

Learning from Smart Services & Infrastructure Projects: Case Studies in Rural BC



2016

Prepared for the Rural Policy Learning Commons

**Prepared by: Laura Ryser, Danielle Patterson, Marli Bodhi,
Greg Halseth, Julia Good, Sean Markey, and Negar
Naghshinepour Esfahani**

**Canada Research Chair in Rural and Small Town Studies
Prince George, BC**

CONTENTS

| | |
|---|-----------|
| CONTENTS | 1 |
| Acknowledgements..... | 2 |
| Availability of Reports..... | 3 |
| Contact Information..... | 3 |
| ACRONYMS | 4 |
| RURAL RESTRUCTURING TO RURAL RENEWAL | 6 |
| MOVING FORWARD TO RECOGNIZE ‘RURAL’ | 8 |
| APPENDIX A: CASE STUDIES | 10 |
| Bella Coola Community Support Society | 11 |
| Cariboo Family Enrichment Centre | 12 |
| Central Interior Community Services Co-operative..... | 13 |
| Dome Creek Multi-Purpose Recreation Facility..... | 14 |
| East Line Activity Centre | 15 |
| Elkford Community Conference Centre | 16 |
| Fraser Valley Employment & Support Services Co-operative..... | 17 |
| Golden Loom Co-Location Project..... | 18 |
| Kitimat Child Development Centre Association..... | 19 |
| Kootenay Boundary Community Services Co-operative | 20 |
| Lake Cowichan Neighbourhood Learning Centre..... | 21 |
| Nechako Valley Community Services Society | 22 |
| Penticton and District Community Resources Society..... | 23 |
| Prince George Community Foundation..... | 24 |
| Port Clements Multi-Purpose Building | 25 |
| Pouce Coupe Regional Multi-Purpose Centre | 26 |
| Robson Valley Support Society | 27 |
| Sea to Sky Community Services..... | 28 |
| Shuswap Community Resources Co-operative | 29 |
| Smithers Community Services Association..... | 30 |
| Sooke CASA (Co-operative Association of Service Agencies)..... | 31 |
| South Peace Community Resources Society | 32 |
| Tumbler Ridge Community Association Responding to Extended Services (TR Cares)..... | 33 |
| Ucluelet Multi-Purpose Community Centre..... | 34 |
| Valemount Multi-Purpose Facility | 35 |
| Valley Community Services Society | 36 |
| Wells Multi-Purpose Facility | 37 |
| Yellowhead Community Services | 38 |
| REFERENCES | 39 |

Acknowledgements

In 2015, our research team contacted local and regional government stakeholders, service providers, and other community groups as part of the Learning from Smart Services and Infrastructure Projects in Rural BC Project. We wish to thank all of those participants who took the time to help out and to answer our many questions.

Funding for this project came from the the Canada Research Chair in Rural and Small Town Studies, the University of Northern British Columbia, the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council's Rural Policy Learning Commons Project, and Simon Fraser University.

Laura Ryser, Danielle Patterson, Marli Bodhi, Greg Halseth, Julia Good, Sean Markey, and Negar Naghshinepour Esfahani

Prince George
January 2016

Availability of Reports

Copies of the report may also be accessed through the website of the Canada Research Chair in Rural and Small Town Studies at: <http://www.unbc.ca/greg-halseth/canada-research-chair-in-rural-and-small-town-studies>.

Project Reports

- Learning from Smart Services & Infrastructure Projects in Rural BC: Executive Summary
- Learning from Smart Services & Infrastructure Projects in Rural BC: Final Report
- Learning from Smart Services and Infrastructure Projects: Case Studies in Rural BC

Contact Information

For further information about this topic and the project, feel free to contact Greg Halseth, Canada Research Chair in Rural and Small Town Studies:

University of Northern BC
3333 University Way
Prince George, BC V2N 4Z9
Website: <http://www.unbc.ca/greg-halseth>

Greg Halseth
Tel: 250-960-5826
Fax: 250-960-6533
E-mail: halseth@unbc.ca

ACRONYMS

| | |
|---------|--|
| AGM | Annual General Meeting |
| BC | British Columbia |
| BCSS | Bella Coola Community Support Society |
| BSE | Bovine Spongiform Encephalopathy |
| CALP | Community Adult Literacy Program |
| CAO | Chief Administrative Officer |
| CAPC | Community Action Program for Children – Public Health Agency of Canada |
| CASA | Co-operative Association of Service Agencies |
| CBT | Columbia Basin Trust |
| CDC | Child Development Centre |
| CEDNet | Community Economic Development Network |
| CEDTAP | Community Economic Development Technical Assistance Program |
| CF | Community Foundation |
| CFEC | Cariboo Family Enrichment Centre |
| CLBC | Community Living BC |
| CMHA | Canadian Mental Health Association |
| CSAPP | Community Service Alignment Pilot Project |
| DVHS | Desert Valley Hospice Society |
| ED | Executive Director |
| EKCCU | East Kootenay Community Credit Union |
| ESL | English as a Second Language |
| EVA BC | Ending Violence Association of BC |
| FASD | Fetal Alcohol Spectrum Disorder |
| FFGRD | Fraser-Fort George Regional District |
| FTE | Full-Time Equivalent |
| GCRS | Golden Community Resources Society |
| HOURS | Housing Our Responsibility Shelter |
| HR | Human Resources |
| HRSDC | Human Resources and Social Development Canada |
| ICAT | Interagency Case Assessment Team |
| JTST | Ministry of Jobs, Tourism and Skills Training |
| KCDC | Kitimat Child Development Centre |
| LIRN BC | Learning Initiatives for Rural and Northern BC |
| LMP | Labour Market Partnership |
| LNG | Liquefied Natural Gas |
| MOU | Memorandum of Understanding |
| NDIT | Northern Development Initiative Trust |
| NLC | Neighbourhood Learning Centre |
| NTC | Nuu-chah-nulth Tribal Council |
| NVCSS | Nechako Valley Community Services Society |
| OECD | Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development |
| PAC | Parents Advisory Council |
| PDCRS | Penticton and District Community Resources Society |
| PGCF | Prince George Community Foundation |
| PGNAETA | Prince George Nechako Aboriginal Employment and Training Association |
| PTE | Part-Time Equivalent |

| | |
|-------------|---|
| QAF | Queen Alexandra Foundation |
| RCMP | Royal Canadian Mounted Police |
| REACH | Resource, Education, and Consultation Hub Program |
| RFP | Request for Proposal |
| RPLC | Rural Policy Learning Commons |
| RVSS | Robson Valley Support Society |
| SCRC | Shuswap Community Resources Co-operative |
| SCSA | Smithers Community Services Association |
| SD | School District |
| SFU | Simon Fraser University |
| SKY Project | Safe Kids and Youth Coordinated Response |
| SOSWS | South Okanagan Seniors Wellness Society |
| SPCRS | South Peace Community Resources Society |
| SSCS | Sea to Sky Community Services |
| SSHRC | Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council |
| TR Cares | Tumbler Ridge Community Association Responding to Extended Services |
| UBCM | Union of British Columbia Municipalities |
| UNBC | University of Northern British Columbia |
| VCSS | Valley Community Services Society |
| VCTV | Valemount Community Television |
| VIC | Visitor Information Centre |
| WCRS | Westcoast Community Resources Society |
| YCS | Yellowhead Community Services |

Learning from Smart Services & Infrastructure Projects: Case Studies in Rural BC

PREPARED FOR THE RURAL POLICY LEARNING COMMONS

RURAL RESTRUCTURING TO RURAL RENEWAL

The new rural economy is situated within a constantly changing and hyper-connected global economy. Since the early 1980s, neo-liberal policies in many OECD countries, such as Canada, Denmark, the UK, the US, and Australia, have downloaded more responsibilities to local governments and increasingly looked to contractors in the private and voluntary sectors to deliver services and manage infrastructure (Askim *et al.* 2011; Burke-Robertson 2002; Howard 2014; Province of New Brunswick 2011). At the same time, public policies and grants have increasingly called for collaboration, partnerships, smart services, and shared infrastructure as a part of “bottom up” community development (Argent 2011; Paagman *et al.* 2015; Shortall and Warner 2010; West 2013). This means that rural and small town places must pay increasing attention to their place-based assets and how possibilities for developing those assets can create local benefits that fit with local aspirations (McDonald *et al.* 2013). There is an urgent need to understand how infrastructure and services pressures, and new arrangements to cope with these pressures, are shaping the capacity in rural and northern places since they are particularly vulnerable to the long distances and low population densities involved.

The purpose of this research is to examine the best practices and key issues that must be considered by rural stakeholders and senior governments who wish to strengthen smart service and infrastructure projects in British Columbia. The research explored multi-purpose or co-location initiatives, service co-operatives, and multi-service or one-stop shop organizations. Information collected can be used to inform supportive policies and investments to support the renewal of small communities in order to better position them to respond to the challenges and opportunities associated with the new rural economy. After briefly discussing the infrastructure and service restructuring pressures for small places, this report provides profiles of case studies around rural BC that are pursuing shared or streamlined infrastructure and service arrangements.

Infrastructure Restructuring

Services and infrastructure were once seen as the foundations for creating strong working communities that would drive the provincial economy. However, rural BC has been experiencing an ongoing transformation of infrastructure investment and services. Since the 1980s (Sullivan *et al.* 2014), the transformation has been from a Keynesian public policy framework of government participation and investment towards a neoliberal public policy framework defined by government withdrawal of direct participation in favour of allowing market-based providers and reduced government expenditures in

many areas. As a result of these changes in the public policy mindset, non-metropolitan BC is experiencing an accumulating infrastructure deficit.

Across BC, small communities are confronted with the challenges of aging and inadequate infrastructure. Many of BC's small communities consist of buildings developed during the war or immediate post-World War II era to attract and retain young workers and their families. Many of these structures require new foundations, roofs, windows, insulation, and other energy efficient considerations. In some cases, rural infrastructure assets were not even equipped with basic elements, such as running water and indoor plumbing. Mold has also rendered many older infrastructure assets unusable to support community renewal. New per capita funding formulas has also prompted school closure announcements in rural areas. Over time, the closures of schools, former military buildings, businesses, and industries have left small communities with poorly maintained and underutilized infrastructure.

The limitations of these structures are not only that they are aging, but they were never designed for uses envisioned today. Major renovations are needed to update rural facilities and equip them with the technology, equipment, and space to support meetings, industry functions, new economic sectors, community events, and broader community development initiatives (Bauch 2001). At the same time, much of the infrastructure in small communities is not accessible for young families with strollers, people with disabilities, or an aging population.

The problem of aging infrastructure manifests some important issues for renewal. Small communities tend to have many non-profit organizations and groups that have limited resources. While these groups benefit from being able to lease or own affordable infrastructure, it has left small groups dispersed in tiny and inadequate spaces in small communities. There are missed opportunities to create synergies, renew infrastructure, and reduce operational costs through shared space.

Rapidly growing rural communities have experienced unique infrastructure renewal challenges of their own. Despite similar concerns of aging infrastructure in these communities, pressures from tourism or renewed industry activity have made it difficult for rural stakeholders to acquire property to support shared infrastructure projects.

Service Restructuring

Since the 1990s, the provincial and federal governments increasingly moved towards open procurement and tendering processes. This prompted concerns that service contracts would be awarded to, and delivered by, larger agencies outside of rural regions in distant regional centres, leaving rural and remote residents with more limited access to supports (Province of New Brunswick 2011). There were concerns that regional agencies would not understand the rural context and may not provide the same quality of services in smaller communities (Paagman *et al.* 2015). There continues to be debates about whether senior levels of government are moving towards regional contracts in order to reduce government expenditures on contract management (Evans and Grantham n.d.; Province of New Brunswick 2011).

Over the past 25 years, service agencies were faced with successive rounds of funding cuts, competitive funding environments, and contract reforms¹. These fiscal pressures threatened the retention of key staff, the viability and effectiveness of programs, as well as the organizations themselves. Since 2009, the federal government has transferred a number of housing and employment programs to the province.

¹ Contract funding is also determined on a per capita basis, leaving rural non-profits to deliver the same quality of services with limited financial resources.

During this transition period, the province reduced the number of contracts under the guise of eliminating duplication and inefficient use of public funds (West 2013). Non-profits were charged with doing more with less money, all while demonstrating efficiency and accountability.

The economic and social restructuring processes that have affected rural and remote regions have increased concerns about services and have motivated civil society organizations to pursue other ways to deliver supports to residents that may otherwise not exist. Exploring new arrangements is becoming increasingly important as non-profits struggle to respond to the increased downloading and hollowing out of government services, demands for more accountability and collaboration, constrained fiscal environments, limited human resources, and the complexity of many social and economic development issues that are often beyond the mandate of any individual organization (Milbourne 2010; Nelson 2007).

Policies that are driving new expectations for organizations to adopt integrated or shared service arrangements, as well as business-oriented models of service delivery, however, are challenging the capacity of rural organizations (Poole *et al.* 2002). While such challenges are not unique to rural organizations, they can exacerbate pressures and undermine the effectiveness of an already limited capacity in underserved small communities (Hanlon *et al.* 2011; O'Connell 2003). With limited human, financial, infrastructure, and political capital, rural stakeholders must ensure that these limited capacities are not wasted, but are purposefully deployed in the most relevant and effective way.

In the remainder of this compendium report, several case studies are described that have pursued alternative infrastructure or service arrangements, most notably through multi-purpose or co-location, service co-operatives, and multi-service or one-stop shop arrangements (see main report for a more detailed description of these models). These one-page summaries capture key issues respecting governance, infrastructure, human resources, funding, and community impacts.

MOVING FORWARD TO RECOGNIZE 'RURAL'

In addition to the general challenges posed by a low density rural and small town setting, stakeholders in small communities are under stress from changes occurring within this context. Many resource sector activities that have been the foundation for rural and small town economies have been under economic threat from low cost supplier regions around the world (Hayter 2000). To meet that challenge, resource industries have aggressively pursued efficiency as a means to lower their costs of production and remain globally competitive (Edenhoffer and Hayter 2013). This often means a substitution of capital for labour, with the result that workforces today are much smaller and we are producing more raw material for export with far less labour. Population decline affects not only the mean level of human capital within the community, but also the limited base upon which groups can draw potential staff and volunteers. This limits organizational capacity, innovation and flexibility, and access to alternative resources.

Further, an increasing level of offloading, downloading, or outright closure of public and private sector services has exacerbated all of these issues (Halseth and Ryser 2006). In a context where private and public sector services or supports have been downsized or eliminated, the voluntary and non-profit sector has been increasingly called upon to fill the gap (Baines and Cunningham 2011; Hanlon *et al.* 2007). Not only does this increase the workload, but it increases the risk of burnout. As mentioned, if there is burnout, the possibility of renewing crucial human resources is limited by small community size.

It is vital to understand that rural and small town places have a very different context that affect the operations of local governments and community organizations compared to similar types of groups operating in urban or metropolitan settings (Sullivan *et al.* 2014). Distance is a considerable challenge for

many small communities. There is distance involved in connecting with governmental agencies or key policy makers that may determine the fate and the success of initiatives and their funding applications. Distance exacerbates the possibility that policy-makers may not understand rural and small places. The opportunity to connect with wider networks of organizations or with government ministries and regionalized supports, is also negatively impacted by the friction of both social distances, that are created through increasingly lengthy bureaucratic processes and accountability procedures, and the physical distances within which rural voluntary groups operate (McKinney and Kahn 2004; Molnar *et al.* 2001). Distance also impacts exposure and access to information and different forms and types of innovations, ideas, options, and solutions. With limited external networks, rural stakeholders can become isolated and introverted; thereby, limiting their capacity for renewal (Wollebæk 2009). Rural and small town organizations know that a significant portion of their annual operating budget may be consumed by travel costs—costs either to deliver services in a low-density wide-reaching geographic area, or costs associated with connecting with policy and program offices (Harris *et al.* 2004).

Moving forward, greater political leadership is needed by designating ministries to lead supportive policies that can shape the implementation of new shared infrastructure and service arrangements (Farquhar *et al.* 2006). Senior levels of government can also create shared services assessment teams or managers to provide advice and guide the development of these new infrastructure and service arrangements that are increasingly being requested through their policies and RFPs (Lennie 2010; Torres *et al.* 2014; Zeemering and Delabbio 2013). These changes will go a long way to equip and better position stakeholders in small communities to respond to the challenges and opportunities associated with rural change.

APPENDIX A: CASE STUDIES

In the spring of 2015, key informant interviews were conducted with leaders of community groups, service agencies, and local and regional governments around rural British Columbia. This included consultations with co-ops chairs, consultants, local / regional government staff, non-profit executive directors, staff of coops and multi-service agencies, and volunteers. There were a total of 51 interview participants in 35 communities. The purpose of this project is to identify key benefits and lessons for developing smart, efficient service infrastructure that can enhance the capacity and resiliency of rural and small town places. Developing an understanding of these lessons is critically important as many organizations and communities respond to ongoing social, economic, and political restructuring with aging infrastructure and fewer human and financial resources. This appendix assembles a summary of key governance, infrastructure, human resource, and funding issues as identified by each of the following case studies:

- Bella Coola Community Support Services,
- Cariboo Family Enrichment Centre,
- Central Interior Community Services Co-operative,
- Dome Creek Multi-Purpose Recreation Facility,
- East Line Activity Centre,
- Elkford Community Conference Centre,
- Fraser Valley Employment and Support Services Co-operative,
- Gold Loom Co-location Project,
- Kitimat Child Development Centre Association,
- Kootenay Boundary Community Services Co-operative,
- Lake Cowichan Neighbourhood Learning Centre,
- Nechako Valley Community Services Society,
- Penticton and District Community Resources Society,
- Prince George Community Foundation,
- Port Clements Multi-Purpose Building,
- Pouce Coupe Regional Multi-Purpose Centre,
- Robson Valley Support Society,
- Sea to Sky Community Services,
- Shuswap Community Resources Co-operative,
- Smithers Community Services Association,
- Sooke Co-operative Association of Service Agencies (CASA),
- South Peace Community Resources Society,
- Tumbler Ridge Community Association Responding to Extended Services (TR CARES),
- Ucluelet Multi-Purpose Community Centre,
- Valemount Multi-Purpose Facility,
- Valley Community Services Society,
- Wells Multi-Purpose Facility, and
- Yellowhead Community Services.

Bella Coola Community Support Society

Context

- BCSS started in response to local youth suicides in 1985. It serves the Bella Coola area.
- First contract was for drug and alcohol services; expanded to other contracts due to the lack of other service providers.

Governance

- Governed by a seven-person board, currently made up of professional people.
 - Difficult to find enough qualified people to volunteer on the board of directors.
- Part of interagency coordination for violence against women and children (ICAT).
- Engaged with the Band's safety committee; the New Hawk Child and Youth Mental Health Committee.
- Remoteness limits the amount of engagement with staff at various ministries.
- Programs: counseling and prevention for alcohol and drug addictions; children and family services (sexual abuse prevention, family support, family preservation / reunification, parenting workshops, nobody's perfect, children / youth with special needs); women's services (stopping the violence / women's outreach); community-based victim services; and food bank / grow your own food program.

Infrastructure

- Located in aging house with limited space.
- Building bought with a grant from the BC Gaming Commission.
- The society's small building limits the contracts they can pursue.
- House has an A-frame backroom for meetings and shared office space: heated by firewood.
- Some programming upstairs: inaccessible, requires relocation if a participant has accessibility needs.
- Building renovations: new roof and new foundation in 2014.
- Can be 1.5 to 2 years to access contractors from outside the valley and local skilled contractors are busy.
- Higher costs / limited product options for supplies.

Human Resources

- 6 part-time and 1 full-time (has 2 part-time positions) employees.
- Contracts an alcohol and drug clinician from Vancouver via Skype.
- Professional development done via EVA BC or via the Band (at low or no cost).
- Remoteness of the community and the part-time nature of jobs make recruitment of qualified personnel a challenge; it is rare to combine positions due to the variation in required skills.
- Uncertainty with ministry contracts makes it difficult to provide job security, and hence recruit / retain staff.

Funding

- Downturn in forest industry has led to out-migration and reduced opportunities for fundraising.
- Society uses Simply Accounting which does not have advanced features for reporting.
- Contracts book keeping services out.
- Provincial funding: MCFD, Ministry of Housing and Social Development, the Ministry of Public Safety and Solicitor General, and the Bella Coola General Hospital.
- Department of Justice Canada provided funding for self-defense training.

Impact

- Organization seen in the community as a place to go to make things happen (i.e., assisted with New Horizons grant for community group to do seniors' programming).
- The valley is ~ 25km long with limited bus service. Having a one-stop shop streamlines access to supports.

Website: <http://bccss.net>

Phone: 250-799-5588

Cariboo Family Enrichment Centre

Context

- CFEC began operations 27 years ago when the community needed counselling services.
- Three groups amalgamated in response to funding cuts in the 1990s, including the pregnancy outreach program, the Childcare Resource and Referral organization, and the CFEC's counselling services.

Governance

- Has 6 board members. Office location / service area is in 100 Mile House.
- Faces challenges recruiting board members in general and those with varying backgrounds.
- Programs: family services (family support, FASD, parenting workshops, men's night), early years services, youth services (youth zone, youth employment services), and counselling services.

Infrastructure

- The centre rents an entire building, resulting in lower square footage rental costs.
- The daycare, youth employment services, and youth zone programs have their own building spaces.
- Maximized use of space by combining PTE jobs into FTE and flexibility in work space use.

Human Resources

- 30 employees (many full-time positions are created from amalgamating part-time positions).
- Operating as a one-stop shop is more cost-effective, allowing the centre to offer more competitive salaries and more full-time jobs in the community.
- Combining part-time positions into FTE enhances retention and recruitment in a small community, resulting in staff with more skills and higher levels of education.
- As a multi-service provider, CFEC has working supervisors to support succession planning.
- Contracts out book keeping services to two people.
- Challenges recruiting staff, especially early childhood educators, family support workers, and counsellors.
- Does not have the funds to hire professionals for human resources, finance, occupational health and safety, information systems, or a clinical director: managers perform these tasks on top of daily operations.
- Advertising externally to fill positions is expensive and ineffective in small communities: must build capacity within.

Funding

- Provincial funding through MCFD, Ministry of Health, BC Gaming Commission.
- Federal funding through Service Canada.
- Other funding sources include the Cariboo Regional District and the District of 100 Mile House.
- There are challenges associated with uncertainty with contract renewals.
- Due to its size, uses Simply Accounting, which does not have the ability to collect the detailed information required for reporting.

Impact

- As a one-stop shop, CFEC is able to provide streamlined access to a greater variety of services.
- As a multi-service provider, the CFEC can support and operate with one Executive Director and two program managers more cost effectively compared to smaller organizations that need to supply staff with singular program budgets.
- The youth and employment services program has an 80% success rate of participants going to school or obtaining employment.

Website: <http://cariboofamily.org>

Phone: (250) 395-5155

Central Interior Community Services Co-operative

Context

- In the 1990s and 2000s, funding cuts and contract reforms prompted fears that the Women's Contact Society and the Boys and Girls Club would need to fold. Social sector organizations formed a service co-operative as a proactive response to reduce operating costs and maintain the viability of organizations. Office location / service area is in Williams Lake.

Governance

- Coop members include: Canadian Mental Health Association, the Association of Community Living, the Women's Contact Society, the Boys and Girls Club, and the Cariboo-Chilcotin Child Development Centre.
 - Sought out partners that were non-profits and had a full-time Executive Director.
- Each agency maintains a board. The co-op is governed by an Integrated Management Team with the five Executive Directors and sub-committees.
- Worked collectively to meet with MCFD contract manager as part of the co-op's integrative approach.
- Co-op has a non-competitive clause for RFPs/bids.

Infrastructure

- CMHA, the Association of Community Living, and the Women's Contact Society initially co-located.
 - The CDC and the Boys and Girls Club are not co-located.
- Includes common meeting space, kitchen areas, and storage while each agency has their own board room.
- The building is owned by Child Development Centre. Rental rates are all-inclusive to provide predictability / certainty with budget planning.
 - There is a maintenance contract and janitorial services with costs based on occupancy.
- Lots of work put into the design to ensure everyone could work efficiently: entry points, security, some tenants had clients that could not be around children. Front desk keeps an eye on those who enter and exit the building.

Human Resources

- The Integrated Youth Services Team was created in response to contract reductions to reorganize youth services into a model in order to shift dollars to allow the continuation of as many services as possible.
- Central finance / administrative department, shared grant writer, and some cross-sharing / secondment of staff.
- Concerns that a lack of wage parity would result in organizations unintentionally poaching one another's staff.
 - Led to common formats for job descriptions; an initiative to look at potential wage parity.
- Canadian Mental Health and the Association for Community Living share a full-time Executive Director.
- The varying types / sizes of organizations impacted levels of contribution and involvement.

Funding

- Northern Development Initiatives Trust: funds to support renovations.
- Local gov't: some tax forgiveness/grants; assisted with grant applications, and CDC leases land for \$5/year.
- Provincial funding: MCFD.
- Federal funding/contracts: Status of Women Canada, Health Canada, and accessibility funding.
- Received HRSDC Labour Market Grant: funds used for a 1) strategic plan and 2) wage grid and job development template, including job competencies and a universal benefit program.
- Challenges remain with limited funding to support coordination.

Impact

- The shared structure resulted in more effective and efficient service delivery for clients, i.e., common intakes for services, reducing how much clients had to be in contact with multiple agencies, etc.
- Able to provide cross-training and share skills with other co-op members.
- Able to attract professionals: better pay and benefits than smaller agencies can provide on their own.
- Financial savings increased organizational stability; created income diversification; development of new or expanded products and services; and adoption of new technology infrastructure to increase capacity.

Website: <http://cccdca.org>

Dome Creek Multi-Purpose Recreation Facility

Context

- The older former school built in 1917 became a community hall owned by the Dome Creek Community Association when it closed down in Dome Creek. A new school was built in 1967 on land given to the School District from a Dome Creek resident. When the school closed, the School District planned to demolish it. The Community Association approached the Regional District about taking over the 1967 school building.
- In 2000, the school closed down and became the community centre. Process took ~ 5 years to complete.

Governance

- Referendum held for a local tax service for the facility. “Yes” vote for facility passed with narrow margin.
- The Dome Creek Community Association received assistance from the school and the FFGRD to take over the school.
- There is a McBride Library-Dome Creek Community Association user agreement and a Regional District-Dome Creek Community Association user agreement in place at the facility.

Infrastructure

- The facility has a small community kitchen, a library, and a recreation centre. The Great Room contains toys, tools, and seating.
- Facility renovations included a new roof and foundation with future plans for a new furnace, a wheelchair ramp, and back-up power source. Residents are able to access Wi-Fi.
- Due to the remote location of Dome Creek, it was difficult to obtain a contractor for the foundation work.
- When the school closed, a reverted clause on the property required it to be returned as Crown land.
- The facility was purchased from School District 57 for \$1.00 with the FFGRD retaining ownership.
- If the Dome Creek Community Association ever dissolved, the facility would go to the regional district.

Human Resources

- A Regional Management Committee was created to manage the funds for the building, utilities, maintenance (propane, water, and garbage and snow removal), and to book the facility for events.
- The community association is responsible for lawn mowing, window cleaning, etc.
- The regional district assisted with finding funding for Dome Creek.

Funding

- A small community population (under 100) and lack of school-aged children impacted funding options.
- \$6,000 of in-kind from the Dome Creek Community Association.
- The Fraser-Fort George Regional District provided financial support for major renovations.
 - Between \$7,000 and \$10,000 is also collected per year in taxes to operate the facility.
- \$25,000 in federal funding from the New Horizons for Seniors Program supported renovations.
- A grant was received from NDIT.
- The library, “Lena Schultz Reading Room,” is funded and operated by the McBride library.

Impact

- Facility created more activities such as movie nights, a video recording workshop for seniors, card nights, barbeques, etc.
- The Lena Schultz Reading Room now has a budget from the regional district to buy some books and supplies.
- Facility attracted outside rentals: UNBC and forest services, along with 1-2 regional district meetings a year.
- The McBride library now hires 2 part-time workers and contracts out custodial services locally. Two local jobs are also now created when elections are held at the facility.
- New library space is larger, has community computer access, and brought public Internet to the community.
- Due to telephone access, the building acts as a muster location for emergencies.

Website: <http://www.rdffg.bc.ca/services/community/community-facilities/halls>

East Line Activity Centre

Context

- An emergency meeting was held after the Giscome Elementary School was slated for closure due to mold and low enrollment. Students in the region would have to travel between 40 and 95 km to Blackburn Elementary.
- There was also a need for a community centre in the East Line area for community formal events, visits from politicians, or voting locations.
- After five years, the East Line Activity Centre opened in the Fall of 2014.

Governance

- In June 2014, an area referendum on taxation to maintain facility passed with 70% support.
- There was a facility agreement between the Fraser-Fort George Regional District and School District #57, as well as an additional agreement permitting the Willow River Rec. Association to manage the activity centre. The School District-Regional District agreement allows the Regional District to buy the building if the school district closes the school.
- The school district owns the building and is responsible for utilities and all maintenance unless a community group requires after hours custodial services.
- By locating with an elementary school, a no-alcohol policy needed to be drafted for the community centre.

Infrastructure

- The co-location project includes an elementary school, library, community centre, and community kitchen.
- Portables were built in Vancouver and their foundations were built onsite.
- No storage space designed into the building. Willow River Recreation Association looking at C-Can for storage.
- Activity Centre provides access to the Internet and audio-visual equipment.

Human Resources

- East Line formed a “Save Our School” Committee which had meetings with Minister Shirley Bond and regional district staff about building a new school in the East Line area.
- Willow River Recreation Centre was engaged in fundraising, reviewing architecture plans, etc.
- Local residents and the Farmer’s Institute reached out to their networks and wrote letters of support.
- FFGRD did research, assisted with grant applications, drafted the facility agreement, and acted as a liaison. School District #57 managed the project construction process.
- Project delayed due to teachers’ job action. There was also turnover in Ministry of Education contacts.

Funding

- Pursued the Neighbourhood Learning Centre model as a way to access funding.
- School District 57, through Ministry of Education, provided ~\$2.3 million for the classroom portion of the project. Regional District was responsible for ~\$550,000 for the community centre.
- Other funders: NDIIT (more than \$200,000); Willow River Recreation Centre (\$18,500); Ministry of Community, Sport, and Culture (\$287,000) (had to be used by March 2015); local bottle drive fundraising (\$10,000); Graymont Western Canada Inc. (to purchase kitchen appliances).
- Challenges and delays accessing NDIIT funding: required evidence of local economic benefits and there were concerns about investing in an infrastructure asset owned by the provincial government. Sought stronger language about the fate of the asset pending any potential future school closure.
- Challenges with ability to access funds due to limited population and limited access to matching funds.

Impact

- Space has been used for community fundraisers, community events, film nights, etc.
- Eaglet Lake Farmer’s Institute holds meetings at the centre. There is discussion about delivering a young farmers’ program through the school, as well as food safe training to meet the needs of the farmers’ market.

Website: <http://www.rdffg.bc.ca/services/community/community-facilities/east-line-community-facility-information>

Elkford Community Conference Centre

Context

- The closure of Elkford Elementary School left 5-6 parcels of land in the downtown vacant.
- The community did not have adequate space for large events, especially those put on by the mining community.

Governance

- The District of Elkford bought the property from the school district in December 2006 for \$175,000 to use as a community centre and a community centre committee was struck.
- On August 11, 2007, the property burnt down: the building was insured ~\$3.6 million. The requirement to rebuild and the insurance money changed the options of the building's scope.
- Through a non-binding survey the community rejected the design brought forward from public consultation by a narrow margin but council decided to proceed.
- Ground breaking ceremony May 25, 2011. Construction finished and grand opening occurred in June of 2012.
- Building is owned and operated by the District of Elkford.

Infrastructure

- Includes large multi-purpose meeting room, Visitor Centre/administration area, a playschool, community hall, and a commercial kitchen.
- The meeting room can be split into two separate rooms with both sides wired for presentations.
- Building built with cross-laminated timbers and structurally insulated panels: the first building in Canada to use both building technologies in a commercial application.
- Lighting is in place in the common area hallways for social and historical displays that will be added.
- Some elements were scaled back or eliminated due to costs (from \$11 million to \$6 million facility). Removed the divider wall from the banquet facility, scaled back meeting rooms and storage space, and removed art room.
- Key issues included cost of contractors and rapid construction timeframe required to access second half of insurance dollars (\$3.5 million).
- The facility can now support large events, but the community lacks accommodation for such events.

Human Resources

- CAO and the Director of Leisure Services managed the project (i.e. working with sub-contractors, community groups).
- Visitor Centre is located with Leisure Services Department and provides clerical support.

Funding

- Funders: District of Elkford: just under \$1 million; Towns for Tomorrow: \$400,000; Columbia Basin Trust: \$400,000; Teck Coal Limited: \$1,000,000; Canadian Wood Council: \$45,000; Mike Sosnowski, Area "A" Director of Regional District of East Kootenay: \$10,000; Falkins Insurance Group: \$5,000; FortisBC: Outdoor Barbeque; East Kootenay Community Credit Union: \$10,000.
- Funds for playschool playground: EKCCU Community Awards: \$12,500; Tire Stewardship BC Grant Program: \$10,000; Elkford Project Society: \$5,000; and CBT Community Initiatives Grant: \$4,000.

Impact

- The new building freed up the former playschool space in the arena, now used as an art studio.
- New building used for annual fundraisers, comedy nights, dances, and movie nights by non-profits.

Website: <http://www.elkford.ca>

Phone: 250-865-4004

Fraser Valley Employment & Support Services Co-operative

Context

- Employment services were transferred from the federal government to the provincial government.
- Employment service contracts were reduced from more than 400 to 73 with smaller programs cut.
- Four agencies who delivered employment services in the Fraser Valley decided to bid together on contracts.

Governance

- Members: Win Resources, Agassiz-Harrison Community Services, Free Reign, Mission Community Skills Centre.
- ~1 year to design co-op and put together RFPs. Employment contracts started in 2012.
- Met weekly to work out details before forming the co-op and worked on areas of strength for each agency: finance, curriculum, shared demographic data on each community, and wrote RFPs together.
- Each member has two votes on the board and can vote by proxy.
- Challenges working with two for-profit members and two non-profit members.
- Conflict protocol: a third-party member not involved in the conflict mediates.

Regional Infrastructure

- Agassiz co-location: building is owned by Agassiz-Harrison Community Services.
 - Win Resources / Agassiz-Harrison Community Services have separate entrances. Other local groups, Seniors Peers, and co-op administration are in same location.
 - Equipped with 3 large meeting spaces, shared kitchen and washrooms, board room, and classroom.
- Mission co-location: Win Resources, other non-co-op social services, a transition house, and programming that compliments employment services.
- Hope location: rents out part of its building privately.
- Buildings upgraded for accessibility (i.e. automatic doors).

Human Resources

- Win Resources has an annual contract to operate the co-op: payments to clients, review of data entry in billings, submission of invoices, and follow-up negotiations with the province.
- Key benefits include joint training and ability to provide staff coverage amongst partners.
- The coop benefits from the diverse networks of each partner across different communities and sectors (i.e. chamber of commerce groups, business associations, healthy communities, etc.).
- Key issue included ensuring security clearance with the government for all staff at all locations.
- Having contracts throughout the Fraser Valley increases daily commute times and costs.
- Faces challenges filling treasurer role on board of directors.
- Provincial ministries lack of understanding of co-ops in BC: impacts success of RFPs.

Funding

- Each partner initially contributed \$25,000 to fund the co-op and it is now funded with 3% revenue from awarded RFP contracts.
- Key contracts/funders: Service Canada / BC Ministry of Jobs, Tourism, and Skills Training.
- Concerns about risk and liability: if one partner can't meet contract obligations, it could jeopardize the contract.

Impact

- The co-op helps to keep more services in small communities by scaling up to bid on contracts.
- Co-location and co-op model approach provides wrap-around services for food banks, counselling, social supports, and employment services. Able to offer more consistent programming and a wider range of services.
- Agassiz location provides space to community in-kind, i.e., Community Response Network (elder abuse prevention), Seniors Peers, and other community projects.
- Savings in shared marketing costs: shared website and information management.

Golden Loom Co-Location Project

Context

- Golden has roughly 189 non-profits serving 6,766 residents. Non-profits lacked an understanding of what each group was doing and there is a shortage of skilled volunteers to support local non-profits.
- Non-profits who attended a LIRN BC (Learning Initiatives for Rural and Northern BC) event in Golden realized they were performing many of the same functions in Golden and Area A. This was a catalyst for the Golden Community Resources Society to submit a grant application entitled Exploring Efficiency Opportunities in Non-Profits in Golden and Area A to start the Golden Loom Co-location Project.

Governance and Development

- The 4-Phase project's structure was inspired by the provincial Early Childhood Coalitions: Phase 1 (Explore Efficiencies): assess local non-profit sector; Phase 2 (Coordination): includes guest speakers and facilitated discussion; Phase 3 (Collaboration); and Phase 4 (Community Team): hiring of a coordinator. The community team is intended for resource allocation, decision making, and priorities at community meetings.
- Golden Community Resources Society is the project sponsor agency who applied for funding.
- Key issues: local government's limited support for the project; regional district is 3 hours away (Salmon Arm).

Infrastructure

- The Golden Loom website was the main structural tool for the project. It includes a blog with related topics for Phases 1, 2, and 3, as well as a non-profit information resource section.
- The Golden Community Resources Society has an extra office used by part-time staff of other non-profits.

Human Resources

- The Golden Community Resources Society hired a consultant for the co-location initiative.
- Local non-profits are participating with staff attending, learning, and sharing their experiences, information and resources. GCRS, the Family Centre, the Women's Centre, and Food Bank are the biggest players.
- Looking at developing local resources such as shared book keepers for the local non-profits.
- Key issues included the limited experience local non-profits have with co-location; difficulties coordinating 100+ participating non-profits and 2 local governments; limited time and funds to support participation.
- Golden lacks enough qualified board members, especially treasurers, for all of its non-profits.

Funding

- Funders include the Columbia Basin Trust, Vancouver Foundation / StepUp BC, the Golden District Community Foundation, and the Columbia Basin Alliance for Literacy.
- Lack of support from senior levels of government. No funding for Phase 4 at this time.
- There are challenges determining which ministry's mandate is responsible for community development over time.

Impact

- Made local non-profits aware of one another and what each non-profit does.
- Brought professional development training to Golden and Area A's non-profit sector: SFU Community Economic Development certificate courses offered in Golden.
- Impact of side-conversations at Golden Loom meetings: non-profits benefiting from lower or no-cost rent from Youth Centre and GCRS; the formation of the Age-Friendly Communities Plan was formed after the Golden Loom brought seniors' groups together.
- The Golden Community Resources Society, the Family Centre, the Women's Centre, and the Food Bank became interested in the Community Service Alignment Project after 2-4 years' work on the Golden Loom. They are now part of the Community Service Alignment Project and hired a consultant for it.

Kitimat Child Development Centre Association

Context

- The KCDC wanted to diversify its funding sources by expanding its services and contracts.
- MCFD is asking contractors to show they have explored opportunities for sharing services. The Innovation and Sustainability project is encouraging shared services (i.e. co-location, co-operatives, etc.).
- Kitimat has been experiencing a period of rapid growth associated with the modernization of Rio Tinto and several proposed LNG projects that have increased the demand for supports (i.e. housing, family, daycare).

Governance

- The decision to expand services was the product of a strategic planning exercise to look 5 years into the future.
- 7 person board is mostly long-term members. Working on recruiting more board members as many are retiring.
 - The community struggles with how to prevent the same people from sitting on multiple boards.
- KCDC is an accredited agency with protocols / policies for dispute resolution, media relations, and research.
- Programs: pre-birth to pre-school services, early intervention, supported child development, family support programs, Welcoming Communities (immigrant supports), and housing resource workers.

Infrastructure

- Rents space from the school district.
- KCDC has explored co-location with other non-profits during discussions of a school closure.
- Barriers to co-location are the long-term leases many non-profits are locked into; not having the funds to buy their own building space; and fear about the work involved in relocation when resources are already stretched.

Human Resources

- Has between 70 and 80 employees, including part-time and on-call.
- Difficulties recruiting local workers in accounting, HR, and mental health (clinicians and support workers).
- Difficult to obtain HR consulting support that understands the community.
- Challenges with sustaining program leaders. Has to train staff in-house for accounting and it is difficult to back up the service during an absence.
- Difficult to find front-line workers in child and youth care, life skills, preschools and daycares due to wages.
- Difficult to find rental accommodation for employees.
- There is a shortage of continuing education funds in service contracts.
- KCDC has been growing staff capacity internally, i.e., employees accessing education at UNBC while working in the community.

Funding

- Key funders / contractors: MCFD, Ministry of Health, and BC Housing.
- Citizenship and Immigration Canada (Welcoming Communities); Service Canada (Community Partners Addressing Homelessness) (contracted to PGNAETA and sub-contracted to KCDC).
- The KCDC cannot apply for federal funds for playgrounds or accessibility as they do not own their building.
- Funding processes have not kept up with the shift to use public facilities more efficiently and to move towards co-location.

Impact

- Family care services are more effective if the service providers know the community: are on the ground and sensitive to concerns that can accumulate overtime.
- The Society is doing a good job communicating with businesses that are becoming more aware about their social responsibility for the health of the community.

Website: <http://www.kitimatcdc.ca>

Phone: (250) 632-3144

Kootenay Boundary Community Services Co-operative

Context

- In the late 1990s and 2000s, changes lead to open procurement and cutbacks for social service programs.
- Many smaller organizations' viability was jeopardized and there were concerns regional contracts would make it more difficult for remote areas to access services.

Governance

- West Kootenay Boundary Regional Administrators Group formalized the co-op in April 2003.
- 13 members: Boundary Family & Individual Services Society (Grand Forks); Arrow & Slocan Lakes Community Services (Nakusp); Circle of Indigenous Nations; North Kootenay Lakes Community Services (Kaslo); Salmo Community Services; TRAIL Family & Individual Resource Centre; Castlegar District Community Services Society, Kootenay Family Place (Castelgar), Kutenai Art Therapy Institute (Nelson); the Nelson Community Services Centre (Nelson Cares), Nelson Women's Centre, & Kootenay Kids Society (Nelson).
- Strategic planning meetings took place between 2001 and 2003 and are revisited every 2 years.
- The co-op is bicameral: the board is comprised of volunteers from around the region: during the first two years, it had staff representatives until the board gained the competencies required. The council has 2 representatives per member: 1) a board or volunteer representative and 2) a staff representative.
- Co-op has a Communication and Advocacy Committee and a Social Planning Framework Committee for research and social planning of service needs in the region.
- Several protocols are in place (i.e. non-compete, conflict resolution, etc.).
- Meetings are rotated annually to Nelson, Castlegar, Trail, and a smaller member community.

Infrastructure

- Members in this regionally-based co-op are not co-located, but the co-op has office space in Nelson.
- The co-op has a resource website for members to access tools and information.

Human Resources

- Co-op has 4 staff members, including a part-time coordinator.
- Ran the REACH program for 5 years for members and other non-profits to access fee-for-service training.

Funding

- Co-op can't sustain itself on memberships and relies on grants. Members hold shares and pay ~\$250 in dues.
- Co-op bids on the groups' behalf for larger contracts (i.e. Early Years and SKY Project - Safe Kids and Youth Coordinated Response). Some members have regional contracts and then subcontract with other members.
- Co-op development and operational funding: CEDNet funding; Carleton University Community Economic Development Technical Assistance Program (CEDTAP) to hire a consultant; and MCFD.
- Co-op has a partnership and regional service contracts with the Columbia Basin Trust.
- Lack of awareness from senior levels of government about the challenges and costs of travelling long distances to deliver and access services in rural areas.
- Due to lack of funding for social sector infrastructure, it took 2 years to find space for the co-op.
- Concerns from members about debt-risk and the collapse of infrastructure if there is no funding.

Impact

- Co-op offers members regular meetings, collaboration, consultation, and organizes regional training: makes it more affordable by pooling participants to have the numbers to provide training in the area.
- By banding together, co-op members have a greater voice when working with funders / government.
- Collaboration / sharing resources have improved knowledge about each member's service delivery.

Website: <http://thekoop.ca>

Phone: (250) 352-6786

Lake Cowichan Neighbourhood Learning Centre

Context

- In an area with many smaller communities, Lake Cowichan experienced a number of school closures, with students being bussed to larger centres. In 2008, the A.B. Greenwell Elementary School was closed due to mold, resulting in students being bussed 30 minutes away.
- Lake Cowichan had shrinking community services (i.e. the daycare closed).
- The Town of Lake Cowichan was looking at the possibility of a community garden and municipal hall. The library / School District 79 were looking to build new structures and the Health Unit was seeking a new space.

Governance and Development

- The process was spearheaded by the Town of Lake Cowichan.
- Potential partners did not have a history of working together (i.e. across First Nations, health unit, school district, local government).
- The process had an ad hoc advisory committee that experienced turnover amongst people representing stakeholder organizations.
- Community meetings, focus groups, and questionnaires were organized with residents and stakeholders.
- Took ~ six months from the initial application for funding to complete the public consultation process for the NLC. The project did not go past the public consultation stage.
- Shortage of partners: site not visible / central for library; RCMP renovated existing building; pre-school obtained space at recreation centre; community services society own their building; post office has long-term lease; health unit not interested.
- There was a lot of distrust and anger about school closures that impeded the ability of some to focus on the existing opportunity. Fears that the NLC would displace groups providing services.

Infrastructure

- Wanted a site that had one building for a school, municipal hall, library and other services rather than multiple structures.
- There were initial discussions of shared spaces, i.e., shared staff rooms, if the project came together.
- Some groups did not want adults sharing a building space with children.
- Disagreement on the best site location for a new elementary school/NLC: spread out, rural population.
- A greenhouse and community garden was built on Lake Cowichan Secondary School grounds.
- Community gardeners did not want to access the greenhouse / gardens on Lake Cowichan Secondary grounds.

Human Resources

- Town of Lake Cowichan hired consultant from Quest Consulting.
- Limited engagement from school district. Need more assistance to broker relationships amongst stakeholders.

Funding

- The Town of Lake Cowichan and the school board received funding from the School Community Connection Program to explore options for a NLC at a new elementary school for the area.
- The process, the greenhouse, and community garden were funded by the Province of BC's Neighbourhood Learning Grant. The Town of Lake Cowichan provided space for the meetings. The community garden and greenhouse were a partnership between the Town of Lake Cowichan and School District 79.
- For the larger co-location project, many potential partners did not have the funds to go ahead with the build.
- Difficult to attract infrastructure funding with a decreasing population.
- Funding for processes/planning without additional funding secured for infrastructure creates local project planning fatigue and disinterest.

Impact

- Lake Cowichan Secondary students have access to a greenhouse and community garden to grow vegetables.

Nechako Valley Community Services Society

Context

- NVCSS built its own building in the 1990s, and expanded into a multi-service organization in Vanderhoof.

Governance

- Currently have 7 board members and a couple of vacancies.
- Programs include: family development, mental health and counselling, support for adults with developmental disabilities, homeless outreach / prevention, infant development, pre-school, seniors' housing, meals on wheels, lifeline, victim's assistance.

Infrastructure

- Main office in Vanderhoof with satellite offices in Fort St. James and Fraser Lake.
- Renovated counselling rooms designed into a playroom / art room for working with families.
- In the 1990s, NVCSS did not envision it would experience such growth. Shortage of space became one of the biggest challenges: accessing enough space to run programs and activities and saving enough funds to obtain more space. There is also a lack of sufficient storage space.

Human Resources

- Employs ~65 full-time, part-time, and casual employees.
- Agency added a Fort St. James Manager to add presence in Fort St James ~ 1 year ago.
- The client population of some programs is made up of more than 50% persons of Aboriginal ancestry: the agency has a level of Aboriginal cultural awareness, collaboration, and accountability.
- Agency has very few formal partnerships with other agencies but has monthly meetings with other local organizations and the Northern Executive Director Network to discuss challenges/opportunities.
- A key issue is staying connected with satellite offices because they are a 45 minute drive from Vanderhoof.
- Challenge of being located in northern communities: recruiting staff for programs that require specialized training.
- Agency requires HR services but is not large enough to have HR personnel in-house: done by executive director or manager.

Funding

- Operates a social enterprise via a mobile work crew and has funding contracts with MCFD, Community Living BC, BC Housing, Public Health Agency of Canada; and federal funds for hiring summer students.
- NVSS has a good relationship with the District of Fort St James, District of Vanderhoof, and the Village of Fraser Lake who provide grants-in-aid and the Regional District of Bulkley-Nechako Regional provides letters of support for some grant applications and financial support for various programs.
- The mobile work crew operates with a ~\$5,000 deficit and is run as a service for the clients rather than a revenue stream. The mobile work crew is well supported by the forest industry and New Gold.
- In 2010, MCFD restructured services to match MCFD mandate. Child and youth counselling did not fit mandate. Funds were reallocated to support high-risk families. Caused ripple effect in communities with some people thinking they are no longer able to access services.
- An overall issue concerns decreased funding while demand for services increases.

Impact

- Agency is able to bring a broader range of services and meet individual community's needs, retain staff by having them work in multiple programs, and have a sufficient budget to support in-house accounting / administration.
- The multi-service, multi-location nature of the agency allowed it to work with BC Housing to expand the Homeless Outreach Program to Fraser Lake and Fort St. James.

Website: <http://nvcss.ca>

Phone: 250-567-9205

Penticton and District Community Resources Society

Context

- Through strategic planning, PDCRS's board wanted to diversify its services and funding options. The society reduced its reliance on government funding from 92% to 75% with the remainder coming from fee-for-service.

Infrastructure

- PDCRS owns real-estate, including a fourplex.
- Co-location: PDCRS owns a two-story building and leases space to the South Okanagan Seniors Wellness Society. The two organizations have a shared supplies cupboard.
- The SOSWS has storefront space for accessibility / visibility to promote the organization.
- The SOSWS has a separate phone number that is linked to the PDCRS phone system.
- Cannot take on additional services without expanding its space: at physical capacity.

Governance

- PDCRS has a 10 member board with the main office located in Penticton.
- The Society has experienced steep growth in the last couple of years. PDCRS made changes to its geographic scope of service to respond to CLBC's new service delivery model that resulted in more requests for services in additional communities.
- Services: pre-school, childcare centres, supportive child development, counselling information and referral services, Better at Home, and family development. Transit delivered with agreements with BC Transit and municipalities (i.e. commuter between Summerland / Penticton, and HandyDart in Summerland / Penticton).
- Locations with services: Penticton, Summerland, Cawston, Keremeos, Oliver, Princeton, Osoyoos, and South Okanagan – Similkameen regional contracts.
- Partnership with Desert Valley Hospice Society: DVHS are the experts in hospice and PDCRS provides experience in leadership, accessing funds, and navigating systems.
- Partnership with Division of Family Practice: PDCRS manages payroll, HR, etc. for a medical office assistant, a social worker, and two community workers.
- Partnership with SOSWS:
 - Some of the seniors program is blended to streamline services. Offers Better at Home as a partnership.
 - Executive Director of PDCRS reports to the SOSWS board and does strategic planning.
- It is challenging to discuss a co-op model or shared services as some smaller agencies are threatened by PDCRS's size and scope of services.

Human Resources

- The Society has leadership teams for each community. Hiring local people in each service community develops relationships, familiarity, and local people know other agencies, community pressures, and context.
- PDCRS faces challenges expanding childcare services due to a lack of qualified personnel; often have to pay for staff to complete an Early Childhood Education certificate or an Infant-Toddler specialization.

Funding

- Funding: City of Penticton, BC Gaming grants. Contracts: MCFD, Community Living BC, BC Transit, Ministry of Health, Service Canada, and small contracts with School District.
- Pressures in costs of operating childcare services for staff and space: School District 53 waived ~\$3,000 of rent to keep childcare services open.

Impact

- Small communities may offer more opportunity to buy real estate for investment.
- Cost savings to SOSWS: telephone system, share supplies, and rent savings. Funds previously used for rent now used for the provision of more services. Able to expand seniors' services in rural areas.

Website: <http://www.pdcrs.com>

Phone: (250) 492-5814

Prince George Community Foundation

Context

- Many smaller communities did not have community foundations / stable funding to support initiatives.

Governance and Development

- The PGCF now manages funds (0.5% admin fee) for Burns Lake, Fort St. James, Kitimat, McBride, Terrace, Valemount, Prince Rupert, Quesnel, Fraser Lake, and rural areas within the Fraser-Fort George Regional District (Salmon River & Lakes, Chilako River – Nechako, Woodpecker – Hixon, Willow River – Upper Fraser, Crooked River – Parsnip).
- PGCF has a 10 member board. There is no representation from other communities on the PGCF Board.
- Communities must organize their own fundraising / grant processes.
- Collaborates with the FFGRD who will manage grants for smaller areas.
- Some communities have their own legal foundation which requires a committee to receive and assess grant applications; they do their own accounting/ issue tax receipts.
- All agreements are retractable through a 1-year process; funds must be transferred to their own foundation.

Infrastructure

- Smaller foundations are always able to find somewhere to meet due to the small amount of people involved.

Human Resources

- PGCF has one staff person.
- Provides leadership, education, guidance, accounting assistance, and tax receipts issuance for all donations.
- Helps smaller foundations with advertising tools.
- Will be collaborating with FFGRD on workshops for community groups to apply for grants.
- PGCF has lawyers, bankers, and accountants on their board, making information from these resources accessible to community partners.
- PGCF struggles to find new board members; other communities are also struggling to find board members.
- There is limited awareness about community foundations: new concept for many people.
- Before Community Foundation of Canada had online resources, information requests for PGCF were outpacing staff resources.
- For most communities, their fund is volunteer-driven; granting committees are time-consuming and take commitment. Communities have limited volunteer capacity and volunteer fatigue.
- Developed relationships and information leave with the board members, keeping CFs in a state of constant renewal.

Funding

- The federal government's Smart and Caring Community Program opened doors for the PGCF.
- In 2004/2005, grant matching funds via the Northern Development Initiative Trust were available. Communities could access a maximum of \$100,000 in 2 installments to create a foundation partner with a larger community foundation. This led the way for PGCF to manage funds for 13 communities totaling \$2 million.
- Community organizations that are not registered as charitable organizations cannot be funded by community foundations unless they have a charitable organization as an agreement partner.
- Small community groups struggle with the formality of the grant application process.
- Rural communities have a limited tax base and face more difficulties accessing federal funding, making it difficult for their community funds to grow.

Impact

- PGCF provides cost savings in administrative fees and in time required for fund management.
- Offers many online workshops to communities to give new ideas on how to do things.
- Instead of granting funds annually, communities can grow their investments to fund community capital projects.

Website: <http://pgcf.ca>

Phone: 250-562-7772

Port Clements Multi-Purpose Building

Context

- Decline in student enrolment led to discussions about the potential closure of the elementary school.
- A large number of buildings were aging and underutilized. The Village Office was located in an old hydro building and the club hall was a condemned building that had been used for many years. Despite an aging population, there was no facility for seniors.

Governance and Development

- Formed Multi-Purpose Society in 1998. Referendum held in 2003 with 76% in favour of the new facility.
- School District #50 and the Village of Port Clements jointly own the facility. The school insures the entire building and bills the Village based on square footage.
- Building committee: mayor, 2 councillors, community resident, village administrator, school principal, teacher, school trustee, support staff member, PAC member, and secretary-treasurer.
- School district and the local government have conflict resolution protocols and sign-in protocols with the janitor for after hours use of the building. New protocols are being developed due to Northern Health's regulations and inspection for usage, policies, and licensing requirements (i.e. food safe, sterilization, etc.). There are joint use agreements for the gym, with school use provided during school hours and the Village manages after hours use.
- There is no formal management committee; a joint task force is formed if capital repairs are needed.
- Needed to address liability insurance for accidents / falls outside of the building. This required clarification that the Village was responsible for maintaining the exterior of the building (i.e. sidewalks, falling ice, etc.).
- The library couldn't be open during school hours due to liability concerns of patrons being in the facility at the same time as school children. This produced changes for the janitorial contract. Concerns were addressed regarding kids' access to the library's Wi-Fi which doesn't have the same restrictions as the school's Wi-Fi.

Infrastructure

- Construction started in November 2007; completed in 2009.
- Key issues: limited interest in contract bids and higher construction costs.
- This facility includes the Port Clements Elementary School, daycare, the Vancouver Island Regional Library, the Village administration office, a commercial kitchen, and multi-purpose rooms.
- Lack of storage for multi-purpose rooms. Seniors have a strong sense of ownership over the multi-use rooms.

Human Resources

- Project manager moved from Abbotsford to Port Clements; lived in home owned by the Village to reduce costs.
- Difficult to find skilled people to do repairs on specialized heating infrastructure.

Funding

- Funding from the Gwaii Trust (\$1 million), the Ministry of Education / School District #50 (\$1.2 million), the provincial Infrastructure Grant (\$1.86 million), the Village of Port Clements (including money earned through tax sale properties), Weyerhaeuser / Western Forest Products (\$30,000 to hire an architect), and various community groups. Weyerhaeuser donated and provided nominally priced timber / materials for concrete work.

Impact

- Cost comparison revealed that the Village saved \$10,000 each year in heating and electricity costs for their share of the multi-purpose facility compared to the three aging structures that were used prior to development.
- Retained their elementary school to support the retention of families.
- Provides a central place for Haida Gwaii residents to gather for meetings and events. There are more community activities (i.e. yoga, aerobics, movie nights, etc.). Provides opportunities to generate revenue from rentals. Multi-purpose rooms are used by the Skeena-Queen Charlotte Regional District, Vancouver Island Health, and the BC Teachers Federation for meetings / training.

Pouce Coupe Regional Multi-Purpose Centre

Context

- The school district planned on closing the school and sending students to multiple schools in Dawson Creek.
- Pouce Coupe had a small library with no room for expansion. Pouce Coupe also needed a community centre.
- Ministry would consider building a new school if there was a need for a multi-purpose facility and if the Village paid for the gymnasium. Project took 5 years to develop and opened on March 7th, 2008.

Governance and Development

- School District owns the building. Joint-user agreement outlines responsibilities: School District 59 operates the school and the Village of Pouce Coupe operates the community centre. School District pays utilities. Village pays for cleaning the community centre when it is rented on days that custodial staff don't normally come in.
 - Library is a school district tenant but does not pay rent and can access the community centre for free.
- Village replaces equipment in the community centre; School District installs it and sometimes partners on smaller items. Large items purchased by School District and invoiced to the Village.
- During school hours, municipal staff require permission to enter site. After 3:30pm and on weekends, the School District requires municipal permission to enter site and space bookings are through the Village.
- Village has an agreement with local recreation committee and they are covered by Village liability insurance.
- Library changed hours (2pm to 8pm): safety concerns with children being on site with adults during the day.

Infrastructure

- Facility includes the Pouce Coupe Elementary School, the municipal library, and the regional community centre. The library space is shared between the school and the municipal library; the community centre contains a commercial kitchen / gymnasium space that is shared with the school.
- Building has solar panels, grey water is captured for use in toilets, and free Wi-Fi provided by school district.
- Electronic sign was installed for advertising school and community events.
- Due to difficulties hiring trades workers, portables were built and transported from the Lower Mainland.
- Lack of storage space for recreation equipment. Lack of space for library's specialized equipment/book storage.

Human Resources

- Municipal library and school library each have their own library staff.
- Community centre maintenance done by School District and charged to Village. Village usually only breaks even on events due to high cost of unionized custodial services. They are pursuing an exemption from full cost.
- Village staff take turns doing late night inspections: overtime pay/extra hours.
- New teachers were not accustomed to the shared facility and needed an orientation about the process.

Funding

- School funded by Ministry of Education. Funding also from the Community Foundation Society (~\$100,000), EnCana (~\$100,000), Village of Pouce Coupe, community donations, and NDI. Library is funded by the Village.

Impact

- Retention of local children and families using the elementary school.
- Savings in utilities and maintenance costs for municipal library; library expanded its programming / collection.
- School can access interlibrary loans through the municipal library.
- Increased library traffic, including from tourists, due to high visibility on highway.
- The community centre is used for events to generate revenue that are reinvested in the community centre.
- Community now has a facility large enough for weddings and funerals.
- Recreation committee revitalized in the community. Yoga, Taekwondo, drop-in volleyball and basketball, and Friday family fun nights at the Community Centre. Provides space for physical activity during winter.

Robson Valley Support Society

Context

- The Robson and Canoe Valley regions have experienced pressures in the forest and agricultural sectors (i.e. mill closures, loss of forest district office, market pressures, new inspection regulations and fees for agriculture, BSE crisis, etc.). These valleys also have an aging population.
- RVSS started with homecare support for seniors and then expanded the scope and scale of their operations.

Governance and Development

- Has 8 board members with representatives from the local governments in McBride and Valemount.
- Services: employment services, handy person, violence prevention, safe shelter, victims services, infant development, child development, family support, community adult literacy program, food program, Better at Home, child and youth mental health, and community outreach.
- There are a lack of hubs for one-stop shops offering the same range of services. This limits opportunities to discuss issues or challenges with other similar multi-service / one-stop organizations in small communities.

Infrastructure

- McBride: located in a house in the downtown core. McBride location is at capacity. Lots of office sharing and space coordination is necessary.
- Valemount: rents space from Village of Valemount in the Community Services Building. The Village handles maintenance. Older building carries sound; small windows.
- Much of the service information is via telephone and website which is difficult in rural areas where many people do not have electricity, cell phones, or know how to use the Internet.

Human Resources

- 17 staff operate programs in McBride and Valemount.
- The limited labour pool makes it difficult to find qualified staff: money has to be spent training staff.
- A one-stop shop gives staff an opportunity to try out other roles. RVSS provides some support for cross-training.
- The two communities are facing volunteer fatigue.
- Housing costs impact recruitment and retention of employees.

Funding

- Key funders/contracts: MCFD, Ministry of Justice, Ministry of Advanced Education, BC Housing, Northern Health Authority, Women's Foundation, Columbian Basin Trust, United Way (Better at Home) and the United Way of Northern BC, Ministry of Social Development and Social Innovation.
- Has a partnership with Valemount Learning Centre: some of their funds reach RVSS.
- Small municipal tax bases: limited funds for social services.
- A key issue concerns the complexity of using reporting software for those with human service backgrounds rather than business management backgrounds.
- Transportation for staff travelling between the two villages is costly and consumes program funds.

Impact

- One-stop shops in smaller communities do a lot of advocacy for clients and play a role in connecting clients to more services in urban centres.
- Clients are able to build a connection with service providers and feel respected as they are not sent to numerous specialized service providers for each step of the process.

Website: <http://robsonvalleysupportsociety.org>

Phone: 250-569-2266 (McBride); 250-566-9107 (Valemount)

Sea to Sky Community Services

Context

- Started in 1979 with a MCFD contract serving Pemberton to D'Arcy to Britannia Beach. In the 1980s, SSCS expanded the scale and scope of its operations as senior governments moved to contract out more services.
- In 2006, the pulp mill closed: loss of good paying jobs put stress on services.

Governance

- Has 8 board members. Conflict resolution protocols are in place. Accreditation has shaped policies and practice.
- Programs: Better at Home; counselling services; stopping the violence; sexual abuse prevention program for children; healthy pregnancy outreach; Success by Six; a six-bed recovery house; and operates social housing for seniors, families, and persons with disabilities.
- Operates Strong Start in partnership with the School District and has an Early Years table.
- Provides services to ~5 First Nations Bands near Squamish.
- Co-location site has a joint building committee between SSCS and the United Church.
 - United Church providing \$1.5 million and will buy back 1.5 lots for \$1; SSCS will oversee the project.
 - Lease agreement will outline United Church's priority for community rooms.

Infrastructure

- Squamish main office is leased. Moved to a small office downtown above the post office to have a community presence. Expanded space above post office to ~6,000 ft² when awarded federal employment contracts.
 - Includes financial operations and a few programs.
- Squamish old courthouse is leased and retrofitted for early childhood development and daycare services.
- Squamish Youth Centre located downtown by secondary school: leased from municipality who handles major maintenance issues.
- Aging infrastructure of youth centre: may only last 5 more years and there is uncertainty about availability of space at recreation centre.
- Squamish: new building co-location with Squamish United Church on 5 lots – will own the building.
 - Will have 32 housing units, the church, and commercial kitchen and community spaces for rent.
- In Pemberton, lease small office with staff that serve up to D'Arcy.
- In Whistler, leased small office; but took time to open due to high space costs.

Human Resources

- 160 staff deliver programs through the Sea to Sky corridor. Key issue is the lack of available housing for staff.
- Multi-service programs cause challenges in hiring staff.
- Union wage grids not competitive: professional services, occupational therapy, and physical therapy difficult to hire.

Funding

- Provincial funders/contracts: MCFD (including \$20,000 for staff at youth centre), Community Living BC, BC Housing, Ministry of Justice Work BC, Vancouver Coastal Health, and local community foundations.
- Federal programs: Strong Start; and CAPC - Public Health and Parent and Tot. Subcontracted with Sunshine Coast Community Services for Parent Tot.
- District of Squamish developer / amenity fund - \$188,000 towards new building and letters or support.
- Contract with District of Squamish to operate youth centre.
- Staff commutes impact program budgets.

Impact

- Partnership helps local church remain financially viable and builds new community multi-purpose facility.
- Able to support capacity development for staff: will hold their positions while they obtain further training and will receive remuneration upon return to SSCS. Multi-service format creates efficiencies and improved service delivery at a central location.

Shuswap Community Resources Co-operative

Context

- Restructuring and decreased funding in the non-profit sector led to the pursuit of a for-profit co-op model.
- Some members feared dissolution and competition from regional contracts.
- Many members had worked together through the Child and Youth Committee and sought other members with a social service sector focus.

Governance

- In 2007, social service sector executive directors began meeting to discuss co-ops, followed by study groups, focus groups, and a consultant case study.
- Received advice on constitution and bylaws from the BC Co-operative Association.
- Has membership in Realize Co-op in Vancouver: SCRC has a Director on its board.
- Incorporated as a for-profit co-op in 2008. There are four members: Canadian Mental Health Association Shuswap-Revelstoke, Shuswap Children's Association, Shuswap Area Family Emergency Society, and the Eagle Valley Community Services Society.
- Serves from Salmon Arm to Sicamous.
- Members sign a non-competition MOU: the bid goes to the co-op first for consideration.
- Each agency has two directors on the board and one vote per member for AGMs.
- Co-op has a governance committee, finance committee, and executive committee (does hiring).
- Set-up was time-intensive and member agencies have limited staffing resources.

Infrastructure

- Co-op office rents space (nominal fee) from the Canadian Mental Health Association Shuswap-Revelstoke.
- The members are not co-located: 3 agencies are based in Salmon Arm and 1 agency is based in Sicamous.

Human Resources

- In 2011, the co-op opened its book keeping services for non-profit agencies, clubs, and groups.
- Agencies provide 4 hours per week in admin time towards co-op work.
- Hired a co-op manager, pay-roll administrator, and 3 book keepers.
- Increased difficulty in finding skilled people in rural communities.
- Initial concerns about the liability of doing book keeping for other organizations.

Funding

- Federal co-op innovation grant to start co-op: ~\$14,000 in first year and ~\$10,000 in second year.
- Agencies put in shares based on their operating budgets. Contributions varied from ~\$3,300 to \$2,000. Seed capital that could be withdrawn if leaving the co-op. Seed funds used for office set-up and working capital.
- Costs of for-profit structure: the for-profit co-op is not eligible for discounts to commercial software via TechSoup; lack of eligibility for many grants because it is not a charity; lack of government funding for co-ops beyond initial set-up and limited funding for co-location; lack technology infrastructure to support communication; and limited funds for travel budgets.

Impact

- Co-op membership allowed members to build better connections with other agencies in their sector.
- Information on the communities is shared by the co-op, allowing some members to expand their mandates.
- Members benefit from collaboration and potential share returns: co-op showed a profit last year.
- Provides accounting, book keeping, space rentals, and hosts training for members and non-members.
- Better understanding of local services and supports which led to improved responsiveness and service referrals. Book keeping services provides consistent access to back-up staff for agencies.
- Started *Moving Forward* (formerly *Together Shuswap*) annual two day workshop on regional social planning with local Aboriginal Bands and service providers.

Smithers Community Services Association

Context

- Smithers Community Services Association formed to address service gaps in the community.
- Some specialized programs have branched off from the Smithers Community Services Association:
 - Women's service mandate branched off into the Northern Society for Domestic Peace.

Governance

- Operates with a volunteer board of seven.
- Programs: foster care, family support, youth support, neighbourhood kitchen, ESL, literacy outreach, immigrant services, homelessness prevention, social housing, emergency shelter, seniors' housing, FASD, lifeline, helping hands, and transit. Provides programing in Smithers, Houston, and Hazelton.
- Challenge of mandate creep as community members and municipality turn to SCSA to provide new services.

Infrastructure

- Owns and operates in a former train station.
- Two units rented to tenants with separate entrances. The rest of the building is now used for SCSA programs.

Human Resources

- To make on-call work more attractive, casual employees often trained and on-call for multiple programs.
- Provides immigrant services through a contract funded 50-50 by the BC government and federal government.
- More than 15 staff and a number of volunteer tutors.
- Different local cultures in each community served. Challenges recruiting staff in Houston and Hazelton.
- Has to use outside contractors from Vancouver Island to provide HR services as the organization could not find a local contractor.
- Due to population, funding not always available for full-time work: harder to fill part-time vacancies.

Funding

- SCSA creates revenue from renting out space which reduces operational costs. Current tenants: Via Rail and an engineering firm.
- Does book keeping for Brain Injury Society for nominal fee.
- Has ~30 contracts with ~10 funders. Major funders: BC Housing and MCFD.
 - BC Housing works in partnership with BC Non-profit Housing Association (SCSA is a member).
 - BC Housing supports ShelterNet (SCSA is a member), an organization that provides shelter workers with training and annual service provider meetings.
- Community Adult Literacy Program (CALP) annual funding contract.

Impact

- Goal of society to mentor smaller community organizations locally and in the region for initiatives that aligned with SCSA's values. Assists other communities groups: helped housing group in Telkwa set up (organizing books, creating tenancy agreements, calculating rent, etc.); answered governance questions for Gymnastics Club and Fall Fair Society.
- The SCSA can be a competitive employer because of low operational costs: can provide good wage / more full-time hours.
- Often able to attract overqualified staff due to high level of staff participation in community and the awareness of the SCSA.

Website: <http://www.scsa.ca>

Phone: 250-847-9515 or 1-888-355-6222

Sooke CASA (Co-operative Association of Service Agencies)

Context

- In 1998, Sooke Family Resource Society completed a feasibility study which showed community interest in co-location to streamline access to services.

Governance

- Co-op was incorporated in 2003. CASA members: Sooke Family Resource Society, Edward Milne Community School, Vancouver Island Health Authority, Pacific Centre Family Services Association, Sooke Options for Community Living Association, Sooke Transition House, MCFD, and the Sooke Co-operative Preschool Association.
- Queen Alexandra Foundation (now the Children's Health Foundation of Vancouver Island) owns the facility; members have \$1 lease agreements; pay maintenance / management fees according to their use of the building.
- In 2014, the co-op merged with the Community Health Network as both had the same stakeholders.
- During development, committees were created that members could come and go from (i.e., communications, site selection, and governance committees). The co-op has a health committee, a volunteer centre services committee, and a committee working with the Chamber of Commerce to bring more doctors to Sooke.
- The co-op started with a board with representation from each member that operated the facility.
- There are bi-annual tenants meetings to discuss any issues with the co-location facility.
- Service co-ops were a new concept when Sooke CASA was created so it was a slow process working on development and receiving buy-in from the government. Time was needed to educate people about co-ops.
- Problems arise when new faces come to the table: challenges maintaining co-op memory and orientating people.

Infrastructure

- Organizations pay rent for the square footage of dedicated spaces such as private offices.
- Costs are shared for common spaces (i.e. licensed kitchen, shared staff room, and shared reception at the front of the building; although, MCFD and the Vancouver Island Health Authority have their own reception areas).
- The Early Years Room: shared by Sooke Family Resource Society / Public Health.
- Photocopy room: shared by Sooke Family Resource Society / MCFD.
- After merging with the Community Health Network, co-op members are located onsite and offsite.

Human Resources

- Consultants were brought in to facilitate sessions for the creation of the co-op.
- The co-op has a part-time coordinator. Receptionist services are contracted to Sooke Family Resource Society.
- ~ 5 years ago, a management company was hired to operate the facility so those in the co-op focus on service delivery, integration of services, and collaborative services.
- Sooke CASA does not have the staffing capacity to be very active in the BC Co-op Society; members are doing work off the side of their desk or utilizing retired community members.

Funding

- In 2000, the QAF became the major funder for the co-location site. QAF provided financial support for coordination, research to understand the functionality of the space, and efforts to bring in architects.
- Funds for development: MCFD: \$1.2 million; Island Health: ~\$1 million; large amounts of funding from Children's Health Foundation. The municipality has given organizations in the building a reduced tax rate.

Impact

- Co-op membership expanded program offerings and staffing, i.e. Sooke Family Resource Society grew ~ 50% within a couple of years of moving into the co-op.
- Co-op membership has increased collaboration and improved communication: a better understanding of what organizations do due to those connections and improvements in how funders viewed member organizations.
- Having the co-op in Sooke means community members do not have to travel to Victoria to access services.

Website: <http://www.sfrs.ca>

Phone: (250) 642-5152

South Peace Community Resources Society

Context

- Society's services and strains on services impacted by boom-bust cycle: lack of awareness that many people are in need during booms due to rising cost of living (i.e. high rents, etc.).
- The South Peace Community Resources Society is a multi-service organization based in Dawson Creek with locations and services in Fort St John, Chetwynd, and Tumbler Ridge.

Governance and Development

- The Society has a nine-person board.
- Have partnerships with the City of Dawson Creek, School District 59, the Nawican Friendship Centre, as well as other partners for Supportive Child Development and Success by Six.
- Services/Programs: addictions counsellors, housing adults with disabilities, community support workers, social workers, homelessness intervention, transition house, safe homes, second stage housing, legal advocacy, transition house, Better at Home, and supportive child development.

Infrastructure

- Dawson Creek: SPCRS owns their administration building. Services for families, victim's services, and legal advocacy are offered in a quieter space. Children's counselling space is located downstairs separating it from the administration area: room contains toys, art, and a TV.
- The Reconnect program for street youth is in a house and the Society owns houses for 24 hour coverage support for adults with disabilities.
- The Society rents a space in the co-op mall for child development/care programs: keeps services accessible and noise away from administration building.
- Rents space in Chetwynd in a building shared with other tenants.
- Faces difficulties accessing contractors/trades: required two years to obtain two quotes for a coach house.

Human Resources

- Employs ~75 persons with some staff working in multiple programs.
- Does joint training with other organizations, i.e., first aid.
- Some joint training done with other organizations through Peace Region's Professional Resources Program.
 - Comprised of SPCRS and three other Peace Region providers of community living services to adults with disabilities. Managed by SPCRS and ran by a committee comprising all of the member organizations' Executive Directors.
 - Developed in 1984: BC government closed the Tranquille Institution and sent children with disabilities to their home communities for inclusion. Home communities did not have the capacity to provide services to the children. Province provided regional funds for training; the Peace Region advocated managing the funds internally rather than via the provincial government.
- During economic booms there are challenges recruiting and retaining employees; faces challenges competing with other sectors' wages. Difficult to provide training needed by so many types of professionals.

Funding

- Key funders: Ministry of Justice, BC Housing, MCFD, Community Living BC, and Law Foundation.
- Receives many private sector donations: used for side projects or issues that are not a current government focus.
- Limited travel costs for training and attending regional meetings.
- Faces challenges finding software to meet the communication and file management needs of different services.

Impact

- Because it is a one-stop shop, SPCRS is able to provide streamlined supports and crisis intervention, as well as keynote speakers and presentations for professional development.

Tumbler Ridge Community Association Responding to Extended Services (TR Cares)

Context

- Mine closures and housing sale prompted an influx of people looking for affordable housing.
- Many new residents (i.e. seniors, people with disabilities, low-income residents, etc.) had a breadth of needs that could no longer be addressed locally as services were closed or regionalized in distant centres.
- There were limited local transportation options and no bus service to connect residents with regionalized services.

Governance

- Board of directors, 6-8 committees, and approximately 20 volunteers.
- Functions as an umbrella organization. This reduces the need for multiple organizations to obtain charitable status and supports are streamlined through one organization.
- Programs: medical shuttle service to regional centres, Work In Progress (special needs group), police-based victim's services, Citizens on Patrol, Restorative Justice, legal assistance, family assistance, medical / prescription assistance, food and basic shelter assistance, utilities fund, and HOURS (Housing Our Responsibility Shelter) – a safe home program.

Infrastructure

- Obtained outdated vehicle from the District of Tumbler Ridge to start the medical shuttle services.
- Difficulty obtaining an affordable lease on vehicles.

Human Resources

- Medical shuttle operates with 4 regular volunteers and two back up volunteers.
- There are still challenges with a lack of volunteers.
- Challenges transporting clients who have addictions.

Funding

- Funding from Northern Health (leased use of vehicles for certain days of the week, insurance, gas, maintenance), the District of Tumbler Ridge, Fort City Chrysler, Shop Easy, Finning, Peace River Coal, the Dollar Store, and various other hotels, business, and golf courses around the region who have donated to the annual golf tournament.
- Financial assistance provided to volunteers drivers to obtain BCAA coverage and first aid. Drivers also receive an honorarium to cover incidentals out-of-town.
- District provides assistance of a grant writer.
- During the period of rapid growth associated with expanded mining activity, taxi drivers were busy transporting workers to the mine. TR Cares renegotiated its contract with Northern Health to provide transportation once a week to connect residents to local medical services.
- There are still challenges with a lack of funding.
- Resources needed to complete grant applications and reporting documents.

Impact

- Over half a million documented kilometres driven by volunteers to connect residents with regionalized supports.
- Services have helped to retain residents in the community.
- TR Cares saves Northern Health the full maintenance costs, as well as the costs of hiring union drivers. By using a smaller vehicle, TR Cares is able to deliver a more cost effective service than the use of the larger Northern Health Connections Bus.

Phone: 250-242-7444

Ucluelet Multi-Purpose Community Centre

Context

- Small World War II era and pre-war era buildings, including the recreation hall, had aged significantly.
- Municipality recognized need for new community spaces, including non-profit office space.

Governance

- Partners in project were Village of Ucluelet, Province of British Columbia, MCFD, Ucluelet Daycare Society, Vancouver Island Regional Library Board, and Westcoast Community Resource Society.
- Municipality handled project management, owns the building, rents space, and handles all bookings.
- Vancouver Island Library Board very involved in the project due to their previous experience with partnering with a municipality in a multi-purpose building.
- A municipal committee was struck with municipal leaders / staff, local builders, and community members.
- To borrow funds for the project, there were 3 public votes (first 2 failed): impact tax rates for 15-20 years.
- Project took 3+ years for planning, 1 year for architectural designs, and 1 year for build. Building opened in 2010.
- Lease agreements were signed with the library and WCRS before the design and build.
- Disputes are first handled informally amongst staff as formal disputes have to go to Council.

Infrastructure

- Shared reception space for non-profits; with access to photocopier room, equipment, and kitchen:
 - WCRS, Ministry of Children and Family Development, Mental Health, a child and youth mental health worker, the public health nurse, and a NTC Early Years worker.
- Individual service needs taken into account, i.e., the public health nurse office has a sink, an observation window, and increased soundproofing. Non-profits share a meeting space. The library and the WCRS each have their own separate entrances, as well as access through the main entrance / hallways.
- Other key spaces include: large performance hall, teen centre, dance studio, an arts room, and two activity rooms with a retractable white board wall to form one large room. Building has publically accessible WiFi.
- Building is wired/set-up for video-conferencing and fibre-optics once the community receives these services.
- Much of the infrastructure is in the building's floors, and the floors are heated, polished cement.
- Predicted cost for the geotechnical work was ~\$150,000 higher than estimated: building built on rock.
- Only one local hardware store: could not keep up on orders or compete on pricing for project. It was cheaper/faster for contractor to bring their own supplies into town.
- Lack of storage space, i.e., in Council Chambers, is a problem.

Human Resources

- District staff manage space rentals, maintenance, tenants, etc. Non-profits share janitorial services / reception.
- Key issue: negotiating with builder to hire as many local workers as possible for project.

Funding

- Municipal Recreation Director worked with the Ucluelet Daycare Society to obtain a ~ \$ 1/2 million grant.
- Key funding came from federal tax grant funds, Towns for Tomorrow, a \$2 million municipal debenture, and funds raised from amenity fees charged to large local development projects.

Impact

- Theatre-style council chambers built that is used as a community movie theatre on Friday and Saturday nights.
- Old community hall now used for other community groups, i.e., Girl Guides and pancake breakfasts.
- Community has a nice place to hold weddings, funerals, and large events such as the Edge to Edge marathon.
- Building provides some heat and electricity cost savings. Increased usage at municipal library.
- Enhanced ability for non-profits to collaborate and provide quick referrals to other community resources; easier for community members to be connected to services.

Website: <http://ucluelet.ca/community/parks-recreation/parks-rec-forms-pubs/category/10-facilities-rentals>
Phone: 250-726-7744

Valemount Multi-Purpose Facility

Context

- The local government had been operating in an aging building with limited space. A Visitor Information Centre had been a proposed project since the 1970s.

Governance

- Valemount Multi-Purpose Facility includes the Tourist Information Centre and the Village Office.
- When the concept went to the public, community members wanted the building to contain space for community organizations. Community decided to add Village offices to the VIC building and make the former Village office building into the Community Services building, increasing project costs to \$1.2 million.
- The Village owns the building. There is an agreement between the Village and the contracted out Visitor Information Centre: VIC operates from May to September; the VIC pays rent to the Village; Village receives ~ 5 to 10% of merchandise sales; Village provides VIC with Internet, telephone, and other utility services.
- Village owns the Community Services Building and rents it out to ongoing tenants (Community Forest, VCTV, Robson Valley Support Society, and previously the Valemount Learning Centre) or to short-term tenants (presenters such as Columbia Basin Trust).

Infrastructure

- Valemount Multi-Purpose Facility's key features: standard wood frame building, passive solar hot water system, and video-conferencing services. Plans to add an outdoor stage / interpretive space in partnership with Simpcw First Nation.
- Contaminated ground soil delayed the project by ½ year. Now short of office space with no room for expansion.
- Community Services Building (formerly the Village office): received minor repairs and renovations. Main floor has 3 tenant spaces. A classroom is set up that can be rented out. Upstairs contains small office spaces for rent.
- Lack of demand for the Community Services Building space because groups have their own buildings (i.e., Lions Club and the Legion). The Valemount Learning Centre has moved out of the Community Services building; potential loss of the Community Forest who has acquired their own site.

Human Resources

- The College of New Caledonia's Northern Outdoor Recreation Eco-Tourism Program was still in Valemount with ~ 24 students who volunteered to keep the Visitor Centre open during the Olympics.
- Village was the main contractor for the project and hired subcontractors for trades work.
- When the project was built, the community had one each: local plumber, electrician, and contractor.

Funding

- The Village purchased the multi-purpose facility site with funds from the Columbia Basin Trust.
- The provincial Ministry of Small Business put out an RFP for live site locations to view the Winter Olympics.
- Funding: Ministry of Small Business - \$330,000; NDI - \$345,000; Village of Valemount - \$~300,000; Columbia Basin Trust - \$150,000; Regional District Fraser-Fort George - \$20,000; Tourism BC - \$3,500; UBCM Community Tourism Program - \$38,000. Municipality took steps to save funds where possible (i.e. Council Chambers is furnished with second hand for furniture ~ \$5,000).
- Will take ~20 years to recover cost of passive solar hot water system.

Impact

- Olympic Live Site for the 2010 Vancouver Olympic Games. In the off-season, the VIC is used by other groups.
- Provides municipality with more functional space and ability to host meetings.
- Meeting rooms, video-conferencing, and technical equipment can be rented out by community groups or presenters who wish to provide training and public presentations (i.e. Valemount Glacier Resort and Borealis).
- Community Services Building has attracted community tenants who could not afford their own space.

Website: <http://www.valemount.ca>

Phone: 250-566-4435

Valley Community Services Society

Context

- A local clinical psychologist set the groundwork for collaboration in Creston. Home support was the only non-profit in Creston when the provincial government began to offer service contracts. With partnership funds, the Family Resource Centre was created.

Governance

- Board members are selected with a 2-3 person nomination committee.
- VCSS is a host agency for services with a coordinator to work with coalition partners and site coordinators.
 - Subcontracts to five other regional agencies to deliver supports in the region.
- Service access region: Riondel area to the Ferry landing before Nelson to Yak.
- Holds two regional contracts: 1) serve Invermere and Golden; 2) The Elk Valley, around Fernie; Kimberly, Cranbrook, and Creston.
- Sometimes provides assistance with hiring, interviewing, human resource or legal issues, if requested by other contractors.
- Regional colleagues meet four times per year in Cranbrook.
- Programs: Early Years (including East Kootenay Community Action Program for Children, parent-tot, daycare services, etc.), anti-violence, family services, reconnect programs for at-risk youth, seniors programs (i.e. Better at Home), dad's services, and mental health.

Infrastructure

- Some programs are offsite: rents space from the School District for Early Years; mental health program located in seniors' centre with staff sharing office space.
- Worked at the board level to offer all community Early Years programming at one location.
- The seniors program came together as a result from commitment from the Regional District to have seniors programming in one location.
- Lack of infrastructure in rural communities; not enough space in the building to hold all of the programs.

Human Resources

- Accredited agency with ~ 40 staff; some work in 4-5 programs.
- Can be challenging to advertise positions and offer full-time work, i.e., applicants may not have the skill-set for the programs that are combined to offer one full-time position.

Funding

- Federal grant: New Horizons for seniors' program; federal contract - community action program for families with children under six. Provincial funding from MCFD, Interior Health.
- Distances travelled to provide a service adds costs to service delivery (1-1.5 hours each way).

Impact

- Rural communities are used to networking and building relationships with other regional players.
- One-stop shop provides early intervention: families who go to the site learn about additional services and may receive referrals to other programs.
- Sharing space with other programs and with other agencies creates greater collaboration.
- Can amalgamate contracts into full-time positions (i.e. two staff operating six family programs) leading to greater recruitment and retention of staff in smaller communities.

Website: <http://www.valley.services>

Phone: 250-428-5547

Wells Multi-Purpose Facility

Context

- In the early 2000s, provincial funding cuts prompted School District 28 to announce the closure of the elementary school in Wells. Wells is 80 kilometres from the next school in Quesnel via a mountain road that can receive up to 26 feet of snow per year. Families began to move out of the community to avoid bussing their children.

Governance

- The community formed a “Save Our School” committee to try to keep the school open in 2002.
- When the school closure was planned, the District of Wells Council and Administration and the School District Board and Administration became the key players and created a 10-year agreement signed April 16th, 2003:
 - Wells purchased the school and property for \$1.00 and SD 28 signed a 10-year lease agreement to pay \$5,000 annually to rent classroom space from Wells and would provide an elementary program.
 - If enrolment falls below 9 students or if capital costs become too high for Wells, the agreement can be terminated with one year’s notice.
- The District of Wells owns the building. They are responsible for all maintenance and capital costs, and may lease it out as long as it does not pose a hazard for students.
- School District 28 is responsible for all educational costs, has their own janitor, Internet, and storage space.
- In 2012, a new 5 year agreement was executed.

Infrastructure

- The building has a kitchen, 6 classrooms with a pre-school play-group, a library, and a gymnasium.
- A second floor classroom was converted into a daycare facility and the other upstairs classrooms are leased out as art studios in the winter. Space is leased to Island Mountain Arts in the summer. The basement is a membership health centre. A new community playground was built to replace the old school playground. Site has a community garden and greenhouse.
- One floor of the building is heated with geothermal heat, replacing oil heat. The building has new roof insulation, wall insulation, an upgraded furnace, and controls on thermostats were installed.
- There is storage space in the building for non-profits such as the Historical Society.
- The property has potential for future subdivision or recreational opportunities.
- High-speed Internet and cell-phone service are not available in Wells. Wells frequently has power outages.

Human Resources

- District only has 4 regular employees: the multi-purpose facility is a strain on limited staffing resources.

Funding

- Funding: multiple grants valued at \$650,000 compiled to pay for geothermal system. Grants funded the daycare space and health centre. Federal and provincial governments provided capital grants. Northern Development Initiative Trust also provided funding.
- Taking over the building was a huge risk when Wells has a population of ~250 people, with a limited tax base to cover annual costs of \$30,000 to \$50,000 for the school building (about \$20,000 after income streams). Increased oil prices for oil heat can have a huge impact.

Impact

- The school provides a central focal point and can now be more responsive to community needs.
- A community garden resulted in the creation of a local farmer’s market.
- The school now has 20+ students as young families are moving to Wells again to raise children.
- Revenue is generated from renting space for weddings or overnight accommodation for school trips to Barkerville (\$5.00 per student) and from leasing space to for art studios and the Art Wells Festival.

Website: <http://wells.ca/venuerentals>

Phone: 250-994-3330

Yellowhead Community Services

Context

- YCS formed in 1989 in order to address several social and health service gaps in the region.

Governance

- Has a 6 member board of directors.
- Programs: anti-violence, mental health, transit, literacy, women's services, Aboriginal engagement, supports for adults with developmental disabilities, child care, employment services, etc. Also operates the Ashcroft-Lillooet-Clinton bus system.
- District of Clearwater co-location: The District of Clearwater's CAO was on the oversight team during the building process. The Executive Director of YCS took the lead in the building construction.
- District of Clearwater entered a long-term lease agreement with School District 73 for \$1.00 per year.
- YCS has a MOU and lease agreement with the District of Clearwater and School District 73 owns the building. The District is responsible for maintenance and YCS shares in the costs. The District and YCS are each responsible for their own custodial services. YCS is responsible for managing the Community Centre side of the building: responsible for room rentals which the Society relies on to cover the costs of the Community Centre.

Infrastructure

- ~2005/2006, the Society built its own building / paid off the mortgage. Savings support competitive staff wages.
- More recently, the YCS also co-located with the District of Clearwater at the Dutch Lake Community Centre.
 - Half the building contains the District's offices / council chambers; the other half contains a Community Centre with a gym, multi-purpose room, art gallery, rental spaces, and some YCS services.
- High heating costs in the large, older building: heated with propane.
- District of Barriere: co-located with YCS in a former Barriere Ridge Elementary School.

Human Resources

- YCS has annual operating budget of ~ \$3.5 million with 60 employees in 5 locations.
- YCS combines related functions from different contracts, allowing them to build full-time positions.
- Because YCS clusters contracts together, they have to hire staff with skills and training that exceeds the needs of most contracts. Difficult to recruit and retain counsellors: turns to retired school counsellors to fill positions.

Funding

- Provincial funding: MCFD, Interior Health, Community Living BC, BC Gaming Commission, BC Housing, BC Transit, Ministry of Justice, Recreation Sites and Trails BC, and Ministry of Social Development. Other funding / revenue from: Decoda Literacy Solutions, District of Clearwater, Thompson Nicola Regional District, United Way, and Wells Gray Community Forest Corporation. YCS has sub-contracted funds from federal government through their Community Partners to Address Homelessness.
- Took time for funders to trust the way YCS blends funding from multiple programs into one position.
- YCS received \$700,000 in funds to retrofit co-location building. District of Clearwater received \$90,000 from federal infrastructure funding program; \$45,000 from the Community Forest; and matched \$45,000.
- YCS generates additional revenue by renting to Chamber of Commerce, Service Canada, the community forest, Tourism Wells Gray, the arts council, the regional district, and Thompson Rivers University.

Impact

- YCS is now ~5th largest employer in the valley.
- YCS' clustering of contracts has allowed them to obtain service contracts that often go to larger service hubs.
- Co-location with District of Clearwater: rents out office space to community organizations that cannot afford to have standalone offices. Provides an economic incubator in the community through its 5 office cluster.

Website: <http://www.yellowheadcs.ca>

Phone: 250 674-2600 (main office)

REFERENCES

- Argent, N. 2011. Trouble in paradise? Governing Australia's multifunctional rural landscapes. *Australian Geographer* 42(2): 183-205.
- Askim, J., A. Fimreite, A. Moseley, and L. Pedersen. 2011. One-stop shops for social welfare: The Adaptation of an organization form in three countries. *Public Administration* 89(4): 1451-1468.
- Baines, D. and I. Cunningham. 2011. 'White knuckle care work': Violence, gender and new public management in the voluntary sector. *Work, Employment, & Society* 25(4): 760-776.
- Bauch, P. 2001. School-community partnerships in rural schools: Leadership, renewal, and a sense of place. *Journal of Education* 76(2): 204-221.
- Burke-Robertson, J. 2002. Strategic alliances in the voluntary sector in Canada. *The Philanthropist* 17(1): 49-74.
- Edenhoffer, K. and R. Hayter. 2013. Organizational restructuring in British Columbia's forest industries 1980-2010: The survival of a dinosaur. *Applied Geography* 40: 222-231.
- Evans, P. and B. Grantham. n.d. *Friendship, Courtship, Partnership: Why Canadian Nonprofits Need to Think About Working Together Differently*. Charity Village.
- Farquhar, C.R., J.M. Fultz, and A. Graham. 2006. *Implementing Shared Services in the Public Sector: The Pillars of Success*. The Conference Board of Canada. Report March 2006.
- Halseth, G. and L. Ryser. 2006. Trends in service delivery: Examples from rural and small town Canada, 1998 to 2005. *Journal of Rural and Community Development* 1(2): 69-90.
- Hanlon, N., Halseth, G., and A. Ostry. 2011. Stealth voluntarism: An expectation of health professional work in underserved areas? *Health & Place* 17(1): 42-49.
- Hanlon, N., R. Clasby, G. Halseth and V. Pow. 2007. The place embeddedness of social care: Restructuring work and welfare in Mackenzie, BC. *Health and Place* 13(2): 466-481.
- Harris, M., B. Cairns and R. Hutchinson. 2004. "So many tiers, so many agendas, so many pots of money": The challenge of English regionalization for voluntary and community organizations. *Social Policy & Administration* 38(5): 525-540.
- Hayter, R. 2000. *Flexible Crossroads: The Restructuring of British Columbia's Forest Economy*. Vancouver: UBC Press.
- Howard, C. 2014. Rethinking post-npm governance: The bureaucratic struggle to implement one-stop shopping for government services in Alberta. *Public Organization Review* 1-18. DOI 10.1007/s11115-014-0272-0.
- Lennie, J. 2010. *Learnings, Case Studies and Guidelines for Establishing Shared and Collaborative Service Delivery in the Non-Government Sector: Evaluation of the Multi-Tenant Service Centre (MTSC) Pilots Project*.

Final Report Prepared for the Department of Communities, Queensland Government. Brisbane. Updated version of 2008 report.

McDonald, C., Brown, A., Frost, L., Van Dijk, P. and A. Rainnie. 2013. Partnerships and integrated responses to rural decline: The role of collective efficacy and political capital in Northwest Tasmania, Australia. *Journal of Rural Studies* 32: 346-356.

McKinney, R., and H. Kahn. 2004. Lottery funding and changing organizational identity in the UK voluntary sector. *Voluntas* 15(1): 1-19.

Milbourne, P. 2010. The geographies of poverty and welfare. *Geography Compass* 4(2): 158-171.

Molnar, J., P. Duffy, L. Claxton, L. and C. Bailey. 2001. Private food assistance in a small metropolitan area: Urban resources and rural needs. *Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare* 28(3): 187-209.

Nelson, M. 2007. Ongoing challenges in the understanding of rural poverty. *Journal of Poverty* 10(4): 89-108.

O'Connell, M. 2003. Responding to homelessness: An overview of US and UK policy interventions. *Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology* 13(2): 158-170.

Paagman, A., M. Tate, E. Furtmueller, and J. de Bloom. 2015. An integrative literature review and empirical validation of motives for introducing shared services in government organizations. *International Journal of Information Management* 35: 110-123.

Poole, D., Ferguson, M., DiNitto, D., and A. Schwab. 2002. The capacity of community-based organizations to lead local innovations in welfare reform: Early findings from Texas. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership* 12(3): 261-276.

Province of New Brunswick. 2011. Stakeholder Consultation on Regional Service Delivery. May 2011.

Shortall, S., and M. Warner. 2010. Social inclusion or market competitiveness? A comparison of rural development policies in the European Union and the United States. *Social Policy Administration* 44(5): 575-597.

Sullivan, L., Ryser, L., and G. Halseth. 2014. Recognizing change, recognizing rural: The new rural economy and towards a new model of rural services. *Journal of Rural and Community Development* 9(4): 219-245.

Torres, G., K. Swietek, P. Ubri, R. Singer, K. Lowell, and W. Miller. 2014. Building and strengthening infrastructure for data exchange: Lessons from the Beacon communities. *eGEMs* 2(3): article 9.

West, B. 2013. *Impact of Government-Mandated Partnerships on Service Providers: The BC Experience*. Unpublished Masters Thesis. Victoria: School of Public Administration, University of Victoria.

Wollebæk, D. 2009. Survival in local voluntary association. *Nonprofit Management & Leadership* 19(3): 267-284.

Zeemering, E. and D. Delabbio. 2013. *A County Manager's Guide to Shared Services in Local Government*. Collaborating Across Boundaries Series. IBM Center for the Business of Government.