



Special Council Agenda

The agenda for the **Special Meeting of Council** to be held in the **Council Chambers** of the Municipal Hall, 8645 Stave Lake Street, Mission, British Columbia on Monday, May 11, 2015 commencing at 12:00 p.m.

1. CALL TO ORDER

2. ADOPTION OF AGENDA

3. BYLAWS FOR CONSIDERATION

(a) 2015-2019 Financial Plan Bylaw 5495-2015

A bylaw to establish the Financial Plan for the years 2015 to 2019

Adoption

Page 2

(b) 2015 Tax Rates Bylaw 5496-2015

A bylaw to impose property tax rates for the year 2015

Adoption

Page 11

4. NEW BUSINESS

(a) Stone Soup Initiatives and Homelessness Discussion

i. Stone Soup Phase 1 Report Out

Page 14

ii. Proposed Addictions Forum

iii. May 29, 2015 Wellness Workshop

5. ADJOURNMENT

DISTRICT OF MISSION

BYLAW 5495-2015

A bylaw to establish the Financial Plan
for the years 2015 - 2019

WHEREAS, pursuant to Section 165 of the *Community Charter*, the Council shall, before the 15th day of May in each year, before the annual property tax bylaw is adopted, adopt a financial plan;

NOW THEREFORE the Council of the District of Mission, in open meeting assembled, ENACTS AS FOLLOWS:

1. This Bylaw may be cited for all purposes as "District of Mission 2015-2019 Financial Plan Bylaw 5495-2015.
2. Those schedules marked as Schedule "A", "B", "C", "D" and "E" attached hereto, and forming part of this bylaw, are hereby declared to be the Financial Plan for the District of Mission for the period January 1, 2015 to December 31, 2019.

READ A FIRST TIME this 4th day of May, 2015

READ A SECOND TIME this 4th day of May, 2015

READ A THIRD TIME this 4th day of May, 2015

ADOPTED this xxxx day of xxxxx, 2015

RANDY HAWES, MAYOR

TINA PENNEY
ACTING CORPORATE OFFICER

**District of Mission
2015 - 2019 Financial Plan**

**Schedule “A” of Bylaw No. 5495-2015
Statement of Objectives and Policies**

In accordance with Section 165(3.1) of the *Community Charter*, the District of Mission is required to include in its Five-Year Financial Plan (2015 - 2019), objectives and policies regarding each of the following:

1. The proportion of total revenue that comes from each of the funding sources described in Section 165(7) of the *Community Charter*;
2. The distribution of property taxes among the property classes; and
3. The use of permissive tax exemptions.

1. Funding Sources

Council’s objectives and policies in regards to operating and capital revenue sources are provided below. Table 1 highlights the various operating and capital revenue sources, including the percentage from each source, reflected in the District’s Five-Year Financial Plan (2015 - 2019). Over the five years about 49% of operating revenues will come from property taxes with user fees making up the other significant portion at around 44%. The majority of capital funding is intended to come from the District’s internal reserves and from development cost charges (DCCs).

Operating Revenue Sources

Objective:

Over the five-year financial plan timeframe, it is Council’s goal to diversify and expand its revenue base as much as possible with the goal of becoming less reliant on property taxes.

Policy:

Council recognizes that the District of Mission is reliant on property taxes to fund the majority of its services/programs. Council is committed, on an annual basis, to formally reviewing and adjusting, where possible, existing user fees and to examining and implementing new user fees where feasible, in order to minimize overall property tax increases. Council also recognizes that raising user fees beyond a certain point will actually result in less usage or demand and ultimately less revenue and that various services like recreation need to be subsidized to a certain level so that all citizens can partake. The District of Mission, like other local governments in B.C., also needs access to other sources of revenue to meet growing service demands and to stabilize property taxes.

Capital Revenue Sources

Objective:

Over the five-year financial plan timeframe, it is Council’s goal to build up its reserves to provide for greater internal capital funding/financing opportunities.

Policy:

Council sees the need to increase its internal capital funding capacity by building up its own reserves, to minimize future external debt/interest costs and to provide internal borrowing

opportunities. Internal debt financing for capital projects should be utilized to the extent possible before resorting to external debt with the proviso that internal debt repayments need to take place as scheduled; however, external debt financing may be required for larger, high priority capital projects if sufficient reserves are not in place.

Table 1: Sources of Revenue

	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Operating Revenue Sources					
<i>Property value taxation</i>	49%	49%	49%	50%	50%
<i>Parcel tax</i>	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%
<i>User fees and charges</i>	44%	44%	43%	44%	44%
<i>Other revenue</i>	7%	7%	7%	7%	7%
<i>Proceeds from borrowing</i>	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Totals	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Capital Revenue sources					
<i>Other sources - Reserves</i>	76%	54%	69%	43%	57%
<i>Other sources - DCCs and developer contributions</i>	23%	43%	31%	57%	43%
<i>Other sources - Grants</i>	0%	3%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Proceeds from borrowing</i>	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Totals	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

3. Distribution of Property Taxes

Council’s objective and policy in regards to the distribution of property taxes are provided below. Table 2 highlights the estimated municipal property tax dollars and the respective percentages to be collected from each of the tax classes in 2015. The District collects approximately 75% of its property taxes from the residential class and approximately 20% from the business/other class with the other classes making up the balance. This is reflective of the fact that about 90% of Mission’s assessment base is residential and about 8.5% is business/other.

Objective:

Over the five-year financial plan timeframe, it is Council’s goal to diversify and expand its tax base so that all taxpayers are in a more favourable position.

Policy:

Council recognizes the need to rationalize its property tax distribution among the various tax classes; however, more importantly Council recognizes the need to diversify and expand its assessment/tax base. Council is committed to aggressively pursuing business/commercial economic development opportunities to achieve this. Council is also committed to comparing its

assessment mix, property tax levels and property tax distribution with other B.C. communities on an annual basis. Council understands that the level of property taxation for each of the tax classes does not necessarily correlate with the amount of services provided; however, quantifying and costing the services provided to each tax class is difficult and subjective at the very least. It should also be recognized that many businesses in the community have employees that benefit from and use many District services, facilities and amenities, and that additional services and amenities benefit all of the tax classes, both directly and indirectly.

Table 2: Approximate Distribution of 2015 Municipal Property Taxes

Property Class	Property Tax Dollars Raised	% of Total Property Taxation	Ratio
(1) Residential	21,659,454	74.6%	1.0
(2) Utility	220,265	0.8%	8.1
(3) Social Housing	-	0.0%	1.0
(4) Major Industry	-	0.0%	2.8
(5) Light Industrial	958,595	3.3%	2.8
(6) Business/Other	5,999,923	20.7%	2.9
(7) Municipal Forest	1,113	<0.1%	2.9
(8) Recreation/Non Profit	131,114	0.5%	2.2
(9) Farm	60,618	0.2%	4.1
	\$ 29,031,082	100.00%	

4. Permissive Tax Exemptions (including Revitalization Tax Exemptions)

Council's objective and policy in regards to permissive tax exemptions (including revitalization tax exemptions) are provided below.

Objective:

Over the five-year financial plan timeframe, Council will continue supporting worthy charitable/non-profit organizations that provide valuable services to the community and will determine how it can use its expanded powers in terms of revitalization tax exemptions to benefit the community as a whole.

Policy:

Council chooses to support charitable/non-profit organizations (churches, social, recreational, health and housing organizations) that provide valuable services to the community through permissive tax exemptions as allowed for by legislation. Council is committed to continuing with these tax exemptions and to treating all organizations with similar mandates equally when it comes to property tax exemptions.

A Mission Downtown Development Incentive Program offering a 10-year revitalization tax exemption is available within the defined Downtown Planning area and provides a financial incentive to encourage development in the downtown area. The revitalization tax exemption program will accept applications up to December 31, 2016 and is outlined under Bylaw #5391-2013 Downtown Revitalization Tax Exemption.

**Schedule “B” of Bylaw No. 5495-2015
2015 Detailed Financial Plan**

	General Operating	Internal Adjustments	Water Operating	Sewer Operating	Refuse/ Recycling	Forestry	General Capital	Water Capital	Sewer Capital	Total
Revenue										
<i>Property taxation</i>	-29,031,082	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-29,031,082
<i>Local Improvements</i>	-121,890	0	0	-45,598	0	0	0	0	0	-167,488
<i>Sale of services and regulatory fees</i>	-7,268,794	0	-5,962,408	-4,143,945	-4,411,114	-4,516,000	-94,375	-100,000	0	-26,496,636
<i>Government transfers</i>	-1,305,440	0	0	0	0	-25,000	0	0	0	-1,330,440
<i>Amortization of restricted revenue</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0	-1,120,885	-555,390	0	-1,676,275
<i>Investment income</i>	-613,297	0	-187,283	-221,651	0	0	0	0	0	-1,022,231
<i>Other revenue</i>	-1,517,992	0	-5,978	0	0	0	0	0	0	-1,523,970
<i>Developer in-kind contribution for capital</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0	-2,843,868	-346,553	-243,619	-3,434,040
Total revenue	-39,858,495	0	-6,155,669	-4,411,194	-4,411,114	-4,541,000	-4,059,128	-1,001,943	-243,619	-64,682,162
Expenses										
<i>Administration and finance</i>	4,283,328	-4,737	0	0	0	0	49,934	0	0	4,328,525
<i>General government and fiscal services</i>	2,091,457	-1,315,638	0	0	0	0	139,739	0	0	915,558
<i>Protective services</i>	14,944,237	0	0	0	0	0	1,567,869	0	0	16,512,106
<i>Engineering and public works</i>	8,330,899	-937,375	0	0	0	0	1,074,143	0	0	8,467,667
<i>Transit services</i>	2,882,731	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2,882,731
<i>Waste management</i>	0	0	0	0	4,185,300	0	192,339	0	0	4,377,639
<i>Development services</i>	2,281,247	0	0	0	0	0	3,342	0	0	2,284,590
<i>Parks, recreation and cultural services</i>	6,489,959	-20,000	0	0	0	0	522,246	0	0	6,992,205
<i>Library</i>	1,378,685	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,378,685
<i>Cemetery</i>	229,360	0	0	0	0	0	3,242	0	0	232,602
<i>Water utility</i>	0	-58,542	3,986,380	0	0	0	0	204,552	0	4,132,390
<i>Sewer utility</i>	0	0	0	3,618,015	0	0	0	0	228,411	3,846,426
<i>Forestry enterprise</i>	0	0	0	0	0	4,344,645	0	0	0	4,344,645
<i>Internal recoveries</i>	-2,277,750	2,336,292	-58,542	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total expenses	40,634,154	0	3,927,838	3,618,015	4,185,300	4,344,645	3,552,854	204,552	228,411	60,695,769
Annual (surplus) deficit	775,659	0	-2,227,830	-793,179	-225,814	-196,355	-506,274	-797,391	-15,208	-3,986,393
Reserves, capital and debt										
<i>Tangible capital assets purchased</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0	10,670,756	3,851,574	1,272,623	15,794,953
<i>Tangible capital assets contributed by developers</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0	2,843,868	346,553	243,619	3,434,040
<i>New debt/temporary borrowing</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<i>Repayment of debt</i>	545,160	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	545,160
<i>Transfers to reserves</i>	5,057,973	0	3,457,985	1,869,426	458,726	239,462	0	0	0	11,083,573
<i>Amortization</i>	-5,544,328	0	-1,230,155	-1,076,247	-232,912	-43,107	0	0	0	-8,126,750
<i>Reserves/surplus used for capital funding</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0	-13,008,350	-3,400,735	-1,501,034	-17,910,119
<i>Reserves/surplus used to fund operations</i>	-834,464	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-834,464
Total reserves, capital and debt	-775,659	0	2,227,830	793,179	225,814	196,355	506,274	797,391	15,208	3,986,393

**Schedule “C” of Bylaw No. 5495-2015
 2015 to 2019 Summary Financial Plan**

	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Total
Revenue						
<i>Property taxation</i>	-29,031,082	-29,299,449	-29,979,958	-30,615,513	-31,258,235	-150,184,237
<i>Local Improvements</i>	-167,488	-167,488	-167,488	-167,488	-167,488	-837,440
<i>Sale of services and regulatory fees</i>	-26,496,636	-26,733,246	-27,001,610	-27,318,282	-27,641,512	-135,191,286
<i>Government transfers</i>	-1,330,440	-1,838,246	-1,332,941	-1,334,210	-1,335,492	-7,171,329
<i>Amortization of restricted revenue</i>	-1,676,275	-3,350,692	-63,985	-5,409,302	-1,385,109	-11,885,363
<i>Investment income</i>	-1,022,231	-1,056,856	-1,078,183	-1,100,769	-1,155,950	-5,413,989
<i>Other revenue</i>	-1,523,970	-1,567,199	-1,611,723	-1,657,590	-1,619,849	-7,980,332
<i>Developer in-kind contribution for capital</i>	-3,434,040	-4,234,338	-3,842,913	-4,970,386	-4,349,211	-20,830,887
Total revenue	-64,682,162	-68,247,513	-65,078,801	-72,573,540	-68,912,846	-339,494,862
Expenses						
<i>Administration and finance</i>	4,328,525	4,365,828	4,467,852	4,599,491	4,689,278	22,450,973
<i>General government and fiscal services</i>	915,558	791,674	807,945	763,895	762,728	4,041,800
<i>Protective services</i>	16,512,106	15,297,449	15,646,328	16,003,317	16,368,606	79,827,807
<i>Engineering and public works</i>	8,467,667	8,195,547	7,764,889	7,872,453	8,027,774	40,328,330
<i>Transit services</i>	2,882,731	2,940,386	2,999,193	3,059,177	3,120,361	15,001,848
<i>Waste management</i>	4,377,639	4,262,318	4,403,972	4,449,492	4,564,716	22,058,138
<i>Development services</i>	2,284,590	2,100,715	2,142,662	2,185,448	2,229,091	10,942,506
<i>Parks, recreation and cultural services</i>	6,992,205	6,808,943	6,786,631	6,909,660	7,081,671	34,579,111
<i>Library</i>	1,378,685	1,401,386	1,432,883	1,445,620	1,468,280	7,126,854
<i>Cemetery</i>	232,602	233,584	238,021	242,544	247,155	1,193,905
<i>Water utility</i>	4,132,390	4,159,080	4,188,614	4,230,148	4,310,585	21,020,818
<i>Sewer utility</i>	3,846,426	3,971,958	3,926,227	3,943,480	4,003,687	19,691,778
<i>Forestry enterprise</i>	4,344,645	4,345,076	4,345,511	4,345,951	4,346,395	21,727,577
<i>Internal recoveries</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total expenses	60,695,769	58,873,942	59,150,730	60,050,677	61,220,326	299,991,444
Annual (surplus) deficit	-3,986,393	-9,373,571	-5,928,071	-12,522,863	-7,692,520	-39,503,419
Reserves, capital and debt						
<i>Tangible capital assets purchased</i>	15,794,953	12,159,159	8,457,355	12,848,207	8,489,558	57,749,232
<i>Tangible capital assets contributed by developers</i>	3,434,040	4,234,338	3,842,913	4,970,386	4,349,211	20,830,888
<i>New debt/temporary borrowing</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0
<i>Repayment of debt</i>	545,160	568,078	591,980	616,907	506,470	2,828,595
<i>Transfers to reserves</i>	11,083,573	10,861,797	10,966,960	11,063,555	11,223,759	55,199,644
<i>Amortization</i>	-8,126,750	-8,208,018	-8,290,098	-8,372,999	-8,456,729	-41,454,594
<i>Reserves/surplus used for capital funding</i>	-17,910,119	-9,637,373	-9,021,607	-7,914,660	-7,790,036	-52,273,795
<i>Reserves/surplus used to fund operations</i>	-834,464	-604,410	-619,432	-688,533	-629,713	-3,376,552
	3,986,393	9,373,571	5,928,071	12,522,863	7,692,520	39,503,419

Schedule “D” of Bylaw No. 5495-2015 2015 to 2019 Summary Capital Plan

PLANNED CAPITAL EXPENDITURES

	2015		2016		2017		2018		2019		Totals	
	TCA (1)	Expense	TCA (1)	Expense	TCA (1)	Expense	TCA (1)	Expense	TCA (1)	Expense	TCA (1)	Expense
General Capital Plan												
Cemetery	-	3,242	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	0	-	3,242
Corporate Administration	32,255	3,342	0	3,342	10,000	3,342	89,124	3,342	0	3,342	131,379	16,711
Engineering & Public Works	3,874,292	1,074,143	2,536,373	669,867	2,887,592	104,715	3,007,142	75,403	3,395,451	113,403	15,700,849	2,037,531
Finance & Purchasing	0	10,472	0	4,456	0	4,456	0	4,456	0	4,456	0	28,297
Fire/Rescue Services	78,995	145,998	71,495	1,114	71,495	1,114	71,495	1,114	71,495	1,114	364,975	150,454
Forestry	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
General Government	0	139,739	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Information Services	316,886	36,120	185,000	10,000	275,000	21,000	200,000	6,000	25,000	75,500	1,001,886	148,620
Inspection Services	0	3,342	0	3,342	0	3,342	0	3,342	0	3,342	0	16,711
Library	0	0	0	1,114	0	10,674	0	1,114	0	1,114	0	153,755
Parks, Recreation & Culture	3,551,566	522,246	63,348	220,155	93,503	76,875	68,203	76,625	68,203	123,000	3,844,822	1,018,900
Planning	0	3,342	0	3,342	0	3,342	0	3,342	0	3,342	0	16,711
Police	45,952	1,418,528	100,000	7,798	0	7,798	0	7,798	0	7,798	145,952	1,449,722
Subtotal General Capital Plan	7,899,946	3,360,515	2,956,216	924,531	3,337,590	236,659	3,435,963	182,537	3,560,148	336,412	21,189,863	5,040,654
General Development Cost Charge (DCC) Capital Plan												
Cedar Valley Drainage	96,548	0	1,109,721	0	0	0	1,805,000	0	101,000	0	3,112,269	0
Cedar Valley Environmentally Sensitive Parkland Acquisition	115,749	0	32,694	0	75,809	0	345,376	0	332,776	0	902,404	0
Cedar Valley Environmentally Sensitive Parkland Development	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Cedar Valley Roads	250,000	0	964,000	0	0	0	250,000	0	0	0	1,464,000	0
Roads - All Areas	518,938	0	702,260	0	0	0	3,125,000	0	0	0	4,346,198	0
Silver Creek Parkway Parkland	267,339	0	255,177	0	3,226	0	0	0	731,707	0	1,257,449	0
Subtotal Development Cost Charge (DCC) Capital Plan	1,248,574	0	3,063,852	0	79,035	0	5,525,376	0	1,165,483	0	11,082,320	0
Waste Management Capital Plan												
Landfill	14,790	157,814	0	72,000	0	122,000	0	72,000	0	72,000	14,790	495,814
Regional Recycling	107,582	34,525	19,987	1,817	18,170	1,817	19,079	0	54,510	0	219,328	38,159
Subtotal Waste Management Capital Plan	122,372	192,339	19,987	73,817	18,170	123,817	19,079	72,000	54,510	72,000	234,118	533,973
Equipment Replacement Capital Plan												
	1,399,864	0	1,258,088	0	580,241	0	1,409,602	0	533,304	0	5,181,099	0
Water Utility Capital Plan												
Cedar Valley Water DCC	561,000	0	238,000	0	0	0	0	0	74,250	0	873,250	0
Water Capital - Non-Regional	1,620,863	135,524	1,074,448	135,524	1,055,849	121,524	1,152,448	115,792	1,233,017	129,792	6,136,624	638,154
Water Capital - Regional	1,669,711	69,028	206,648	8,543	192,411	7,955	138,684	5,733	541,645	22,392	2,749,099	113,651
Regional Water Supply DCC	0	0	47,627	1,969	0	0	0	0	0	0	47,627	1,969
Subtotal Water Utility Capital Plan	3,851,574	204,552	1,566,723	146,036	1,248,260	129,478	1,291,132	121,525	1,848,912	152,184	9,806,600	753,774
Sewer Utility Capital Plan												
Sewer Capital - Non-Regional	581,662	152,915	1,272,048	115,235	1,939,759	101,235	264,364	101,235	282,495	115,235	4,340,327	585,857
Sewer Capital - Regional	690,961	75,496	1,592,384	173,988	1,254,300	137,048	893,534	97,630	811,873	88,707	5,243,053	572,868
Regional Sewage Treatment DCC	0	0	429,861	38,861	0	0	9,157	828	232,833	21,049	671,851	60,738
Subtotal Sewer Utility Capital Plan	1,272,623	228,411	3,294,293	328,084	3,194,059	238,283	1,167,055	199,693	1,327,201	224,992	10,255,231	1,219,463
Total	15,794,953	3,985,816	12,159,159	1,472,468	8,457,355	728,238	12,848,207	575,755	8,489,558	785,587	57,749,231	7,547,864

1) TCA = Tangible Capital Assets

**Continued - Schedule "D" of Bylaw No. 5495-2015
 2015 to 2019 Summary Capital Plan**

PLANNED CAPITAL FUNDING	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Totals
General Capital Program						
Reserve Funds (total)	-10,726,317	-3,880,747	-3,574,249	-3,618,500	-3,896,560	-25,696,373
Accumulated Surplus	-534,144	0	0	0	0	-534,144
Subtotal General Capital Program	<u>-11,260,461</u>	<u>-3,880,747</u>	<u>-3,574,249</u>	<u>-3,618,500</u>	<u>-3,896,560</u>	<u>-26,230,517</u>
Development Cost Charge (DCC) Capital Program						
DCCs - total	-1,120,885	-3,027,063	-63,985	-5,405,157	-1,091,233	-10,708,324
Reserves - total	-33,314	-36,789	-15,050	-120,219	-74,250	-279,621
Third Party Recoveries	-94,375	0	0	0	0	-94,375
Subtotal Development Cost Charge (DCC) Capital Program	<u>-1,248,574</u>	<u>-3,063,852</u>	<u>-79,035</u>	<u>-5,525,376</u>	<u>-1,165,483</u>	<u>-11,082,320</u>
Waste Management Capital Program						
Refuse Reserve Fund	-314,711	-93,804	-141,987	-91,079	-126,510	-768,091
Subtotal Waste Management Capital Program	<u>-314,711</u>	<u>-93,804</u>	<u>-141,987</u>	<u>-91,079</u>	<u>-126,510</u>	<u>-768,091</u>
Equipment Replacement Capital Program						
Equipment Reserve Fund	-1,399,864	-1,258,088	-580,241	-1,409,602	-533,304	-5,181,099
Subtotal equipment capital program	<u>-1,399,864</u>	<u>-1,258,088</u>	<u>-580,241</u>	<u>-1,409,602</u>	<u>-533,304</u>	<u>-5,181,099</u>
Water Utility Capital						
DCCs - total	-3,937,318	-1,612,759	-1,277,738	-1,312,657	-1,901,096	-10,041,567
Sewer Capital Reserve Fund	-18,807	0	0	0	0	-18,807
Third Party Recoveries	-100,000	-100,000	-100,000	-100,000	-100,000	-500,000
Subtotal Water Utility Capital	<u>-4,056,125</u>	<u>-1,712,759</u>	<u>-1,377,738</u>	<u>-1,412,657</u>	<u>-2,001,096</u>	<u>-10,560,374</u>
Sewer Utility Capital						
DCCs - total	-1,501,034	-3,078,816	-3,432,342	-1,366,748	-1,552,192	-10,931,132
Grants	0	-506,562	0	0	0	-506,562
Third Party Recoveries	0	-37,000	0	0	0	-37,000
Subtotal Sewer Utility Capital	<u>-1,501,034</u>	<u>-3,622,377</u>	<u>-3,432,342</u>	<u>-1,366,748</u>	<u>-1,552,192</u>	<u>-11,474,694</u>
TOTAL PLANNED CAPITAL FUNDING	<u>-19,780,769</u>	<u>-13,631,627</u>	<u>-9,185,592</u>	<u>-13,423,962</u>	<u>-9,275,145</u>	<u>-65,297,096</u>

**Schedule “E” of Bylaw No. 5495-2015
 2015 Change in Net Financial Assets**

	Budget 2015
Surplus for the year	3,986,393
Acquisition of tangible capital assets	(15,794,953)
Amortization of tangible capital assets	8,126,750
(Gain) / Loss on sale of tangible capital assets	-
Proceeds on sale of tangible capital assets	<u>5,955</u>
	<u>(3,675,855)</u>
(Increase)/Decrease in inventories of property	-
(Increase)/Decrease in prepaid expenses	-
(Increase)/Decrease in inventories of supplies	<u>-</u>
	<u>-</u>
	<u>-</u>
Change in net financial assets/net debt	<u><u>(3,675,855)</u></u>

DISTRICT OF MISSION**BYLAW 5496-2015****A bylaw to impose property tax rates for the year 2015**

WHEREAS, pursuant to Section 197 of the *Community Charter*, the Council shall, before the 15th day of May in each year, establish tax rates for municipal revenue and for amounts collected for the year by means of rates established by the municipality to meet its taxing obligations in relation to another local government or other public body, based on the assessed value of taxable land and improvements;

NOW THEREFORE the Council of the District of Mission, in open meeting assembled, ENACTS AS FOLLOWS:

1. This Bylaw may be cited for all purposes as "District of Mission Annual Tax Rates Bylaw 5496-2015".
2. The following rates are hereby imposed and levied for the year 2015:
 - (a) for general municipal purposes, including debt, of the municipality, on the assessed value of land and improvements taxable for general municipal purposes, those rates appearing in column "A" of Schedule "A" attached hereto and forming part of this bylaw;
 - (b) for policing purposes of the municipality, on the assessed value of land and improvements taxable for general municipal purposes, those rates appearing in column "B" of Schedule "A" attached hereto and forming part of this bylaw;
 - (c) for library purposes of the municipality, on the assessed value of land and improvements taxable for general municipal purposes, those rates appearing in column "C" of said Schedule "A";
 - (d) for purposes of the Mission Diking District, on the assessed value of land and improvements within the said Diking District and taxable for general municipal purposes, those rates appearing in column "E" of said Schedule "A" attached hereto and forming part of this bylaw;
 - (e) for purposes of the Silverdale Diking District, on the assessed value of land and improvements within the said Diking District and taxable for general municipal purposes, those rates appearing in column "F" of said Schedule "A" attached hereto and forming part of this bylaw;
 - (f) for purposes of the Downtown Mission Business Improvement Area (BIA), on the assessed value of Class 5 and 6 land and improvements taxable for general municipal purposes only, and that fall within the specified BIA area, those rates appearing in column "G" of said Schedule "A" attached hereto and forming part of this bylaw;
 - (g) for purposes of the Fraser Valley Regional District, on the assessed value of land and improvements taxable for general municipal purposes, those rates appearing in column "H" of said Schedule "A" attached hereto and forming part of this bylaw;
 - (h) for purposes of the Fraser Valley Regional Hospital District, on the assessed value of land and improvements taxable for regional hospital district purposes, those rates appearing in column "I" of said Schedule "A" attached hereto and forming part of this bylaw;

- (i) for purposes of the BC Assessment Authority, on the assessed value of land and improvements taxable for regional hospital purposes, those rates appearing in column "J" of said Schedule "A";
- (j) for purposes of the Municipal Finance Authority, on the assessed value of land and improvements taxable for regional hospital purposes, those rates appearing in column "K" of said Schedule "A";

READ A FIRST TIME this 4th day of May, 2015

READ A SECOND TIME this 4th day of May, 2015

READ A THIRD TIME this 4th day of May, 2015

ADOPTED this >

RANDY HAWES, MAYOR

TINA PENNEY
ACTING CORPORATE OFFICER

DISTRICT OF MISSION
Schedule "A" of Bylaw 5496 - 2015
2015 Tax Rates (Dollars of Tax per \$1000 Taxable Value)

PROPERTY CLASS	Municipal Purposes				Special Municipal Levies			Municipal General & Special Levy	Municipal General & Special Levy	Municipal General & Special Levy
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D) =(A) + (B) + (C)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(D) + (E)	(D) + (F)	(D) + (G)
	General & Debt	Policing	Library	Subtotal Municipal General	Mission Diking District	Silverdale Diking District	Business Improvement Area (BIA)	Totals With Mission Diking Only	Totals With Silverdale Diking Only	Totals With BIA Only
1 Residential	3.0571	1.6467	0.2091	4.9129	0.2129	0.2057		5.12581	5.11861	4.91290
2 Utility	24.8360	13.3877	1.7763	40.0000	0.7452	0.7200		40.74519	40.71999	40.00000
3 Supportive Housing	3.0571	1.6467	0.2091	4.9129	0.2129	0.2057		5.12581	5.11861	4.91290
4 Major Industry	8.5375	4.5943	0.5833	13.7151	0.7239	0.6994		14.43899	14.41451	13.71510
5 Light Industry	8.5375	4.5943	0.5833	13.7151	0.7239	0.6994	1.90531	14.43899	14.41451	15.62041
6 Business/Other	8.9376	4.8248	0.6125	14.3749	0.5216	0.5040	1.90531	14.89653	14.87889	16.28021
7 Managed Forest	8.9154	4.8084	0.6104	14.3342	0.6387	0.6171		14.97293	14.95133	14.33420
8 Recreational/Non-profit	6.7653	3.6392	0.4620	10.8665	0.2129	0.2057		11.07941	11.07221	10.86650
9 Farm	12.6334	6.8009	0.8634	20.2977	0.2129	0.2057		20.51061	20.50341	20.29770

PROPERTY CLASS	Taxes Collected on Behalf of Other Taxing Authorities					
	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L) = (H) to (K)	
	Fraser Valley Regional District	Fraser Valley Regional Hospital District	BC Assessment Authority	Municipal Finance Authority	Subtotal Other Taxing Authorities	
1 Residential		0.1054	0.2237	0.0596	0.0002	0.3889
2 Utility		0.8569	0.7830	0.5030	0.0007	2.1436
3 Supportive Housing		0.1054	0.2237	0.0000	0.0002	0.3293
4 Major Industry		0.2941	0.7606	0.5030	0.0007	1.5584
5 Light Industry		0.2941	0.7606	0.1679	0.0007	1.2233
6 Business/Other		0.3088	0.5481	0.1679	0.0005	1.0253
7 Managed Forest		0.3078	0.6711	0.3380	0.0006	1.3175
8 Recreational/Non-profit		0.2329	0.2237	0.0596	0.0002	0.5164
9 Farm		0.4353	0.2237	0.0596	0.0002	0.7188

Total Municipal Purposes & Other Taxing Authorities
(Not Including Special Municipal Levies)
(D) + (L)
5.3018
42.1436
5.2422
15.2735
14.9384
15.4002
15.6517
11.3829
21.0165

Above rates do not include Provincial School Tax rates

Stone Soup: Phase One Report Out
District of Mission Council
May 11, 2015

Presented by:

Kirsten Hargreaves, Manager of Social Development
Paul Horn, BootStrap Consulting

Executive Summary:

This report summarizes Phase 1 of the Stone Soup Initiative. It provides council in the community with a brief description of the initiative's history and the impetus for it. It summarizes the major themes, community values and possible strategies gathered through a series of community engagement events between October 2014 and April 2015.

The report offers a wide range of possible community-based measures that might be undertaken to address the compelling and growing issue of homelessness in Mission. Most of the suggested interventions include a role for the District of Mission, but there are a considerable number that seek to find partnerships for engagement in both formal and informal ways from a number of other constituencies. These include neighborhoods, landlords, family and friends, and community volunteers. At a higher level, many of these recommendations call for specific types of engagement by community service providing agencies and by other branches of government.

The "menu options" are described across two continua - from short-term to long-term, and from inexpensive to requiring significant investment. Another distinguishing criteria of many of the menu items is that some can be described as action items, achievable by the District of Mission and/or partnering community organizations, while other menu items are best described as "influence items" in which the municipality and its partnering agencies invest our efforts in creating Business cases or cogent lobbying efforts in attempt to mobilize funding or services in our region.

Six common themes can be seen across the menu items, and are further explored in the report:

1. Coordination
2. Research
3. Education
4. Communication / Collaboration
5. Capacity
6. Review, revise, report results

The report asks council to give an initial consideration to those menu items that are seen as highest priority. With council's direction, the next steps will involve providing were detailed strategy, including expectations around time, money and resource needs. Council has also been asked to identify any limits or concerns; offer direction for approaching other organizations and levels of government; and indicate, a broad fashion, the extent to which it is prepared to allocate money and other resources in pursuing this initiative.

This report will be supported by a presentation and workshop on 11 May 2015, and ample opportunity will be afforded for questions and generative dialogue. It is not expected that council will be able to identify and agree upon their recommended priorities at the end of the May 11th session, but rather that the options will be thoroughly explained and that council may offer a concrete resolution at a regular council prior to the Wellness Committee Planning session scheduled to occur on 29 May 2015. This will allow the facilitators at the planning session to build these council priorities into the planning work.

The Impetus:

In the summer and fall of 2014, the growing problem of homelessness in the Fraser Valley became particularly prominent. Propelled by news events such as Abbotsford's large homeless encampment and their subsequent issue with approving provisional housing facilities, the Communities Central Fraser Valley began to engage in a vocal debate about how best to manage homelessness.

Meanwhile, here in Mission, both social and traditional media began to take note of issues such as:

- Visible poverty and behavioural confrontations in the downtown (which was the subject of a revitalization effort);
- Homeless encampments and tragic deaths near the CNR tracks;
- Open drug abuse and the discarding of bio-hazardous needles in the vicinity of the mission library, museum and downtown steps;
- And a growing problem with drug related crime, coupled with an under-resourced RCMP force.

In the context of the fall election, the subject of homelessness became a hot topic. It was clear that the public was demanding action, but what was expected was far less clear.

Traditionally, homelessness has been the subject of the tremendous and often fruitless debate. The roots of homelessness are not well understood by most members of the public, and because some people who are homeless are particularly visible, this sub-population can sometimes become the unfair recipients of concerns about crime, mental illness and drug use.

Homelessness has a diverse range of causes, but at its root, it is largely an issue of poverty. Normally, when we consider poverty, we think of it as a lack of financial resources, but a more useful construct might be to consider it as a lack of resources of every kind. Those resources, or assets, include a supportive social structure around the person; employment and education; physical and mental health services; creative, spiritual and physical opportunities; life and coping skills; and timely access to crisis response services when needed. Of course, the most prominent resource needed is a safe and stable home, but a significant number of homeless people have difficulty maintaining a home even when one is available, largely because of converging deficits in these other areas.

In Mission, as in many communities, the initial response to homelessness could best be summed up as anger and finger-pointing. But this initial response, thankfully, was not long-lived. It became apparent that no single agency could be blamed for homelessness or charged with the responsibility of reversing the issue. Indeed, it was immediately apparent that homelessness would demand the will of the community as a whole if it were to be effectively targeted.

Kirsten Hargreaves, Mission's Manager of Social Development, was seen as a "hub person" with meaningful connections to many of the constituent agencies and community groups that were growing concerned. These included the Downtown Business Association, the District of Mission council, the RCMP, and many service provider agencies. Kirsten was directed to begin developing a made-in-Mission strategy for addressing homelessness.

Kirsten has successfully applied for a small grant that could be used for this work. Having worked with Paul Horn, Bootstrap Consulting, on projects such as Mission's Mental Health and Substance Use Strategy; Community Cares: Mental Health Response Training; and the city's annual Back to Health... for Good Fair, she asked him to work with her on the project.

In our early discussions, the concept of Stone Soup was born. A simple plan was presented to the previous council in the fall of 2014 and was approved.

The Concept:

By now, all of us are more than familiar with the story of Stone Soup. The metaphor of Stone Soup – that we all produce something better by contributing a little to the larger pot – was chosen for two reasons. First, it is a concise way of capturing the big idea behind a made-in-Mission approach to reducing homelessness. The metaphor was not chosen by accident, but rather with Mission's unique community culture in mind. Despite the fact that there are some voices in the community who still feel that homelessness is a policing issue, our work suggests that Mission has a unique willingness to embrace community-based approaches.

Second, stone soup metaphorically represents two important social development tools: community development and case management. These two tools form the root of our recommended approach(es).

Community development is an important trend in social services. The central idea is that the role of social professionals is to develop a strong network of professional and nonprofessional, formal and informal, intense and casual supports throughout the community. For example, rather than having social needs being addressed entirely by professional community service agencies, such as the Ministry for Children and Family Development or Mission Community Services, the social worker attempts to invigorate and bolster more sustainable informal supports such as the faith community, neighbors, employers, extended family, friends, cultural groups, school and community groups. The professional also invests in strengthening the person's family of origin and ensuring that the family is taking the highest possible benefit from available community services, such as a child's school or local health and recreational services.

The community development approach requires a significant degree of understanding and community will because it does not yield the sort of direct results that may appear to be evident when the police or public works arrive and move people out of an area. However, unlike a policing approach, the community development model is designed to pay off over the long term with lasting results, both for the individual and for subsequent generations. Another advantage of the community development approach is that it is cost-effective, ensuring the highest possible subscription to publicly funded services and taking advantage of unfunded supports.

Similarly, the Case Management approach builds on a model by creating an individualized “circle of support” for each consumer. That circle of support includes both professionals and non-professionals. One of the key ideas is that the consumer plays a central role in the case management team, allowing the team to expect personal accountability and to design interventions suited to the person. This is incredibly important because research shows that many people reject systematized services, complaining that they are too restrictive, robbing them of dignity and choice.

Another advantage of the case management team is that it can be created in the shadow of crisis, such as when a person is arrested under the Mental Health Act or when an at-risk person is identified through a community referral. Initially, the case management team may be comprised mostly of professionals, including social workers, mental health professionals, medical professionals, and educators (in the case of children and youth), but one of the priorities of the team is to quickly add informal social “assets.” These assets may or may not be what we traditionally consider to be members of a person’s family. If a person does not have functional relationships with her family, the case management team may consider members of their extended family; their larger cultural and/or faith community; former staff who have remained and connected; friends, including other service consumers; neighbours; landlords and even employers.

In some cases, supporters may be found in unusual places. For example, one local man is a regular at his bank where he withdraws five dollars every day. This allows him the method of budgeting his income, but also means that he is a regular customer at the bank and has been established a very warm set of relationships with the tellers and staff there. In their own way, he monitor his wellness and keep him socially connected. As another example, some of our local firefighters report that they have and at risk gentlemen who regularly stops by and talks to them as they do their daily maintenance on the trucks. For this man, that contact plays an invaluable role in maintaining his wellness and allowing others to keep track of him.

The concept of Stone Soup has been at the forefront from the very beginning of this project. Rather than simply prescribing one or two interventions, the project design begin with asking the community, including professionals, homeless people, formerly homeless people and the general community what they believed we should do. One end result of this was that we were able to determine a very high-level of support from within the general community. A very common response was that people wanted to help - contributing their time, skills or money – but that they did not know how and where to begin. Time and again, people were eager to learn the facts behind homelessness, and people who experienced homelessness demonstrated and eager willingness to share their stories and dispel the miss that caused them to be stigmatized.

The second and result of the Stone Soup information-gathering phase was that we were able to acquire a lengthy list a potential approaches, some of which are immediately attainable, while others will require a longer-term strategy.

The cultivation of this social will and this list of potential approaches is very much in keeping with the Stone Soup philosophy. Our aim is to ask council to support some of the items on the “menu” which follows, but with council support, we hope to address other citizens and community groups in tackling other items on the menu. In other cases, council will see the benefit in approaching partnering communities, the Fraser Valley Regional District or even the Province in attacking some of the mid- and long-term items on the menu.

The Process:

The Stone Soup project was conceptualized in three phases:

- Phase 1 – Information-gathering and collation using:
 - a) Day long session to explore and consider “menu” of options with service providers, ECG’s (Engaged Community Guys and Gals) and local government;
 - b) Workshop and interviews with homeless persons and recently housed;
 - c) Public forum;
 - d) Facebook page.

Report out and initial “menu” for council. (This report represents the conclusion of this phase.)

- Phase 2 – After council identifies specific “menu” items it wishes to pursue, develop a concrete (timed and costed) implementation plan for those items and bring to council for formal approval. Those strategies not selected by council may be presented to other community organizations or individuals. In some cases, partnerships may be pursued between the District and other agencies.
- Phase 3 – Implement approved strategies. Review, report and revise on agreed frequency as part of implementation.

The Philosophy:

From the beginning, consumers and professionals have espoused a philosophically driven approach. This approach considers both how we as stakeholders will work together, as well as the fundamental values we wish to embed in our community interventions.

These are more than “feel-good” sentiments. Research has shown that a significant number of people have rejected services because they feel alienated or mistreated by professionals. Similarly, considerable evidence shows that service gaps are created when a lack of good will and open communication exists between professionals. Without a strong philosophical bond, organizations can sometimes lose sight of their priorities and inadvertently isolate their clients.

These ideas were strongly validated throughout our information-gathering phase and two sets of values emerged as a result:

Values for How We Will Work Together

- We will treat one another with respect and dignity.
- We will “assume good will,” meaning that we will not question the motivations of one another.
- We will be quick to accept responsibility. We won’t blame one another.
- We will respect the background and expertise of others. We will understand that each of us brings a valuable set of skills and responsibilities to the community.
- We will be solution-minded and realistic. We will focus on what we can do.
- We will listen first and learn from others.

- While we recognize that data is important in making decisions, we also recognize that learning about a problem is distinct from resolving it. We will gather information to the extent that it helps us to do better work.
- We will demonstrate empathy, and will relate to people as people, rather than as labels or "populations."
- We will trust others and be trustworthy.
- We will avoid thinking or communicating using an "us and them" construct, because such constructs tend to be artificial and misleading.

Values for How We Will Address Homelessness

- The individual "consumer" will be at the centre of the process. S/he will have a key voice, autonomy and a high degree of accountability for moving forward.
- Every person will be afforded the utmost respect and dignity.
- We will respect the fact that the individual is a citizen of Mission and deserves to be a valued member of this community.
- Every person needs a sense of place to call his/her own.
- Being homeless should never mean the loss of personal choice.
- Supports and interventions must be sustainable. In particular, attention must be paid to the supporting people through life transitions.
- Before creating new supports or services, we should use current capacity first.
- We must engage both paid & unpaid supports, and unpaid supports should be our first priority if they will meet the needs of the consumer.
- We must manage individual expectations. Our aim is not to achieve a paternalistic or uniform view of citizenship, but rather to help people achieve the degree of stability and wellness that suits them. Our aim is to provide people with the social and personal assets needed to buffer against future crises.
- We must manage collective expectations. Homelessness is a significant social crisis and one that has been growing for many years. Reversing it will be an incremental process and there will be setbacks. Volunteers and family members will do much of the work, which means that many variables may affect the pace of progress. This is a "long view" approach.
- Our standard approach will be to Plan – Pilot – Review – Revise, but the aim is to act quickly.
- Approaches must be individualized to the highest possible extent. There is no "one-size-fits-all" approach.
- We must all accept responsibility for addressing this problem. It affects us all and is "our job" as citizens.
- Whatever we do, we must strive to do it well.
- We will employ a "Stages of Change" or "Gateway" approach, recognizing that people become ready to accept services and supports in different ways and at different paces. These approaches place value on establishing relationship and trust with people before establishing supports. They also recognize that some people may only be willing to "one step at a time" and that setbacks are expected. Such services employ outreach and try to locate services where they are most likely to be accessed. Barriers are reduced where possible and moral judgment is absent from all supports.

What did consumers (people who are homeless or were previously homeless) tell us?

- We live here for the same reason as most people do. Mission is a warm, welcoming community with a variety of supports and amenities.
- We may be homeless, but we are members of this community.
- It can be difficult to know what supports are out there and how to access them.
- Compromised dignity and bureaucracy are very big barriers to accessing services.
- We need choices because we are not all the same.
- It can be difficult to know who to trust. Many of us have been exploited by family, friends and professionals.
- We are not criminals. Like you, we don't like violent or untrustworthy people in our midst.
- We like to help our community, and that often occurs as us helping others who are homeless.
- Our biggest need is a stable home which will serve as a foundation to making our lives and selves better.
- We need more housing choices.
- We do not want to be homeless.

The Six General Recommendations:

1. Coordination
2. Research
3. Education
4. Communication / Collaboration
5. Capacity
6. Review, revise, report results

1. Coordination:

- Ensure that all professionals/agencies are working together
- Combine professional services with informal supports
- Involve the consumer at the centre of the process; build relationship
- Building a care/advocacy team around the person

2. Research:

- Learn what is working in other communities
- Base interventions on the data we have and our unique community profile (e.g. factors such as climate, geography, services)
- Collect data where needed about our population (e.g. causal factors; consumer perspectives)
- Gather information/personal insights from those that work directly with the homeless in Mission (including agencies and ECG's)

3. Education:

- Ensure that the community understands the roots and truths about homelessness – reduce fear and opposition, discourage false assumptions and harmful public perceptions (Be part of the solution, not the problem)
- Ensure that community knows the resources available – improve access
- Engage and inform community in supporting initiatives
- Multi-pronged and sustained approach needed
- Values and information-based
- Engage consumers in self-advocacy

4. Communication and Collaboration:

- Ensure that partners are communicating with one another, build a method for consistent streamlined communication
- Ensure that informal supports and consumers are involved and informed
- Build circles (Community Based Teams, aka Case Management Teams) around individuals

5. Capacity:

- Ensure that we have the services we need
- Ensure we have access (e.g. transit services)
- Ensure we have policies that work together (e.g. confidentiality)
- Ensure that service decisions are research-based (based on Theme #2)
- In some cases, the role of the District will be in advocacy (such as at a provincial or regional level, or to a community service agency/organization, rather than direct provision.)
- Provide a “smorgasbord” of options, within means that are realistic and actionable

6. Review, revise, report results:

- Show value for investment
- Adjust services to optimize
- Expand what is working; eliminate what is not
- Incorporate into public education
- Engage consumers in reporting out

The Menu:

Legend:

\$ - Little or no cash cost to the district. Expenses are generally in the form of in-kind staff time, use of venues, use of communications platforms or small one-off grants. (\$0- \$5000 expected.)

\$\$ - Moderate budget impact, in the form of a capital expenditure and/or on-going operational expenses. (Approximately \$5000 - \$50000)

\$\$\$ - Considerable budget impact, in the form of a capital expenditure and/or on-going operational expenses. These projects would normally involve a need to pursue partnerships and/or achieve funding from other levels of government; or be considered a strategic priority of the District of Mission.

ECG's – Engaged Community Guys and Gals (Volunteers)

Short Term				
Approach	Description	Who	Expected Cost	Other Resources
1. Stone Soup Dinners	Monthly pitch-in / potluck dinners at a central venue (such as All-Saints Church). An opportunity for homeless and at-risk persons to share their stories, connect with community and professionals.	Initially, DoM would organize these dinners, but the aim would be to quickly see the responsibility transitioned to a working group of volunteers.	\$	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ECG's • Faith community or other venue provider • ACT and MCSS Outreach (to help publicize the event.) • Possibly "Mission's Kitchens" community kitchen.
2. Consumer/ Former Consumer Outreach Support	Assist in coordinating this informally existing Outreach team, which is comprised of people who have lived through homelessness. Assistance means planning together with other service providers, ensuring proper equipment (for activities such as clean-up) and referral information.	MCSS and DoM working in coordination with the current informal group.	\$	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Connection to professional services (such as ACT Team) • Connection to FHA • Connection to Food and Clothing banks. • Provide Community Cares Training to the outreach volunteers.

3. Public Information Sessions (What is homelessness?)	Prepare a presentation about homelessness that includes testimony from homeless people, community members, family and professionals. Deliver the presentation in multiple ways, including larger forums, small community groups (such as Rotary, Chamber, library or high school classes, for example) and provide the materials on-line.	Social Development Agencies and Mission Public Schools (potentially through the Social Development Committee)	\$ \$\$ (If videographer is needed.)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Speakers • Advice from DoM Communications • Use of City Page, Website • Possible use of MPSD on-line platform / Youtube • Videography?
4. Website/Social Media Clearing House	Similar to a buy/sell website (i.e. Craigslist), this would be a website for people to identify resources (such as time, belongings, funding, expertise) that they are willing to give, as well as a place for people to post "wanted" ads. This site needs to be curated and publicized by a facilitator, as well as augmented by other social media.	DoM Social Development and Communications, with help from other local agencies. Ultimately, the work of curating the site would be handed off to a fee-for-service partner with specific annual deliverables expected.	\$ - capital \$ - operational (per annum)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Server space (MCSS, DoM?) • Web design expertise (professional help required) • Subscribed and engaged community members • Would this work best as an adjunct to a service such as a "thrift store" where people donate physical goods?
5. Warming/Drop-In Centre	A place (or space) for people to socialize in during the day, and particularly in bad weather. This might be offered daily or specifically on food-bank and cheque pick-up days, so that people don't need to wait outside for hours. This spot would be a point of contact for outreach workers and other service providers, because it would likely attract a large percentage of the local homeless population.	Potentially, Mission Community Services or Friendship Centre could assist with this. But other options, such as utilizing the meeting room at the Mission public library should also be considered.	\$	

6. MOU around confidentiality/release – legally vetted	A template or standardized form and procedure agreed upon by Mission agencies (and legally vetted) that would allow clients to give permission for interdisciplinary care at the point of intake.	A draft agreement could be created buy bootstrap consulting, In collaboration with mission community services and other social and health care organizations. Small amount of seed money would be needed to pay for the legal fees involved in vetting a letter, although it maybe possible to seek assistance from the Public Trustee's office.	\$	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public Trustee • Law Society
7. "Flash Mob" community helping events – foodbank/fund-raiser	Using social media, spontaneous events would be scheduled to bring the community in contact with homeless people in meaningful, constructive and helpful ways. For example, if there is a forecast for bad weather, we might call for a sweaterfest, asking citizens to show up with warm clothing. Not all events would be specifically about feeding or clothing people. In some cases, the aim would be to simply have people interact in our public spaces.	Assistance from the DoM's Communication and Social Development managers would be a major asset here. However, the aim would be to have a group of motivated volunteers be responsible for coordinating this. Given their strength in using social media, this is seen as an apt	\$	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Youth volunteers/group

		opportunity to deploy youth.		
8. Maintenance bylaws and enforcement – minimize unsightly premises	Review and revise our bylaws – working in concert with our bylaw enforcement officers and gathering best practice information from UBCM and other communities. The aim is to provide a mechanism that expedites the ability of the city to act on accumulations of garbage and acts of damage or vandalism that might encourage “squatting” on private lands (e.g. empty homes or vacant lots). Also, by up-keeping premises, areas like our downtown are more likely to remain populated and therefore less conducive to camping out.	Manager of the inspection services and inspectors from DoM, working alongside Mission social and healthcare organizations.	\$	UBCM, LMLGA
9. Youth Work Initiative	THIS PROJECT IS ALREADY UNDERWAY. Directed at homeless youth, who may have difficulty completing schooling or gaining work experience, this project aims to give entry level work experience to young people. It provides guidance and financial support to the young worker and the employer.	MCSS, Youth Unlimited, SRC-Tec and others	\$\$	
10. Service Infocards	At a glance and plasticized cards that can be given to homeless and at-risk people. In plain language, they would offer information about the services offered here, contacts, and a basic explanation of the processes for getting help. As an example, the cards would answer the question: How can I get help if I've lost my ID? Or, I'm not from BC. Who do I call?	MCSS, community donors, in-kind assistance from printers	\$	

Mid-Term				
Approach	Description	Who	Expected Cost	Other Resources
11. Pilot "Community- Based Team" Approach	THIS IS A KEY APPROACH. Working with community partners, this approach involves creating individualized support teams for people who are cyclically involved with social services, police and healthcare systems. The aim is to include the consumer, his or her social support system, including friends, family and other informal supports, alongside of professional supporters to monitor and develop individualized Service strategies. The strategies would be multidisciplinary and would be closely tracked, rather than waiting for an individual to have further crisis before adjusting approaches.	Lead from Mission Community Services, with financial support from other community partners. Initial seed funding from the district of Mission would help us to see whether this sort of approach can be effective. Other partners involved include the RCMP, ACT team, Mission Mental Health, Fraser House Society and other service providers involved in the persons life.	\$\$ (to pilot)	
12. Research effective practices elsewhere	Establish a fund and a policy which would apply to DoM's social development, planning, economic development, inspection services and communications departments, and potentially to Social Development Committee and/or Mission Healthy Community Partnership Committee. The aim of the policy and fund would be to ask Mission staff and volunteers to actively seek out and, most importantly, share information about effective best practices for preventing or reducing homelessness.	A policy could be drafted by the District admissions HR department, social development manager, or BootStrap Consulting. The district council would need to approve a budget and protocol	\$ - \$\$, Dependent on council approval.	

	<p>More than simply establishing a policy of learning, it would be vital that the policy describe how staff are expected to share and act upon the initiatives about which they have learned. In short, there must be a demonstration of value for the money.</p> <p>In many cases, learning can be done for free or at little expense to the district, but an incentive program can help engage people to participate in continuous learning and Sharing of learned lessons.</p>	for applying for these learning funds.		
13. Outreach Nursing	<p>A professional nurse, in the company of an experienced outreach worker, would meet homeless people where they live and offer Basic healthcare device, referral information and immediate healthcare such as attending to wounds. The advantage of such a system is that it addresses people who are reluctant to access the health care system. Not only is it a method to ensure that people are as healthy as possible, but it can also be a step toward better overall public health.</p>	<p>Some interest has been expressed by experienced nurses who are willing to volunteer sometime. However, a sustainable program will likely require at least some time allocation from a Fraser Health nurse.</p> <p>Using volunteers means that this is a mid range program, But advocating for the use of publicly funded nurses they mean that there is a long-term horizon for</p>	<p>\$ - if volunteers used</p> <p>\$\$ - If professional Fraser Health Authority nurses used</p>	

		this project.		
14. Downtown Ambassadors	Rather than simply employing downtown security, the aim would be to upskill these workers so that they developed basic social services skills, And can serve as a gateway to referring individuals services or as points of contact information for community-based teams and outreach workers. By doing this, we did stigmatize homelessness and significantly increase the value of our downtown security program.	The security program is already funded by the district of Mission. Programs such as Community Cares Mental Health Response Training are designed to help skills professionals such as security guards, but this must be mandated by the District as an expectation of the security provider. Alternatively, the district could employ or contract ambassadors directly.	\$-\$\$ dependent on model	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Security company
15. "Occupy" Campaigns	A public relations and advertising campaign designed to have locals utilize their public spaces and parks more frequently, making them less suitable and attractive as homeless encampments. Part of the program would be for the district to encourage and potentially create a budget for neighborhood events in parks. One model for doing so is to engage Youth workers in taking their activities outside of the leisure center property. This is seen as a strong opportunity for engaging youth and other volunteers.	Parks, Recreation and Culture department; cultural commission; DoM Communications	\$ - \$\$	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Youth groups, neighbourhood organizations, community service clubs • This could involve a "Friends of the Park" type group.

16. Housing Clearing House	<p>Similar to the housing office on many post-secondary campuses, this is a venue which would allow local landlords to advertise their rental sites for free using a district platform. That platform could be very low tech, such as a bulletin board at the leisure center or considerably more high tech such as an online housing listing page.</p> <p>A more advanced approach would be to have each rental offering answer some quick questions which would help to ensure the tenants who might need specific supports or access to services would be well suited to these rentals.</p>	<p>This could likely be adopted via a local social service providers such as Mission Friendship Center or Mission Community Services, but a small fee for service budget may be helpful.</p>	\$\$	
17. Referral Line	<p>A locally oriented one-call-does-it-all line that would help individuals quickly locate the services they need, and potentially locate navigators or volunteers who are willing to go with them. Another potential benefit is that this line could help them to determine the transit routes needed and help them access bus for taxi fare.</p> <p>Most people are reluctant to call the crisis line because they do not see it as a resource. (Most believe it is only for people who are suicidal.) Even when people do to contact the crisis line, it is often difficult to get accurate information about services specific to our local area.</p>	<p>As above, this could likely be adopted via a local social service providers such as Mission Friendship Center or Mission Community Services, but a small fee for service budget may be helpful.</p> <p>It would likely make sense to combine these services.</p>	\$\$ (can be combined with the above within the same budget)	
18. Expedited process for low-cost suites	<p>A simple checklist system could be made available to homeowners who are willing to create secondary suites or rental properties that will rent below a certain threshold. The aim is to create an incentive for authorize suite</p>	<p>DoM Planning department in concert with Social Development Manager</p>	\$	UBCM, LMLGA

	development by making the process free and as quick and simple as possible.			
19. Landlord development, training and support	<p>This is a program specifically designed for market landlords, teaching them skills for supporting at risk tenants, informing them about how to protect their rights as landlords, and providing them with support contact line. The aim is to make landlords more open and willing to providing housing to marginalized individuals.</p> <p>It should be noted that many landlords prefer to rent to individuals who are on government support. This is because are pay directly and reliably by the province.</p>	<p>Like #16 and 17, this could likely be adopted via a local social service providers such as Mission Friendship Center or Mission Community Services, but a small fee for service budget may be helpful.</p> <p>This could be a combined service.</p>		BC Housing, local Housing Committee
20. Targeted strategies for specific areas (CPTED applications)	<p>Specific parks, public spaces and neighborhoods are more vulnerable to becoming homeless encampments because of their physical features. Using the RCMP's Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design construct as a template, Public Works, PRC facilities and Social Development could list public locations in order of priority and create budgeted action plans for those highest on the list.</p>	RCMP, Public Works, PRC Facilities in consultation with Social Development Manager	\$ - Priority list \$\$ - Individual projects and plans	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Neighbourhood volunteer groups, Adopt-A-Block • This could involve a "Friends of the Park" type group.
21. Community Mentor Program	<p>This is a reprisal of a program that was initiated by Mission Community Services a number of years ago. The aim is to connect Community members with people who are currently homeless or at risk, providing valuable mentoring and reducing social alienation. Unlike the previous iteration of the program, the aim would be to link people who had previous experience as</p>	<p>A local social services agency or partnership of agencies.</p> <p>Some mentor training provided through Community Cares.</p>	\$	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Summit Learning Centre / Riverside College • Friendship Centre?

	homeless individuals with those who are currently at risk or are homeless.			
22. Seniors and Youth Connection	<p>A preventive strategy in which recreation, education and leisure programs are designed explicitly to create connections between seniors and adolescents. Both of these groups are particularly at risk of homelessness and alienation, so any efforts to create a stronger social connections can help to ensure that people are resilient in the face a crisis and develop social assets who can help them in times of trouble. Aside from homelessness, there are many social benefits to creating these sorts of relationships.</p> <p>Whether this work is undertaken by the leisure center staff or buy a community organization such as the lifetime learning center or the senior's and youth advisory committees, the aim would be to intentionally plan events and programs that our elders and used together.</p>	DoM PRC, or community organizations such as Lifetime Learning Society, Friendship Centre, local faith community or similar (or a partnership of these groups.)	\$-\$\$	Seniors Advisory Committee, Youth Unlimited
23. Beat Cops/Ambassadors/ACT and Outreach coordination	A critical component behind all of the strategies will be court nation. This is particularly important in our downtown area where different organizations will all be indirect contact with the homeless population. It will be vitally important that the RCMP beat cops, ambassadors/security guards, outreach workers and act team members meet regularly to discuss what they're seeing on streets. In some cases, one group or individual will be better at relating to a consumer than another and it may be helpful for these groups to coordinate their outreach.	RCMP, Downtown security, ACT team, MCSS outreach, Impact youth outreach, Hope Central, Mission Friendship Centre and Mission Library staff	\$	Security company; DBA

Long Term and Advocacy				
Approach	Description	Who	Expected Cost	Other Resources
24. Lobbying for enhanced recovery and detox services, esp. youth	Building a business case for enhanced recovery and detox services in mission or the surrounding area. This might involve advocating for more choice; easier access; or services specializing in youth or detox. However, insignificant amount of underlying research would be needed to verify that the business case is sound. If it turns out that services are adequate, the work would change to one of improving awareness in access to current services.	District of Mission, in partnership with the Fraser Valley Regional Hospital District; with assistance from Fraser health Authority and input from a Healthcare Consultant	\$\$ - Business case \$\$\$ if recovery resources are added	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Knowledgeable healthcare consultant
25. Transition Planning Table: Coordination between addiction services – transition-planning between services and at graduation	<p>In the absence of designated funding or services specializing in helping individuals during transition from supportive care to independent living, it is important that one or more of our community partners play a role in coordinating and sharing information during transitions.</p> <p>This action item aims to create a coordinated table at which professionals can talk about individuals leaving care or moving from one service to another, so that a plan can be made and informal community supports can be developed.</p> <p>It should be noted that item 31, which is a long-term item, aims to see the creation of established transitioning services. This recommendation is seen as a partial step toward addressing a larger problem.</p>	Local social service, recovery and housing organizations. To be done effectively, one community partner would need to be a driving force establishing this transition planning table.	\$	
26. DoM	Identified in the 2009 Mission Health Plan, this	Funding for this	\$\$\$	

Coordinator/ Navigator	<p>has remained an outstanding recommendation. The aim of a navigator is to provide an individual who can be contacted by people who find the healthcare and social service systems confusing, and you need information, advocacy or support to navigate through it.</p> <p>The role of a coordinator is to ensure that various support organizations and informal supports the remaining connected and are working in concert to support individuals. While the job coordinator and navigator are not the same, they are mutually aligned and in the near-term, could be tackled by one worker.</p>	<p>worker might be provided by the District of Mission, FHA or a partnership of the two.</p> <p>Another potential partner make be local First Nations.</p>		
27. Market housing incentives	<p>Similar to the downtown revitalization incentive, the aim here is for the planning and economic development departments consider how they might expedite the development process and/or create incentives for developers who build affordable housing.</p> <p>A variety of models exist and it would be up to the planning and economic development departments to determine which ones were best suited to Mission or to particular areas of Mission, as a first step in this process.</p> <p>The development of this program would take significant time and require significant public engagement.</p> <p>Given that the DoM will soon be reviewing its OCP, this may be seen as a deliverable of that</p>	<p>DoM Planning and Economic Development functions, with support from Civic Engagement</p> <p>Potentially the OCP project lead/team may need to consider this as part of that project.</p>	\$\$	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OCP consultant, if engaged • UDI and developers

	work.			
28. Promote/explore Aboriginal Service Development with Sto:lo	<p>There are a number of advantages of partnering with local first Nations governments in the provision of services.</p> <p>Firstly, for many consumers, services aligned with traditional values and approaches maybe more palatable and accessible, And therefore more likely to be used effectively by a significant amount of the homeless population.</p> <p>Secondly, First Nations governments may have access to financial resources that would otherwise not be accessible.</p>	<p>Partnership between DoM, FVRD and Sto:lo</p> <p>Project-based partnerships between local band governments and community service agencies. (NOTE: Some of these are currently being explored.)</p>	\$\$-\$\$\$	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sto:lo Nation and individual bands
29. Mental Health Support Team Model (Proactive)	<p>While Mission will be gaining an ACT team, shared with Abbotsford, the mandate of the team will be to work with individuals who were already homeless and to suffer from acute mental illness. However, an important and cost-effective method of preventing homelessness is to address the needs of people who are identified as being at risk before they lose their homes. An effective approach for doing so is the use of mental health support teams. These teams employ a psychiatrist, psychologist, psychiatric nurse, and an array of mental health workers. They are cost-effective because the mental health workers provide direct, in community services the one to one basis in consultation with the medical professionals. Their services are biopsychosocial in nature and are intended to work by developing strong community connections.</p>	<p>Advocacy from the district of Mission and the FVRD to Fraser Health, but implementation from FHA.</p>	<p>it is not clear whether this measure would cost FHA more than their current model.</p> <p>\$\$ - If a comparative analysis of the current model is needed.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mission Mental Health Exposure to similar groups, such as the West Coast Mental Health Support Team

	This item advocates for more of this models used in the region. This involves further exploring the approaches used by Fraser Health and advocating for us for a support team model.			
30. Multi-Disciplinary Service Centre: "One Stop Shop"	<p>When designed, the community health center was intended to be a multidisciplinary facility, But this did not materialize. Currently, at least one third of the facility remains vacant. The Fraser Health departments that occupy the space are discrete and do not operate as a team.</p> <p>As was envisioned in the original plan, the intention would be to see this location (or another one in the local area) be a simple "one stop shop" facility, where individuals could get that healthcare, social services support, financial support, and housing assistance they need.</p> <p>This will be a significant undertaking, requiring considerable coordination and relationship building. It is a long-term plan that will require a strong vision, but it is also an opportunity to pilot an important initiative.</p>	A major partnership of the District of Mission, FHA, community organizations	\$\$\$	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review of lease agreements and 3P structure at current facility
31. Designated Transitional Services	A significant number of graduating clients/patients struggle to maintain their wellness and independent living because too often there is a sudden halting or reduction in the degree of support they receive when they leave a program. Often, at the first signs of adversity, The individual decompensates and problems with housing, employment, finances, and healthcare snowball. This leads to a cycle of crisis and reintroduction to the acute care healthcare	<p>DoM, in consultation with FVRHD, FHA, MCFD, and local Addictions Service providers.</p> <p>Again, this will likely require the assistance of the healthcare</p>	\$\$\$	

	<p>system and/or the justice system.</p> <p>Beginning with an in-depth analysis of the current transitional services offered and any gaps that exist, this item calls for the development of a sound lobbying case to Fraser Health, the Ministry for Children and Family Development and similar provincial bodies.</p> <p>Given that this is an enduring problem and not unique to the Fraser Valley, this will be a challenging undertaking, But an effective strategy might be to pioneer/pilot new approaches in this community.</p>	<p>consultant, which can be a costly undertaking.</p> <p>There may be an economy of scale achieved if items 24 and 31 are combined</p>		
32. Youth emergency shelter	<p>A separate and distinct shelter for homeless youth, with specialized workers, would be an effective way to help youth avoid exploitative influences and exposure to hard drugs.</p>	<p>DoM and FVRD advocacy to MCFD</p>	<p>\$\$\$</p>	
33. Social Enterprise employment opportunities	<p>Social enterprise programs aimed to find income opportunities for people who at difficulty with typical employment. People can be supported to start their own small business, often to supplement social assistance, or to work in social enterprise teams. In many cases, these teams operate under the guidance of social service agencies that provide ancillary services such as counseling and life skills teaching.</p> <p>The aim behind this initiative would be for a concerted effort to see such program opened with in one of Mission's community service agencies.</p>	<p>Community service agency, such as MCSS, funded through the provincial government.</p>	<p>\$\$-\$\$\$</p>	
34. Regional Service	<p>This item is more of a policy direction, Calling for</p>	<p>DoM advocacy to</p>	<p>\$</p>	

Approach	<p>the District of Mission to take the lead in asking the Fraser Valley Regional District and the Fraser Valley Regional Hospital District to work in a coordinated way on many of these recommendations, as well as others identified in our neighboring communities.</p> <p>The aim would be to avoid having people move from one community to another, causing them to continuously slip through the cracks.</p>	FVRD and FVRHD		
35. Provide Housing Options	<p>Adopting a Housing First approach, the District of Mission could lobby FHA, BC Housing, and MCFD, and the Min of Social Development and Social Innovation to provide operational dollars if the city was to invest or partner in investing in third stage (i.e. supported market housing) in the community. For example, buildings like the former Bellevue Hotel or the empty building at 32335 Fletcher Avenue could be repurposed for this use.</p> <p>The model of service delivery could be similar to that offered by the Portland Housing Society, which specializes in helping to house those who are "hard to house"</p>	DoM, in partnership with provincial agencies	\$\$\$	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Portland Housing Society • Local Housing coalition or group (MASH, MCSS or similar)

The Questions:

1. Which, if any, of the menu items should be investigated further?
2. What is the expected timeline by council for a response to further investigation, including costing for time, money and other resources?
3. Which of these areas does council see as the largest priority?
4. What groups, individuals and other governments does council want us to approach?
5. Does council have any concerns or limits they want to establish? Are there specific things they do not want us to attempt?
6. To what degree is council prepared to allocate financial and human resources in developing these items for Phase 2?