.

- This could involve deploying existing FCSS staff off-site to work out of other agency locations (e.g. Leduc Regional Housing Foundation, Leduc & District Food Bank, Telford House, Leduc Public Library, outreach schools).
Recommendations: UCRC Proposal

- The current UCRC proposal to complete Phases 3 - 5 of the initiative has not clearly defined the deliverables that would be provided, nor is there an indication of the ongoing financial commitment to implement the results of this work.

- As a result of this and the considerable funding request this current proposal demands, it would not be advisable to proceed with the project as presented.

- It is our understanding that a subsequent proposal may be received. At that time, the merits could be re-evaluated.
Recommendations: Social Services Funding Process

- The decision making process for funding priorities should consider FCSS and other similar social programs and services collectively.

- A community planning framework is recommended to identify priorities to inform the decision making process.
Recommendations: Service Provider Reporting Requirements

- To ensure that social service funding is effective, consistent reporting requirements on program activities and results for both internally and externally provided services is recommended.

- Standardized and streamlined reporting helps to ensure service providers remain accountable for the funding they receive.
Recommendations: FCSS Board

- Support the FCSS Board in being more effective in contributing to the decision making process around priorities and social needs of the community.

- Examination of how the Board could become more consistently effective in meeting its stated obligations would be useful to determine if the current Board structure could be modified to better meet its obligations, or if an alternative would be more effective.
Recommendations: Community Hub

- Further engagement with stakeholders regarding a Community Hub within the City of Leduc.

- Establishing a Community Hub should involve a collaborative process to refine details around what is needed and the approaches that would provide the most value and benefit.
Recommendations: Joint Advocacy

- Explore how the City could work with its municipal neighbours to jointly advocate to other levels of government in the areas of mental health, substance use/addiction and housing.
Recommendations: Community Needs Assessment

- A Community Needs Assessment should be undertaken to reflect the changing demographics and economic environment that may impact the social needs of residents.
  - Integrate Municipal Census data and FCSS program and outcome data to inform social planning.
  - Further exploration of the current social needs and service gaps identified through this work.
  - Explore opportunities to reallocate FCSS staffing to meet the priorities identified by residents and stakeholders.
Next Steps

- Final Report
Reserve Policy Review & Update
Council Workshop
December 2, 2019
1. Introductions, Formalities etc. (5 min)
2. Project Overview (15 min)
3. SWOT (30 min)
4. Break (5 min)
5. An Ideal Future – Defining Success (30 min)
6. Meeting close out & next steps (5 min)
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Why
The City is engaging in a comprehensive project to develop a financial reserve policy that promotes and supports the long term fiscal sustainability plan. The focus is to support best and most efficient funding and management of future operations, capital plans (maintenance & growth) and special projects while providing the best value for the tax dollar.

How
- Review of existing reserve practice and development of Reserve Policy;
- Stakeholder engagement;
- Change management strategies;
- Co-creation of a foundation for future decision making, sustainability and success.

Who
- City of Leduc (“the City”)
- Metrix Group LLP (“Metrix”)
- Key Stakeholders
- Peer Group (AB, CAN, US)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholders</th>
<th>Point of View</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Council Executive Finance Rate Payers</td>
<td>Set the City’s vision and strategic plan as elected representatives Execute the strategic plan, conservatively safeguard City assets Financial reporting, budgeting, reserves and fiscal sustainability Excellent value for taxes and user fees paid</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Proposed Project Plan

Discover

- Gain understanding of the City’s mission, vision, values, financial position and plans
- Review of existing reserve practices, plans, analysis, etc.
- Develop stakeholder engagement criteria
- Develop engagement project plan

Project Initiation

We are committed to clear, consistent and transparent communication with the City throughout the entire project, including updates on project progress and milestones
**Roadmap**

- Review and research best practices from municipalities within AB, Canada and US
- Design the tools and processes required to complete deliverables

**Lead**

- Deliver and oversee the implementation of all external research
- Support education on financial reserves along with the City’s Finance team
- Plan, administer and monitor any data collection processes
- Execute stakeholder engagement tactics

Aug – Nov. 2019
Reimagine

- Presentation of report, recommendations and key findings to the Executive and Council
- Advise on value-added services

Evaluate

- Nov. 1 – Jan. 15
- Identify observations, recommendations and key findings
- Identify potential indicators that would impact future reserve policy updates, and opportunities for continuous improvement
- Comprehensive assessment of the City’s existing reserve structure and recommend reserve guidelines and best practices
**Project Overview**

1. **Informed Research & Discussion**
   - Reserve policy to best and most efficiently fund and manage future operations, capital plans (maintenance & growth) and special projects to support the long term fiscal sustainability.

2. **Stakeholder Collaboration**
   - (Council, Executive, Finance)

3. **Proposed Reserve Policies**

4. **Stakeholder Collaboration**
   - (Council, Executive, Finance)

**Inputs**
- Strategic Direction
- Policies
- Master Plans
- Asset Management & TCA
- Maintenance / Operating Costs
- Benchmarking
- Historical Trends
- MGA, GFOA, PSAS
- Community & Rate Payer Survey Results

**Outputs**
- Reserve policy to best and most efficiently fund and manage future operations, capital plans (maintenance & growth) and special projects to support the long term fiscal sustainability.
SWOT Analysis

Strengths
- Internally – What works well?

Weaknesses
- Internally – What does not work well?

Opportunities
- Externally – What is possible?

Threats
- Externally – What are the risks?
OUR VISION

Our vision statement describes the kind of community we intend to build. Its purpose is to guide our current and future direction and decision making.

OUR MISSION

Our mission statement describes our purpose to help provide focus and direction in achieving our vision.

OUR VISION FOR LEDUC IS

A great life.
A caring community.
A thriving region.

OUR MISSION IS

People.
Building.
Community.
An Ideal Future

A CITIZEN FOCUS
People have wisdom and ought to be engaged in the decisions that affect their lives.

TRANSPARENCY & ACCOUNTABILITY
Strong municipal leadership is open, honest and evidence-based.

EXCELLENCE & PROSPERITY
City-building involves commitment to ongoing excellence, development and innovation.

A COMMITTED CITY TEAM
The quality of our programs and services rests upon the talents, dedication and engagement of our human resources.

FINANCIAL RESPONSIBILITY
We are responsible for properly managing taxpayers’ dollars and keeping services affordable.

RESPECT FOR THE PLANET
We strive to balance our growth and development with care and respect for our natural environment.

DIVERSITY & INCLUSIVENESS
We respect and support diversity and inclusiveness within our community.

PARTNERING FOR SUCCESS
Our capacity to achieve our goals and optimize our resources is enhanced through working in partnership with others.

A REGIONAL FOCUS
We are stronger as a region and will take a leadership role in supporting regional collaboration.
Defining Success

- What does success look like?
- What does success feel like?
- What activities does success include?
Defining Success

Collaborative focus to creating reserves that serve the municipality by:

1. **Informed Decision Making**
   Reserves should aid with the understanding of cause and effect.

2. **Streamline Processes**
   Reserves should simplify internal processes rather than create more work.

3. **Clear & Consistent**
   Reserves should be structured in a clear and consistent manner to support application and understandability are maximized for all stakeholders.

4. **Sustainable & Reasonable**
   Reserves maintain sufficient funds to best serve the municipality for future growth while addressing maintenance for capital projects.

5. **Support Strategy**
   Reserves should supplement and support future economic development, capital investment, growth and allowance for unforeseen events. Reserves should align with Council’s strategic plan and organizational goals.

6. **Support Structure & Flexibility**
   Effective reserve strategy, it should support structure and flexibility to allow for maintenance and adapt as new conditions and events arise.
Benchmarking & Best Practice

1. The decision making process?

2. Who pays for what, when and how?

3. Peer group – Alberta and beyond

4. Building on the Foundation for Long Term Fiscal Sustainability
Informed Decision Making

*without reserves*

Prioritize projects to complete

Determine available funding from grants, current/future taxes or surplus

Fund projects in priority with available funds
Informed Decision Making

with reserves

Establish reserve target

Fund projects from reserve

Determine projects to complete

Fund capital plan
Intergenerational Equity

Who “should be” funding reserves?

Reserves are too conservative

- Current ratepayers
  - Current services
  - Current infrastructure
- Future ratepayers
  - Current services
  - Current infrastructure

Reserves are not conservative enough

- Current ratepayers
  - Current services
  - Current infrastructure
  - Future projects
- Future ratepayers
  - Current services
  - Current infrastructure
  - Future projects
Intergenerational Equity

Finding balance

Current ratepayers
- Current services
- Current infrastructure
- Future projects

Future ratepayers
- Current services
- Current infrastructure
- Future projects

EQUALITY

EQUITY
Connecting the dots …

- The City’s strategic direction should inform reserves.
- Big picture understanding of the City’s relationship between grants, debentures, reserves and debt vehicles will inform strategy.
- Benchmarking with peers, industry leaders and international influence.
Building on the Foundation for Long Term Fiscal Sustainability
Meeting Close Out & Next Steps