



COMMUNITY SERVICES COMMITTEE AGENDA

Community Services Committee Meeting
Monday, June 16, 2014
Tom Davies Square

COUNCILLOR RON DUPUIS, CHAIR

Terry Kett, Vice-Chair

4:00 p.m. COMMUNITY SERVICES COMMITTEE MEETING
COMMITTEE ROOM C-11

Council and Committee Meetings are accessible. For more information regarding accessibility, please call 3-1-1 or email clerks@greatersudbury.ca.

DECLARATIONS OF PECUNIARY INTEREST AND THE GENERAL NATURE THEREOF

PRESENTATIONS

1. Report dated June 4, 2014 from the General Manager of Community Development regarding Parks, Open Space & Leisure Master Plan Review-Final Report. **4 - 7**

(ELECTRONIC PRESENTATION) (RECOMMENDATION PREPARED)

- Steve Langlois, Principal Planner, Monteith Brown Planning Consultants

(2014 PARKS, OPEN SPACE & LEISURE MASTER PLAN REVIEW UNDER SEPARATE COVER)

(Monteith Brown Planning Consultant was hired to conduct a review of the Parks, Open Space, and Leisure Master Plan. The consultant will be making a presentation on the review and the implementation strategy.)

2. Report dated June 4, 2014 from the General Manager of Community Development regarding Child Care System Review-Presentation and Recommendations. **8 - 15**

(ELECTRONIC PRESENTATION) (RECOMMENDATION PREPARED)

- Tyler Campbell, Manager of Children Services

(The Children's Services section will present the recommendations of the Child Care System Review.)

REGULAR AGENDA

MANAGERS' REPORTS

- R-1. Report dated June 3, 2014 from the General Manager of Community Development regarding Health Impact Assessment Screening Tool. **16 - 20**

(RECOMMENDATION PREPARED)

(This report provides recommendations for the inclusion of the Health Impact Assessment (HIA) screening tool and notation that a statement be included in all policy or program reports for Operations Committee and Community Services Committee. The HIA screening tool will be incorporated into the Agendas Online report writing system.)

- R-2. Report dated June 4, 2014 from the Chief of Fire and Paramedic Services regarding 2014 Land Ambulance Grant Allocation Increase. **21 - 22**

(RECOMMENDATION PREPARED)

(This report is regarding the Provincial Funding Announcement for the 2014 Land Ambulance Grant allocation.)

ADDENDUM

CIVIC PETITIONS

QUESTION PERIOD AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

NOTICES OF MOTION

ADJOURNMENT

BRIGITTE SOBUSH, DEPUTY CITY CLERK

Request for Decision

Parks, Open Space & Leisure Master Plan Review-Final Report

Presented To: Community Services
Committee

Presented: Monday, Jun 16, 2014

Report Date Wednesday, Jun 04,
2014

Type: Presentations

Recommendation

WHEREAS the City of Greater Sudbury Parks, Open Space and Leisure Master Plan was completed in 2004 in conjunction with the Parks, Open Space and Leisure background study for the City's new official plan;

AND WHEREAS Master Plans are updated every five years and rewritten every ten years to reflect emerging needs, trends and strategies through a Master Plan review and update;

AND WHEREAS Monteith Brown Planning Consultants was retained by the City of Greater Sudbury to prepare the Master Plan review as part of the official plan review;

AND WHEREAS inventories of existing facilities and services, new initiatives, changes in Leisure demands and trends have been incorporated as part of the review;

AND WHEREAS the plan provides guidance on an implementation strategy which identifies community priorities and sets a general course for meeting the needs by priority projects for implementation purposes;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the City of Greater Sudbury receive the report titled 2014 Parks, Open Space and Leisure Master Plan Review;

AND FURTHER THAT key action plans be included as part of the Leisure Services strategic plan planned actions and included in future capital budgets for Council's consideration;

AND FURTHER THAT the Parks and Recreation Master Plan be used as a background study to inform the City's Official Plan review process.

Signed By

Report Prepared By

Real Carre
Director of Leisure Services
Digitally Signed Jun 4, 14

Recommended by the Department

Catherine Matheson
General Manager of Community
Development
Digitally Signed Jun 4, 14

Recommended by the C.A.O.

Doug Nadorozny
Chief Administrative Officer
Digitally Signed Jun 5, 14

Background

The City of Greater Sudbury 2004 Parks, Open Space and Leisure Master Plan (Plan) was completed in conjunction with the Parks, Open Space and Leisure background study for the City's 2006 official plan.

The City of Greater Sudbury has been successful in implementing the majority of the recommendations included in the original plan.

Monteith Brown Planning Consultant (MBPC) was hired in August 2013, to conduct the 2014 Master Plan review. Building off the existing Master Plan, the purpose of the review is to create a realistic framework for the delivery of cost effective, high quality parks and recreation facilities, parks, trails, leisure services and programming with a view to meeting the changing needs of the community over the next ten years.

The 2014 Master Plan Review is distributed under separate cover (**Appendix A**) and (**Appendix B - Maps**), for Council's information. The plan will become an important planning tool and includes:

- Strategic framework
- Guiding principles
- List of accomplishments
- Parks and Leisure trends
- Community Demographics
- Public Engagement Program (Online survey results, Public open houses, Interviews with individual member of City Council)
- Leisure facilities inventory comparison (2004-2014) background, analysis and action
- Facilities analyzed and reviewed (Arenas, Pools, Community Centres, Fields, etc.)
- Parkland and Trails (Classification, Inventory, Surplus, Parkland, etc.)
- Delivery of Services and Programs (Healthy community challenges/priorities, Affordable access to recreation, staffing/volunteer management, partnerships, etc.)

Implementation Strategy

As part of the Master Plan document, recommendations on potential “action plans” have been identified at the end of each subsection or topic area. This is not intended to be a definitive list, as additional capital repairs, operating expenditures, and other initiatives outside the scope of this Plan may be identified and prioritized on a case-specific basis. By approving this Plan, the City is not bound to implementing every action plan or providing facilities in the order, amount, or timing indicated; rather, this Plan provides guidance on community priorities. It is expected that the City of Greater Sudbury will make decisions on individual projects and funding sources annually through the capital budget process.

This implementation strategy provides guidance for ensuring that the most critical action plans are dealt with in a timely fashion, while the less critical action plans are implemented over time. Annual operating costs for programs, services, and facilities (existing or recommended under this Plan) are not included in this analysis. It is expected that an analysis of operating budget implications and partnership options would be undertaken prior to approving any capital project and that sufficient annual operating funds would be allocated to any approved project.

In addition to funding availability, factors that might change priorities year to year may include:

- capital lifecycle and considerations of safety;
- legislation and mandated requirements;
- changes to service standards;
- public input and community interests;
- emerging trends and changes in participation rates;
- availability of alternate providers; and
- socio-demographic changes and growth forecasts.

The City of Greater Sudbury may be challenged in providing the appropriate financial resources to meet the Master Plan's recommendations. The full implementation of this Plan will require the pursuit of development charges, grants, alternative funding, and the establishment of various partnerships and collaborations with community organizations, schools, agencies, and other partners.

Priority has been determined based on an assessment of need, as identified throughout the planning process (including public engagement, trend and demographic analysis, assessments of facilities, parks, programs, etc.). Within the tables listed in the Plan, the priority and timing of action plans are organized into the following categories:

Priority

High Priority: Immediate attention is recommended during the timeframe recommended.

Medium Priority: Attention is required when high priority actions have been initiated or completed, or when suitable partners have been identified for funding.

Low Priority: Attention is required when high and medium priority actions have been initiated/completed.

Timing

Short-term: 2014 to 2018

Medium-term: 2019 to 2023

Ongoing: 2014 and beyond

*Note: In the tables distributed under separate cover, **(Appendix C)** the action plans are numbered according to the order in which they are presented in the body of the Master Plan. They are not listed in priority order.*

Monitoring and Updating the Master Plan

The City of Greater Sudbury should regularly review and assess, and revise the recommendations of the Parks, Open Space & Leisure Master Plan in order to ensure that they remain reflective of local conditions and responsive to the changing needs of the community. This requires monitoring of activity patterns, tracking user satisfaction levels, and undertaking a detailed ten-year review of the Plan. Through these mechanisms - or as a result of other internal or external factors - adjustment or resource allocations and priorities identified in this Plan may be required.

Reviewing the Plan requires a commitment from all department involved in the delivery of parks and leisure services, Council, and the public. An appropriate time for this is prior to the annual budgeting process. The following steps may be used to conduct an annual review of the Master Plan:

- review of the past year (recommendations implemented, capital projects undertaken, success/failure or new and existing initiatives, changes in participation levels, issues arising from the public and community groups, etc.);
- identification of issues impacting the coming year (anticipated financial and operational constraints, political pressures, etc.);
- cursory review of the Plan for direction regarding its recommendations;
- preparation of staff report to indicate prioritization of short term projects and determination of which projects should be implemented in the coming year based upon criteria established by staff (e.g., financial limitations, community input, partnership/funding potential, etc.);
- communication to staff and Council regarding the status of projects, criteria used to prioritize projects, and projects to be implemented in the coming year; and

- budget requests/revisions as necessary.

Request for Decision

Child Care System Review-Presentation and Recommendations

Presented To: Community Services Committee

Presented: Monday, Jun 16, 2014

Report Date Wednesday, Jun 04, 2014

Type: Presentations

Recommendation

WHEREAS the Ministry of Education, in 2012 changed the funding formula for child care across the Province of Ontario, resulting in a potential funding reduction of \$5.4 million in Greater Sudbury (\$1.8M cut in 2013 and \$3.6M potential cut in 2016); and

WHEREAS, in June 2013, Council requested a Child Care System Review to recommend changes to the child care system, to plan for future funding reductions in 2016; and

WHEREAS Children Services has led a community process in partnership with all child care operators and school boards, and has received unanimous endorsement of the recommended changes from that group of partners;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the City of Greater Sudbury authorize the proposed changes to the child care system outlined in the report dated June 4, 2014 from the General Manager of Community Development regarding Child Care System Review related to the Child Care Funding Allocation Formula, the Redistribution of Licensed Child Care Spaces, the Operating Grant Formula, the Changes to Child Care Rates, and the Direct Operation of Junior Citizens Day Care; and

THAT the City of Greater Sudbury revise Child Care funding agreements with community Child Care operators to reflect these changes; and

THAT a detailed transition plan to transfer directly operated services (Junior Citizens Day Care) to non-profit child care providers, be brought back to Council for approval before December 2015.

Finance Implications

In 2016 there will be a potential \$3.6 Million reduction of grant funding, however, this will not translate into a tax levy reduction as the new Childcare funding allocation model requires a minimum level of municipal contributions that the City currently provides.

Signed By

Report Prepared By

Tyler Campbell
Manager of Children Services
Digitally Signed Jun 4, 14

Division Review

Ron Henderson
Director of Citizen Services
Digitally Signed Jun 4, 14

Recommended by the Department

Catherine Matheson
General Manager of Community Development
Digitally Signed Jun 4, 14

Recommended by the C.A.O.

Doug Nadorozny
Chief Administrative Officer
Digitally Signed Jun 5, 14

As previously reported the City has received mitigation funding to be used to assist in this transition.

Background

In 2012, the Ministry of Education announced a new Provincial Funding Reallocation which included a \$1.8 million cut to the City of Greater Sudbury's Children Services Budget for 2013, and projected a further potential budget reduction of up to \$4.6 million in the future. In 2014, Greater Sudbury's Provincial allocation was increased by \$1 million, thereby reducing the future reduction to \$3.6 million. The \$3.6 million dollar reduction is projected to be implemented in 2016.

With the Provincial funding reallocation came more local flexibility about allocating funds and a requirement to develop local policies to allocate child care funding based on local needs.

In June 2013, Council approved internal Child Care policy changes to respond to the immediate funding reduction and requested a Child Care System Review to recommend policy and operational changes to Council, in order to create a high quality, efficient child care system that can operate within the current funding realities and is positioned to be able to weather further funding reductions.

The City of Greater Sudbury Children's Services Section and its stakeholder agencies (licensed child care, school board and specialized services partners) have worked collaboratively to develop a plan which will create a strong, stable and responsive child care system that can operate within the current and future funding environments.

Historical challenges related to child care funding and delivery

In addition to responding to the current funding reduction and planning for future reductions, these recommendations also address several historical challenges with the funding and delivery of child care services:

1. Provincial funding allocations for the City of Greater Sudbury, historically, have over funded the child care subsidy program while other areas have been underfunded. This plan shifts more funding to direct grants to child care operators that will strengthen the system for all families.
2. Provincial funding increases starting in 2005 allowed for rapid growth of the child care system in Greater Sudbury. As a result, some child care programs were "over licensed" and now some of the spaces being funded are underutilized. This plan will redistribute spaces (and in some case reduce spaces) so that all funded spaces are maximized, and care is available across the City in an equitable way.
3. Provincial wage subsidy allocation formulas have underfunded the youngest age groups of care which are most expensive to provide, while providing significant grants for care for older children, which is much less expensive to provide. This plan shifts more of the grant funding to the younger age groups, where the costs are highest.
4. Provincial funding formulas and per space amounts have remained unchanged for many years. Some funding has been released on a year-to-year basis and subsidy rates have not been increased on a regular schedule. As a result, child care operators have been challenged to keep up with and plan for inevitable increases to costs. This plan provide a more stable and predictable funding plan to help child care operators plan for the future.

5. The system review identified several significant challenges related to the direct operation of Junior Citizens Day Care by the City of Greater Sudbury, especially in a time of funding reductions. These challenges relate to the high cost of providing this care at this site and issues related to inequitable distribution of funding, the potential or perceived conflict of interest of directly operating one child care centre and the non-profit operators' improved capacity to deliver evening and flexible care at a lower cost. More details about these challenges are provided later in this report. This plan recommends that the unique services (evening and flexible care) currently provided by Junior Citizens Day Care be transferred to the non-profit system.

The Child Care System Review provides a foundation for an improved child care system which will allow all partners to work together to plan for, deliver and evaluate a high quality, equitable and stable child care system. It will give the City of Greater Sudbury, as the System Service Manager, the tools and policies to effectively manage the child care system now, and in the future.

Child Care System Review Process

The recommendations in this report are a result of a year-long collaborative community planning process led by the Children Services section. The System Review Working Group, made up of 14 members representing all stakeholders, met regularly and brought their recommendations to the System Review Stakeholders Group, made up of the boards and operators of all childcare agencies and all four school boards. All recommendations included in the report have the full endorsement of the Child Care System Review Stakeholder's Group.

Child Care System- Proposed Changes

1. Child Care Funding Allocation Formula

The System Review Working Group recommends an allocation strategy which will ensure that funding increases or decreases occur in a planned and predictable way. The new, local formula sets the proportion of subsidy funding at the historical level of actual spending on the program. This frees up additional funding to be shifted into direct grants for operators, in order to promote stability of child care programs, to maintain quality and affordability for all families, and to improve working conditions for Early Childhood Educators and child care workers. When changes are made to overall funding, program areas will be increased, or reduced, proportionally.

The System Review proposes a predictable "proportional" formula for core funding areas:

General Operating Grant 36%

Child Care Subsidy 55%

Special Needs Inclusion 9%

2. Redistribution of Licensed Child Care Spaces

The System Review Working Group completed a full review of the current child care system and studied issues related to demand, enrollment, demographics, school board plans, financial viability, efficiencies and facilities at a neighbourhood level.

In some neighbourhoods, there are spaces that are underutilized, while other neighbourhoods are under-served. By reducing spaces where they are underutilized, and creating some spaces in under-served areas, the child care redistribution will create a more equitable, efficient and stable child care system. Where spaces may be closed or moved, and there are currently some children using them, mitigation dollars will be

used, where possible, to allow those children to “age out” of those programs.

After reviewing service levels, utilizations, demographics and demand, the System Review proposes a redistribution of licensed spaces that:

- a. Improves equity of service by neighbourhood and language and provides care in locations that best meet families’ needs
- b. Ensures care is available in remote areas and cultural communities
- c. Reduces underutilized spaces (approximately 190 spaces or 4% of spaces)
- d. Promotes viability/stability of existing agencies and maintains equity of service between school boards
- e. Uses mitigation dollars to ensure a smooth transition and avoid service interruptions for children and families

Child Care Operators and School Boards are actively working with the City to redistribute and reduce underutilized spaces by 2015. A decision making tool for the selection of locations for child care spaces, was developed and has been endorsed by the System Review Stakeholders Group.

The allocation and ongoing operation of funded spaces will be managed through Funding Agreements with the Child Care Agencies

The proposed redistribution of spaces by neighbourhood and language is summarized in Appendix #1- Proposed Licensed Child Care Space Distribution.

3. Operating Grant Formula

Provincial wage subsidy allocation formulas have underfunded the youngest age groups of care which are most expensive to provide, while providing significant grants for care for older children, which is much less expensive to provide. This plan shifts more of the grant funding to the younger age groups, where the costs are highest. The proposed local formula recognizes the high cost of providing care for the younger age groups and focuses the funding on those age groups. It will allow agencies to operate these groups as they are required.

The system review proposes the following General Operating Grant formula which:

- shifts grants to younger age groups to better reflect costs of operating
- ensures that operators can offer the care that is required by the community
- controls the number of spaces approved and avoids funding “underutilized” spaces
- positions child care operators and programs to be able to remain viable as future funding reductions are implemented

1. A per space amount for approved spaces for 0-3.8 year olds:

\$6000 per Infant space per year (approximately 176 spaces will be funded)

\$4000 per Toddler space per year (approximately 475 spaces will be funded)

\$1520 per Preschool space per year (approximately 1044 spaces will be funded)

2. “Block funding” for spaces for children aged 4-12.

A maximum grant of \$7500 per year, per approved licensed site.

The City of Greater Sudbury will work with operators to determine spaces to be funded. Operators will not be permitted to operate spaces for 0 - 3.8 year olds that are not approved. Operators may operate child care programming for children aged 4 - 12 years old, based on community need.

The Grant formula and allocation will be reviewed on an annual basis to ensure it continues to meet community and agency needs.

4. Changes to Child Care Rates

While the Child Care System Review has worked to keep child care rates affordable for families, there are some areas where rates need to be raised to better reflect the true cost of providing care. Further, rates need planned increases that are small and predictable, in order to keep up with rising costs and maintain quality programming.

The System Review proposes the following changes to subsidized and full fee rates:

- a. Keep regular rates stable at their current level but build in small, predictable increases for cost of living.
- b. Support eligible shift working families who require flexible care for children aged 0-3.8, and evening care for children aged 0-10, by paying a negotiated community rate that reflects the higher cost of care.
- c. Operators receiving the flexible care and evening rates will be expected to implement higher flexible and evening rates for their full fee families over 4 years.

Because the overall budget for child care subsidy is fixed, and may be reduced as budgets are reduced, increasing costs over time will mean that less children can be served by the child care subsidy program, resulting in potential waitlists for service.

Details of current and proposed rates for child care subsidy are provided in Appendix #2- Proposed Subsidized Child Care Rates

5. Direct operation of Junior Citizens Day Care

The System Review studied the operation of Junior Citizens Day Care (JCDC), including the service delivered, costs and benefits of direct operation of the program by the City.

Direct operation has allowed Junior Citizens to be innovative and provide a unique type of care to meet families' needs that other operators have not been able to provide. However, the System Review identified several concerns related to the direct operation of Junior Citizens Day Care:

- a. The program costs significantly more to operate than other non-profit programs. In 2013, it cost \$94/child to provide a day of care at Junior Citizens Day Care, while the average rate paid to a community centre for a day of care was \$43/child.
- b. The operation of a child care program by the City of Greater Sudbury creates an inequitable situation in the child care system where one program uses a disproportionate amount of limited child care funding.
- c. The operation of one child care centre may be perceived to be a conflict of interest for the City in its role as the Local Service System Manager for Child Care (as defined by the Ministry of Education).
- d. The non-profit child care sector has the capacity to deliver a comparable service, if given appropriate support and resources.

The System Review proposes that the City transition out of directly operating child care at Junior Citizens Day Care by working to move these services to non-profit community operators who have identified capacity to deliver the unique services currently provided by JCDC.

Given Council direction, a detailed transition plan to transfer directly operated services to non-profit child care providers will be brought back to Council for approval before December 2015.

Planning for reduced funding

The changes to the Child Care System proposed by the System Review, allow for a projection of the impact to service when the identified budget reduction of \$3.6 million is implemented by the Ministry of Education.

A budget reduction as significant as this will have a large and direct impact on service. This table demonstrates the additional impact on service if Junior Citizens Day Care continues to be operated by the City.

Projected Service Impact of \$3.6 million Funding Reduction- with JCDC Options

	After 3.6 million reduction- With JCDC Services Remaining Direct Operated	After 3.6 million reduction- With JCDC Services Delivered by the community
	Status Quo	Recommended
Funding for Core Programs (General Operating Grant, Child Care Subsidy, Special Needs Inclusion)	\$10,816,500	\$12,119,383
Funding for Directly Operated Day Care (JCDC)	\$1,302,833	-----
Projected loss of licensed child care spaces (Estimated loss of 0-3.8 spaces)	605	418
Projected waitlist for Child Care Subsidy (from 2014-estimated based on historical spending)	729	519

Next Steps

With approval from Council, Children Services will work with stakeholders to:

1. Implement required changes and submit required reports to the Ministry of Education
2. Revise Child Care Funding Agreements starting January, 2015
3. Develop a detailed transition plan and bring it to Council for approval by December, 2015

Appendix #1- Proposed Licensed Child Care Distribution

Neighbourhood	# of children (2011 census)	Proposed # of English Spaces for Ages 0-3.8 years-starting 2015	Proposed # of French Spaces for Ages 0- 3.8 years-starting 2015	Spaces as a proportion of number of children in the neighbourhood	Proposed variance in number of spaces (compared to May 2014)
Downtown/ Bell Park	243	158	13	70%	(17)
Flour Mill/Donovan	695	73	62	19%	(24)
West End	306	170	0	56%	(4)
Downtown Area	1244	401	75	38%	(45)
New Sudbury	1021	128	71	19%	(32)
Minnow Lake	550	50	26	14%	26
Minnow Lake/New Sudbury Area	1571	178	97	18%	(6)
South End	718	162	104	37%	(20)
South End Area	718	162	104	37%	(20)
Copper Cliff	105	0	0	0%	0
Lively (incl Whitefish)	459	102	13	25%	(8)
Lively/Copper Cliff Area	564	102	13	20%	(8)
Garson	508	106	13	23%	24
Coniston	96	13	16	30%	(40)
Garson/ Coniston Area	604	119	29	25%	(16)
Azilda	186	0	66	35%	0
Chelmsford	503	32	34	13%	0
Levack	96	13	0	14%	(8)
Dowling	121	0	13	11%	0
Rayside/ Onaping Area	906	45	113	17%	(8)
Val Caron	353	72	53	35%	(4)
Hanmer	909	48	71	13%	(21)
Capreol	126	21	0	17%	(26)
Valley/ Capreol Area	1388	141	124	19%	(51)
	6995	1148	555	24%	(154)

The final number of spaces to be funded will be negotiated with child care operators.

Appendix #2- Proposed Subsidized Child Care Rates

Current Daily Rates for Subsidized Centre-Based Child Care

	4 hours and under	Over 4 to under 6 hours	6 to 9 hours	Over 9 to under 12 hours
Infant	\$21	\$37	\$51	\$55
Toddler	\$16	\$29	\$41	\$45
Preschool	\$14.50	\$26	\$37	\$39
4- 12 years	\$15.50	\$25	\$34.50	\$39

Proposed Daily Rates for Flexible Child Care (Shift Work, On Call etc.) - to be finalized

	4 hours and under	Over 4 to under 6 hours	6 to 9 hours	Over 9 to under 12 hours
Infant	\$25	\$44	\$61	\$66
Toddler	\$19	\$35	\$49	\$54
Preschool	\$17	\$31	\$44	\$47
4- 12 years	\$15.50	\$25	\$34.50	\$39

Proposed Daily Rates for Evening Child Care -to be finalized

	4 hours and under	Over 4 to under 6 hours	6 to 9 hours	Over 9 to under 12 hours
Infant	\$25	\$44	\$61	\$66
Toddler	\$19	\$35	\$49	\$54
Preschool	\$17	\$31	\$44	\$47
4- 12 years	\$19	\$30	\$41	\$44

Request for Decision

Health Impact Assessment Screening Tool

Presented To:	Community Services Committee
Presented:	Monday, Jun 16, 2014
Report Date	Tuesday, Jun 03, 2014
Type:	Managers' Reports

Recommendation

WHEREAS the City of Greater Sudbury adopted the Healthy Community Strategy in 2005;

AND WHEREAS the Corporate Strategic Plan 2012-2014 "Shaping our City's Future" identified a Healthy Community as a priority of the City of Greater Sudbury;

AND WHEREAS the incorporation of a Health Impact Assessment (HIA) screening tool into City decision making was identified as an action item within the Healthy Community Strategy;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the City of Greater Sudbury incorporate the HIA screening tool into the Agendas Online report writing system for reports going forward to Operations and/or Community Services Standing Committees in order to take into consideration the impacts that a program, initiative or policy may have on the health and sustainability of the community;

AND THAT this initiative be implemented by Fall 2014.

Signed By

Report Prepared By

Cindi Briscoe
Community Development Co-ordinator
Digitally Signed Jun 3, 14

Division Review

Real Carre
Director of Leisure Services
Digitally Signed Jun 3, 14

Recommended by the Department

Catherine Matheson
General Manager of Community Development
Digitally Signed Jun 3, 14

Recommended by the C.A.O.

Doug Nadorozny
Chief Administrative Officer
Digitally Signed Jun 4, 14

Background

In February 2013, Community Services Standing committee requested that staff research and develop a screening tool that would assist Council in recognizing the impacts that a program, initiative, or new policy could have on the health and sustainability of the community. Information provided through this tool would add value to the decision-making process resulting in the best possible outcome for the community. A Health Impact Assessment (HIA) (Appendix A) screening tool falls within the scope of the Healthy Community Strategy, which has been a priority of City Council since 2005. The four strategic priority areas within the Healthy Community Strategy are Human Health & Well-being, Economic Vitality, Environmental Sustainability, and Civic Engagement/Social Capital.

Health & Well-being

The World Health Organization has stated that many factors combined together affect the health of individuals and communities. Whether people are healthy or not, is determined mainly by their circumstances and environment. To a large extent, factors such as: where we live, the state of the environment, genetics, income, education level, and relationships with family and friends all have a considerable impact on an individual's health. The more commonly considered factors such as access to and use of health care services often have less impact.

The context of people's lives also determines one's health. Individuals are often unable to directly control many of the determinants of health. These determinants are things that make people healthy/unhealthy and include the following: income, social status, education, physical environment, social support networks, genetics, access to health services, and gender.

The City of Greater Sudbury Council has identified creating a healthy community as a priority. Many decisions made by Council can affect the determinants of health. A Health Impact Assessment Screening Tool will help guide Council by providing information to assist in the decision making process regarding programs, initiatives, and/or policies.

The Health Impact Assessment looks not only for negative impacts (to prevent or reduce), but also for impacts favourable to health. This provides Council with options to strengthen and extend the positive features of a program, initiative or policy with a view to improving the health of the community.

Values

A Health Impact Assessment Screening Tool is based on four values that link the HIA to the policy environment.

1. Democracy – allowing citizens to participate in the development and implementation of policies, programs or projects that may impact their lives through community engagement.
2. Equity – HIA assesses the distribution of impacts from a proposal on the community, with a particular reference on how the proposal will affect vulnerable people (in terms of age, gender, ethnic background, and socio-economic status).
3. Sustainable development – that both short and long term impacts are considered.
4. Corporate review - that all departments have an opportunity to comment on potential impacts that a program, initiative, or policy may have on the community.

Reasons to use a Health Impact Assessment:

1. to build a healthy and sustainable community,
2. to promote cross-sectoral strategies and policies,
3. to develop a participatory approach that values the views of the community.

Internal utilization of the HIA screening tool for a new program, initiative or policy can assist in detecting the impact on individuals and groups, and identify potential barriers and appropriate accommodations to address elimination. It will also identify strengths, areas for improvement and equitable solutions by encouraging interdepartmental conversations to take place prior to the report going forward to Operations and/or Community Services Standing Committees.

Review

A review was undertaken with the City of Toronto and City of Ottawa. The following information has been garnered from the above mentioned municipalities:

City of Toronto

The City of Toronto implemented a Health Impact Assessment (HIA) through the use of an 'Equity Lens' in 2006 based on a directive from Council. A working group was established to focus on the development of the lens as a tool to be used by staff to: identify, remove barriers, and reinforce best practices in planning, development, and evaluation of policies, services, and programs. The equity lens provided a stronger emphasis in identifying barriers and barrier removal and was used for new, developing and existing policies and programs.

Orientation and staff education were considered an essential component of its effectiveness as a tool.

A concern was raised that if the HIA screening tool was not implemented as a mandatory tool that all departments utilize, it would be very difficult to ensure consistent use.

The introduction of an 'Equity Impact Statement' based on the application of the equity lens provided a mechanism for including health impact considerations in the decision-making process of City Council. The application of the equity lens provided an assessment mechanism that led to the inclusion of an 'Equity Impact Statement' in the reports to Council and Committees. Once the screening was completed an Equity Impact Statement was included in the report that explained how the recommendations have taken into consideration any issues resulting from the application of the equity lens.

Examples:

1. This new policy/program addresses barriers faced by youth from diverse backgrounds and is intended to enhance/extend services to this target group. Service data will be collected to monitor the results.
2. This existing policy/program has been reviewed and proposed changes will remove identified barriers faced by low-income families from diverse backgrounds. The results will be reported in the annual reports to Council.

City of Ottawa

The City of Ottawa developed a Health Impact Assessment (HIA) screening tool called an 'Equity and Inclusion Lens'. Staff believe that the benefits from using the lens included: generating better solutions by incorporating a diversity of perspectives; taking positive steps to remove systemic barriers and promote

inclusion; creating a more positive and respectful work environment, and achieving greater resident satisfaction.

Staff felt that by using the equity and inclusion lens, report writers were better prepared to align programs, initiatives and policies within organizational goals and strategic plans. Staff training and awareness programs were seen as an integral part of the process. Once training was completed, there was an expectation from the Senior Management Team that staff would utilize the process when preparing reports. As well, evaluation of the lens to ensure that clear measurement and accountability was also taken into consideration.

The main objectives of the equity and inclusion lens were: to eliminate barriers within policies and programs; to contribute to the achievement of the City of Ottawa's business goals and customer service delivery; to establish a framework that requires all departments within the City to embrace the spirit of equality and diversity in the development of policies and programs that impact the delivery of city services, the use of city facilities, grants to external agencies, and other outwardly focused activities.

Next steps

An inter-departmental staff meeting was conducted in April 2013 to discuss the concept of developing a Health Impact Assessment Screening Tool. Discussion has since taken place regarding the most effective method of integrating this tool into the current system of report writing that will create a minimal amount of work for the user. Feedback was received regarding other assessments that were already being completed due to established regulations by various divisions within the City (i.e. environmental assessment – Roads, Planning, and Social Services).

After considerable review, it was determined that the best approach for inclusion and development of the Health Impact Assessment Screening Tool would be the implementation within the Agendas Online report writing system. Consideration would then be given regarding the impacts that a program, initiative or policy might have prior to finalizing the report and recommendations to Council. Staff who prepare reports for the Operations and Community Services Standing Committees will be assigned the task of reviewing the reports that affect their areas of expertise. A Health Impact Statement will be included in the report identifying how the HIA was considered.

Orientation and staff training on how to apply the HIA screening tool is an essential component of its effectiveness and success. Additional resource materials and dedicated experts on the utilization of the tool may be required.

Integrating the four strategic priority areas of the Healthy Community Strategy within the HIA screening tool allows all information to be assessed from a sustainable development perspective.

An interdepartmental meeting will be held to further discuss the implementation of the screening tool.

**City of Greater Sudbury
Health Impact Assessment Screening Tool**

Many factors affect the health of individuals and communities. Whether people are healthy or not, is determined by one's life circumstances and environment. To a large extent, factors such as: where we live, the state of the environment, genetics, income, education level, and relationships with friends and family all have considerable impacts on health; whereas the more commonly considered factors such as access to and use of health care services often have less of an impact.

The determinants of health include:

- The social and economic environment
- The physical environment, and
- The person's individual characteristics and behaviours.

These determinants align with the four pillars within the Healthy Community Strategy.

The purpose of a Health Impact Assessment is to provide City Council with a set of evidence based considerations about the proposed program, initiative or policy.

City Council has the option to accept, reject, or amend the proposed program, initiative or policy based on the information provided in the report.

The following statement would appear as part of the Agendas Online checklist:

"The Health Impact Assessment has been considered." Yes _____ No _____

Request for Decision

2014 Land Ambulance Grant Allocation Increase

Presented To: Community Services Committee

Presented: Monday, Jun 16, 2014

Report Date: Wednesday, Jun 04, 2014

Type: Managers' Reports

Recommendation

WHEREAS documented increases in the costs related to the provision of land ambulance services have resulted in a corresponding increase in the 50:50 funding allocation of the Land Ambulance Grant from the Ministry of Health & Long-Term Care;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the City of Greater Sudbury authorize Emergency Medical Services to increase staffing levels through additional part-time hours to the amount equal to the additional funding allocation of \$132,249.

Finance Implications

The Land Ambulance Services Grant is reviewed and adjusted on an annual basis by the Ministry of Health & Long-Term Care with changes taking effect April 1st. In April 2014, the Ministry announced an increase in the base funding for the Land Ambulance Services Grant of \$249,317 which represents a 2.66% increase. Since the 2014 Land Ambulance Service Grant increase was budgeted at \$117,068 or 1.25%, Emergency Services is recommending that the additional \$132,249 be used to fund approximately 3,080 additional part-time Primary Care Paramedic hours.

Signed By

Report Prepared By

Lynn Webster
Manager of Strategic & Business Services

Digitally Signed Jun 4, 14

Division Review

Aaron Archibald
Deputy Chief of EMS Operations

Digitally Signed Jun 4, 14

Recommended by the Department

Tim P. Beadman
Chief of Fire and Paramedic Services

Digitally Signed Jun 4, 14

Recommended by the C.A.O.

Doug Nadorozny
Chief Administrative Officer

Digitally Signed Jun 5, 14

Background

The Ministry of Health and Long-Term Care provides financial assistance to municipalities by providing a grant covering 50% of approved costs for the delivery of land ambulance services; the municipality is responsible to fund the remaining 50% of costs related to the delivery of land ambulance services.

Since the provincial announcement for the current year's Land Ambulance Grant funding allocation occurs after the approval of the Emergency Services operating budget, the budget increase for the grant allocation is an estimate only and has historically been set at 1.0%. This year's funding announcement from the

Ministry provided a 2.66% increase in base funding which resulted in additional funding of \$132,249.

Paramedic Services call volumes have increased by 38% over the past five years. In 2008, the service handled 24,300 emergency calls and by 2012 that number jumped to 31,800 calls. It is projected that requests for service will continue to increase by an additional 14% over the next eight years. As well, as Greater Sudbury Paramedic Services continues to grow and evolve as a leader of Pre-Hospital Paramedic Care, future challenges will arise due to aging population. In 2011, 60% of the patients treated and transported were over the age of 50 with the highest age cohort starting at age 70 and peaking at age 85. It is projected that the number of patients over the age of 65 that require Pre-Hospital Paramedic Care will increase by 33% over the next eight years.