MEDIA RELEASE: Friday, January 25, 2013, 4:30 p.m.

REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY OF WATERLOO
COMMUNITY SERVICES COMMITTEE
AGENDA

Tuesday, January 29, 2013
Approximately 12:30 p.m.
Regional Council Chamber
150 Frederick Street, Kitchener

1. DECLARATIONS OF PECUNIARY INTEREST UNDER THE MUNICIPAL CONFLICT OF INTEREST ACT

2. DELEGATIONS

CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS
Items on the Consent Agenda can be approved in one motion of Committee to save time. Prior to the motion being voted on, any member of Committee may request that one or more of the items be removed from the Consent Agenda and voted on separately.

3. REQUEST TO REMOVE ITEMS FROM CONSENT AGENDA

4. MOTION TO APPROVE ITEMS OR RECEIVE FOR INFORMATION

a) SS-13-004, Sunnyside Home Accreditation Results (Information) 1
b) PH-13-006, Quarterly Charged/Closed Food Premises Report (Information) 4
c) PH-13-005, Support, Promotion and Protection of Breastfeeding Public Health Standard Operating Procedure (Information) 6
d) CPC-13-001, Bill C-10 the Safe Streets and Communities Act (Information) 9
e) F-13-008, 2013 Social Services Budget Resolutions (Approval) 14

INFORMATION/CORRESPONDENCE

f) Memo: Renewal of Employment Ontario Contract 17
g) Memo: West Montrose Covered Bridge Public Information Centre 19
h) Memo: 2011 Census Bulletins 2 – 6 (Colour copies provided to Councillors only) 30
i) Memo: Joseph Schneider Haus Opens for the 2013 Season 52
5. Reports – Social Services
   a) SS-13-003, Sunnyside Wellness Centre *(Staff Presentation)*
   b) SS-13-005, Community Homelessness Prevention Initiative – Investment Plan
   c) SS-13-006, Community Homelessness Prevention Initiative – Business Case

REPORTS – Public Health
   d) PH-13-004, Region of Waterloo Public Health’s Radon Health Promotion Initiative

6. Other Business
   a) Council Enquiries and Requests for Information Tracking List

7. Next Meeting – February 26, 2013

8. Adjourn
TO: Chair Sean Strickland and Members of the Community Services Committee  
DATE: January 29, 2013  
FILE CODE: S06-80

SUBJECT: SUNNYSIDE HOME ACCREDITATION RESULTS

RECOMMENDATION:

For information

SUMMARY:

Sunnyside Home has received its accreditation decision from Accreditation Canada and has been “Accredited with Exemplary Standing.” The Executive Summary of the report is attached.

REPORT:

During November 18-21, 2012, Sunnyside Home was surveyed by Accreditation Canada. Staff is pleased to advise that the Home has been accredited with exemplary standing. The award is valid for three years. Accreditation is a voluntary process by which health service organizations can assess their performance against national standards of excellence. Results from the survey assist the Home in continuing to improve the quality and safety of its programs and services.

Sunnyside Home was surveyed under Accreditation Canada using a process for health care settings called “Qmentum”. The program was designed and implemented in 2008 with the following five goals: streamline the process; improve the validity and reliability of the measurement framework; help clients focus on quality improvement actions and results; encourage organizations to use the standards in their day to day work; and to focus the evaluation process on the delivery of services, quality, and safety. Eight dimensions are used to define quality including population focus, accessibility, safety, work life, client-centered services, continuity of services, effectiveness, and efficiency.

A process to increase surveillance is planned. The Summary of Suveryor Team Observations from the Accreditation report is attached as Appendix A. It is of note that Sunnyside Home met 444 of the 445 criteria applicable to long-term care. The one standard not met relates to a good practice where registered staff have taught families about infection control practices but not always charted that teaching in patients files.

The Home achieved compliance with all Required Organizational Practices, which relate to patient safety and risk management. Patient safety has been a strategic focus area for Sunnyside Home over the past several years. In addition, the Home has formally submitted a number of exemplary practices which will be considered for recognition by Accreditation Canada. To date, one of the submissions, “Quality Dining,” has been approved by the organization as a lead practice.

Many stakeholders were instrumental in supporting Sunnyside Home with the Accreditation process and continue to support the Home’s commitment to ongoing quality improvement. Chair Ken Seiling
and Councillors Millar and Mitchell, as well as Mike Murray and former Commissioner of Social Services, Michael Schuster, participated in the Accreditation process as members of the Governance Team. All staff, and numerous residents, families, volunteers, suppliers and community partners also were active participants.

Sunnyside Home is in the process of planning a celebration of its Accreditation award. Key stakeholders and those who participated in the survey preparation will be invited to join staff and residents at this informal event.

Copies of the full Accreditation Report are available upon request. The report is also available for public viewing in the front lobby of the home. The next Accreditation survey will take place in 2015.

CORPORATE STRATEGIC PLAN:

Participating in the Accreditation Program is consistent with the Region’s Corporate Strategic Plan Focus Area 5: Services Excellence and Strategic Objective 5.3 (to) ensure Regional programs and services are efficient and effective and demonstrate accountability to the Public.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

The Province provides a premium of $0.33 per resident per day to accredited homes. Accreditation funding of $31,678 is included in the 2013 operating budget revenues for Sunnyside Home.

OTHER DEPARTMENT CONSULTATIONS/CONCURRENCE:

The division recognizes the support of several Regional departments, including Human Resources, Corporate Resources, CAO’s Office and Finance, who contribute to the Home’s operations, quality improvement initiatives and accredited status.

ATTACHMENTS

Appendix A – Excerpt of Executive Summary, Accreditation Canada Accreditation Report, Sunnyside Home, 2012

PREPARED BY:  Gail Kauftman Carlin, Director, Seniors’ Services

APPROVED BY:  Douglas Bartholomew-Saunders, Commissioner, Social Services
1.6 Summary of Surveyor Team Observations

During the on-site survey, the surveyor team made the following observations about the organization’s overall strengths, opportunities for improvement, and challenges.

The organization, Sunnyside Home, is commended on preparing for and participating in the Qmentum survey process. Sunnyside Home Seniors’ Services is owned and operated by the Region of Waterloo. The regional council is the governing body and has recently established a seniors’ advisory committee to support the operations of the organization. The management team is of long standing, and is dedicated to the mission, vision and values of the organization, which are derived from the region of Waterloo and applied to its population of seniors, which it serves.

The long-term care (LTC) home is part of a continuum of services located on an integrated campus that accommodates supportive housing, a wellness centre for seniors, an adult day program, convalescent and respite care. The tag line of “...more than a home...a community” is demonstrated in the integrated resident programming. The community flu clinic, the children’s playground and the cafe are examples of bringing the community into the centre. There are strong links to academic institutions, the Local Health Integrated Network (LHIIN) and other service providers. There is a wealth of students in the organization, who are committed and contribute to programming, education and research. There is a strong Foundation and volunteer base whose contributions are noteworthy.

Resident and family members are committed to the organization and this is demonstrated in a dedicated family and resident council. The provincial family council association (FCA) is also represented by a member of the Sunnyside community.

There is a strong commitment to evidence-based practice and quality improvement. This is demonstrated via strong committees and clinical outcomes. In addition, there is a commitment to staff and enhancing work-life. There is a dedicated fitness facility, and a quality of worklife committee that is supported by both management and unions. A recent initiative to increase reception and scheduling hours has allowed clinical staff to focus on care issues. Several positions exist in the organization to support the clinical work of staff members.

There is a commitment to quality and innovation. Examples of this include the electronic health record, eMAR and the environmental building automation system.

During the on-site survey, residents, families and community partners were generous in their praise of the organization. One community partner stated: “It is easy to do your job” at Sunnyside. There continues to be a wait list for this home, both for potential residents and employees. This is a testimony to the excellence of the organization.

Accreditation Report
TO: Chair Sean Strickland and Members of the Community Services Committee
DATE: January 29, 2013 FILE CODE: P10-80
SUBJECT: QUARTERLY CHARGED/CLOSED FOOD PREMISES REPORT

RECOMMENDATION:
For information

SUMMARY:
This report is a summary of food premises enforcement activities conducted by Public Health Inspectors in the Health Protection and Investigation Division for the fourth quarter of 2012.

REPORT:
During the fourth quarter of 2012 five establishments were charged under the Health Protection and Promotion Act, Ontario Food Premises Regulation 562 (See Table 1: Food Safety Enforcement Activity).

Food premises charges and closures can be viewed on the Food Premises Inspection Reports website Enforcement Actions Page for a period up to 6 months from the date of the charge or closure. Every food premises charged has the right to a trial and every food premises ordered closed, under the Health Protection and Promotion Act, has the right to an appeal to the Health Services Appeal and Review Board.

CORPORATE STRATEGIC PLAN:
Health and Safe Communities: Support safe and caring communities that enhance all aspects of health.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS: NIL

OTHER DEPARTMENT CONSULTATIONS/CONCURRENCE: NIL

ATTACHMENTS
Table 1: Food Safety Enforcement Activity

PREPARED BY: Chris Komorowski, Manager, Food Safety, Recreational Water Programs and Cambridge & Area Team

APPROVED BY: Dr. Liana Nolan, Commissioner/Medical Officer of Health
### Table 1: Food Safety Enforcement Activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Establishment</th>
<th>Date of Charges or Closure</th>
<th>Charges or Closure</th>
<th>Total Charge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arches Deli – Delicious Café</td>
<td>One Provincial Offences Notice issued for an infraction observed on November 22, 2012</td>
<td>Store hazardous foods at internal temperature between 5 Celsius and 60 Celsius ($460)</td>
<td>$460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 – 115 Christopher Drive Cambridge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delicious Café</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115 Christopher Drive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Provincial Offences Notice issued</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for an infraction observed on November</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22, 2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Store hazardous foods at internal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>temperature between 5 Celsius and 60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celsius ($460)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symposium Café</td>
<td>One Provincial Offences Notice issued for an infraction observed on November 23, 2012</td>
<td>Store hazardous foods at internal temperature between 5 Celsius and 60 Celsius ($460)</td>
<td>$460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 – 4 King Street North Waterloo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterloo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Provincial Offences Notice issued</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for an infraction observed on November</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23, 2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Store hazardous foods at internal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>temperature between 5 Celsius and 60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celsius ($460)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glogowski Euro Food</td>
<td>One Provincial Offences Notice issued for an infraction observed on December 7, 2012</td>
<td>Fail to provide towels in food preparation area ($120)</td>
<td>$120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>403 Highland Road West</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchener</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Provincial Offences Notice issued</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for an infraction observed on December</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7, 2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fail to provide towels in food</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>preparation area ($120)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crystal Palace Chinese Restaurant</td>
<td>One Provincial Offences Notice issued for an infraction observed on December 10, 2012</td>
<td>Operate food premise mechanical equipment not maintained to provide sufficient</td>
<td>$120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 King Street South</td>
<td></td>
<td>chemical solution ($120)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterloo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Provincial Offences Notice issued</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for an infraction observed on December</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10, 2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operate food premise mechanical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>equipment not maintained to provide</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sufficient chemical solution ($120)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern India Restaurant</td>
<td>One Provincial Offences Notice issued for an infraction observed on December 10, 2012</td>
<td>Offer for sale hazardous foods at internal temperature between 5 Celsius and 60</td>
<td>$460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4355 King Street East</td>
<td></td>
<td>Celsius and 60 Celsius ($460)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchener</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Provincial Offences Notice issued</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for an infraction observed on December</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10, 2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offer for sale hazardous foods at</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>internal temperature between 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celsius and 60 Celsius ($460)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
REPORT:

On November 29, 2012, Region of Waterloo Public Health approved departmental SOP #2-40: “Support, Promotion and Protection of Breastfeeding.” The policy states that, “Region of Waterloo Public Health shall support, promote and protect breastfeeding for residents of Waterloo Region by implementing the Breastfeeding Committee for Canada’s BFI Integrated 10 Steps Practice Outcome Indicators for Hospitals and Community Health Services.”

Public Health staff, students and volunteers will be expected to apply the SOP in the delivery of all public health services. Staff and management responsibilities with respect to supporting, promoting and protecting breastfeeding are outlined in six procedures:

- Supportive Environment for Breastfeeding
- Compliance with the International Code of Marketing of Breast Milk Substitutes
- Staff Education

SUMMARY:

The Baby-Friendly Hospital Initiative is a global campaign of the World Health Organization and United Nations Children’s Fund to implement practices that protect, promote and support breastfeeding. In Canada, this initiative is known as the Baby-Friendly Initiative (BFI) and includes hospitals as well as community health services. The Public Health Accountability Agreement between the Ministry of Health and Long Term Care and Ontario Public Health Units sets out requirements for the board of health to achieve Baby-Friendly Community Health Service designation. ROWPH set out on the BFI journey (as the process is described by the Breastfeeding Committee for Canada) in November, 2011, with the intent to complete the process in 2014.

Public health staff have been working with new mothers to support breastfeeding on an ongoing basis. ROWPH’s Position Statement Regarding Infant Nutrition, 0 - 6 Months has been in place since 2004. It recognizes that breast milk is the normal and natural source of nutrition for infants, providing all the nutrients an infant requires for healthy growth and development. The first step in achieving BFI designation is to “Have a written breastfeeding policy that is routinely communicated to all health care providers and volunteers.” To this end, Region of Waterloo Public Health has approved departmental Standard Operating Procedure (SOP) #2-40: “Support, Promotion and Protection of Breastfeeding”. This report outlines the major components of the SOP and the role of Public Health staff in implementation.
Coordination and Tracking of Staff Training
Client Teaching of Infant Feeding
Collaborative Relationships to Support, Protect and Promote Breastfeeding

Specifically, Public Health management and staff will be expected to:

- Welcome mothers to breastfeed at any time while using public health services and provide a private space upon request. Breastfeeding rooms are currently located on the main floor at 150 Main St., Cambridge and on the second floor at 99 Regina St. S., Waterloo.
- Protect breastfeeding by not distributing, displaying or promoting formula or infant feeding products (like bottles).
- Attend required education sessions
- Provide pregnant women and their families with the information they need to help them make an informed decision on infant feeding
- Direct mothers to breastfeeding information and breastfeeding supports in Waterloo Region
- Support mothers to exclusively breastfeed for the first six months of their infants’ lives and to continue to breastfeed, with the introduction of iron-rich complementary foods, for up to 2 years and beyond
- Collaborate with community partners to support, promote and protect breastfeeding

Policy Communication and Implementation
An online education module is being developed for staff, students and volunteers. The online education module will introduce the BFI and orient staff to their role in supporting, promoting and protecting breastfeeding. It is expected current staff will complete the training in Q3-Q4 of 2013 and new staff will complete the online course as part of their new staff orientation. Refresher courses will be offered periodically.

A summary of the SOP will also be developed, and will be posted throughout all Public Health facilities. This is a requirement of BFI and, with further communications to community partners and the public, will serve to increase awareness of Region of Waterloo Public Health’s commitment to the support, promotion and protection of breastfeeding.

ONTARIO PUBLIC HEALTH STANDARDS:
This standard operating procedure contributes to meeting Board of Health requirements related to breastfeeding within the Family Health Standard of the Ontario Public Health Standards, particularly in relation to influencing the development and implementation of healthy policies and the creation or enhancement of supportive environments to address breastfeeding and increasing public awareness of breastfeeding.

ONTARIO PUBLIC HEALTH ORGANIZATIONAL STANDARDS:
Under the Health Protection and Promotion Act, Region of Waterloo Council serves as Waterloo Region’s Board of Health. Boards of health are expected to adhere to the Ontario Public Health Organizational Standards, which outline the expectations for the effective governance of boards of health and effective management of public health units. This report provides information related to the implementation and compliance with the Baby-Friendly Accreditation requirement of the Organizational Standards and targets of the current Accountability Agreement with the Ministry of Health & Long Term Care.

CORPORATE STRATEGIC PLAN:
Support, Promotion and Protection of Breastfeeding Standard Operating Procedure contributes to the Region’s strategic focus area #4 – Healthy and Inclusive Communities: Foster healthy,
safe, inclusive and caring communities.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

The Public Health Department’s work on implementation of a written breastfeeding policy has been completed within the approved base budget for Public Health; the budget is funded 75% by the province and 25% Regional Levy.

General staff training for current and future Public Health staff will be accomplished via an online training module for which a Request for Proposals (RFP) was conducted in late 2012. The successful bidder for the project was Stantec Consulting Ltd at a cost of $37,323.90. The project cost as well as all future and ongoing costs related to training will be covered within existing base budget resources for Public Health.

OTHER DEPARTMENT CONSULTATIONS/CONCURRENCE:

NIL

ATTACHMENTS

Region of Waterloo Public Health Standard Operating Procedure #2-40: Support, Promotion and Protection of Breastfeeding

PREPARED BY:  Mary Denomme, R.N., Public Health Nurse  
Sharmin Jaffer, Manager, Child and Family Health Promotion  
Jennifer Toews, Public Health Planner

APPROVED BY:  Dr. Liana Nolan, Commissioner/Medical Officer of Health
Policy Statement

Region of Waterloo Public Health (ROWPH) shall support, promote and protect breastfeeding for residents of Waterloo Region by implementing the Breastfeeding Committee for Canada’s (BCC) BFI Integrated 10 Steps Practice Outcome Indicators for Hospitals and Community Health Services.

Application

This Standard Operating Procedure (SOP) applies to all Public Health (PH) staff, students, and volunteers in the delivery of all public health services.
PROCEDURES

The procedures below outline ROWPH staff and management responsibilities with respect to the support, promotion and protection of breastfeeding through implementation of the BCC BFI Integrated 10 Steps Practice Outcome Indicators for Hospitals and Community Health Services.

### Supportive Environment for Breastfeeding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Action:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PH Management</td>
<td>Encourage staff to provide supportive environments for breastfeeding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All PH Staff, Students and Volunteers</td>
<td>Provide a welcoming and supportive culture for mothers to feed their children in all public areas of ROWPH facilities and where public health services are provided, for example, Influenza Clinics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Should a mother request a private space,</strong> direct mothers and families to the Infant Feeding Rooms (IFR)(^1). If the IFR is occupied or an IFR is not available, attempt to provide mothers with a comfortable chair in an available private space that is not a washroom, for example, an empty meeting room. Refer mothers experiencing breastfeeding difficulties or in need of breastfeeding support to community resources for direct breastfeeding care. Breastfeeding supports are listed in the document <a href="http://whqlibdoc.who.int/publications/9241541601.pdf">Breastfeeding Support in Waterloo Region</a>.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor, Program Administration, CFH</td>
<td>Conduct monthly maintenance check of IFR. Tracks use of IFR.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Compliance with International Code of Marketing of Breast Milk Substitutes and Subsequent Relevant World Health Assembly Resolutions

http://whqlibdoc.who.int/publications/9241541601.pdf

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Action:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All PH Staff, Students and Volunteers</td>
<td>Do not accept donations, promote/display or distribute breast milk substitutes, feeding bottles or teats, gift packs or other breast milk substitute promotional materials. Provide information/educational materials that are impartial and do not endorse company brand names. Ensure development and purchase of any resources and/or materials are in compliance with the Code.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PH Management</td>
<td>Ensure that ROWPH is free from the promotion of breast milk substitutes and related products and there is no distribution of these products by ROWPH employees, students or volunteers. Ensure that ROWPH is free of educational support materials sponsored by companies that market items covered under the Code.(^2) Ensure staff education is not sponsored or provided by companies whose products fall within the scope of the Code. Do not accept funds or grants from companies whose products fall within the scope of the Code. If products are necessary to carry out PH services, for example, an influenza vaccine produced by Abbott Laboratories, those products may be purchased, but not accepted as a gift or donation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) Infant Feeding Rooms are located at 99 Regina Street South, Waterloo, 2\(^{nd}\) Floor (key available from Public Health Clinic Reception) and 150 Main Street, Cambridge, 1\(^{st}\) Floor (key available from Citizen Services).

\(^2\) Companies include: Abbott Laboratories (Similac, Isomil), Nestle (Good Start Infant Formula), Mead Johnson (Enfamil, Enfalac)
### Staff Education
There are five levels of training as follows:
- **Level A**: General Staff Education on BFI and The Code
- **Level B**: Level A + Public Health Messages that are Integrated with Infant Feeding
- **Level C**: Level A + Emergency Medical Services (EMS)
- **Level D**: Level A + Modified 18-Hour Breastfeeding Course
- **Level E**: Level A + 18-Hour Breastfeeding Course

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All PH Staff, Students and Volunteers</td>
<td>Complete Level A BFI education and orientation accessible via iLink and complete any other applicable training levels as indicated below by division and position. Complete refresher education session prior to re-accreditation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PH Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Additional Training Requirements by Division and Position

#### Central Resources (CR) Division
- **Manager, Strategic & Quality Initiatives**
- **Nurse Specialist (NS) (Quality Practice)**
  - Complete Level B BFI education accessible via iLink. Complete refresher education session prior to re-accreditation.

#### Child and Family Health Division
- **Management**
- **Public Health Planners (PHPs)**
  - Complete Level B BFI education accessible via iLink. Complete refresher education session prior to re-accreditation.
- **Family Visitors (FV)**
  - Complete Level D BFI education. Complete refresher education session prior to re-accreditation.
- **Public Health Nurses (PHNs)**
- **Nutritionist (NS) (Child Health)**
  - Complete Level E BFI education. Complete refresher education session prior to re-accreditation.

#### Emergency Medical Services (EMS)
- **Supervisors**
- **Paramedics**
  - Complete Level C BFI education as part of mandatory training or new hire orientation. Complete refresher education sessions prior to re-accreditation.

#### Healthy Living (HL) Division
- **Management**
- **PHPs**
- **PHNs**
  - Complete Level B BFI education accessible via iLink. Complete refresher education session prior to re-accreditation.
- **PH Nutritionists**
- **Registered Dietitian**
  - Complete Level D BFI education. Complete refresher education session prior to re-accreditation.

#### Health Protection and Investigation (HPI) Division
- **Manager of Information & Planning**
- **PHPs**
  - Complete Level B BFI education accessible via iLink. Complete refresher education session prior to re-accreditation.

#### Infectious Disease, Dental & Sexual Health (IDDSH) Division
- **Management**
- **PHPs**
- **PHNs [excluding Reproductive Health (RH) PHNs]**
- **Registered Nurses (RNs)**
- **Dental Assistants**
- **Nurse Practitioners (NPs)**
- **Dental Hygienists**
  - Complete Level B BFI education accessible via iLink. Complete refresher education session prior to re-accreditation.
- **RH PHNs**
- **Nutritionist**
  - Complete Level E BFI education. Complete refresher education session prior to re-accreditation.
## Coordination and Tracking of Staff Training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Action:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manager, Child and Family Health Promotion</td>
<td>Ensure refresher education sessions are conducted prior to re-accreditation by notifying managers, NS (Child Health), EMS Service Instructors and Central Resources of need to initiate refresher sessions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers</td>
<td>Ensure that all new staff complete Level A BFI education and orientation and Level B education (if applicable) within 1 month of start date.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMS Service Instructors and Supervisor, Tracking</td>
<td>Coordinate Level C BFI education for applicable ROWPH staff. Document completion of Level C BFI education sessions and submit to Central Resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NS (Child Health)</td>
<td>Coordinate Level D and E BFI education for applicable ROWPH staff. Document completion of Level D and E BFI education sessions and submit to Central Resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinator, Support Services</td>
<td>Facilitate compliance with BFI training requirements by tracking completion of all levels of required training.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility:</td>
<td>Action:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All PH Staff, Students and Volunteers</td>
<td>Direct mothers to where to seek information regarding breastfeeding. Breastfeeding supports are listed in the document <a href="#">Breastfeeding Support in Waterloo Region</a>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Centre</td>
<td>Restrict teaching materials related to breast milk substitutes to staff only in consultation with relevant programs. Provide ROWPH-produced public resources related to breast milk substitutes, for example, formula feeding flipchart, to clients on an individual basis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PH Management</td>
<td>Ensure prenatal curriculum for classes to which ROWPH clients are referred (for example, Conestoga College, “Me? Breastfeed”) is compliant with BFI. Ensure training for programs ROWPH supports (for example, Breastfeeding Buddies, Peer Program) are compliant with BFI.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFH PHNs, RH PHNs, Nutritionists, Dietitian</td>
<td>Provide pregnant women and their families with information on breastfeeding which includes the benefits of breastfeeding, contraindications of breastfeeding and the risks of feeding infants breast milk substitutes. Document a mother’s intent to breastfeed in her client record, where applicable. Encourage mothers to discuss and plan with their health care provider to initiate skin-to-skin contact with their infants at birth or soon thereafter and to initiate breastfeeding within the first hour after birth. Encourage mothers to discuss and plan with their health care provider to remain together with their infants throughout their hospital stay. Encourage mothers to exclusively breastfeed for the first 6 months of their infants’ lives and to continue breastfeeding, with the introduction of iron-rich complementary foods, for up to 2 years and beyond. Encourage mothers to exclusively breastfeed for the first 6 months of their infants’ lives and to continue breastfeeding, with the introduction of iron-rich complementary foods, for up to 2 years and beyond. Provide teaching to mothers re: proper positioning and latch, sucking and swallowing, milk production and release, frequency of feeding, infant feeding cues, hand expression of breast milk, how to assess if the infant is getting enough milk, when to contact a health care professional. Do not provide group instruction in the use of breast milk substitutes. Provide information on breast milk substitutes on an individual basis to mothers and their families who have made an informed decision not to breastfeed. Address questions raised in a group setting related specifically to the use of breast milk substitutes one-to-one with families to ensure they have accurate and appropriate information. Encourage mothers to avoid use of artificial nipples and pacifiers until breastfeeding is established.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFH FVs</td>
<td>Encourage mothers to exclusively breastfeed for the first 6 months of their infants’ lives and to continue breastfeeding, with the introduction of iron-rich complementary foods, for up to 2 years and beyond. Encourage mothers to utilize available breastfeeding resources, including classes and written/on-line materials. Encourage mothers to avoid use of artificial nipples and pacifiers until breastfeeding is established.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Client Teaching of Infant Feeding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Action:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>When a mother has made an informed decision not to breastfeed:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFH PHNs RH PHNs Nutritionists Dietitian</td>
<td>Provide current, evidence-based information on the preparation, storage and feeding of breast milk substitutes. Assist the mother and/or caregiver in making a choice in which type of breast milk substitute to use by reviewing what is acceptable, feasible, affordable, sustainable and safe in their circumstance. Provide support and education to all parents and caregivers in learning cue based feeding (including signs of hunger and fullness), recognizing signs of effective feeding and understanding the importance of attachment and skin-to-skin contact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFH FVs</td>
<td>Provide current, evidence-based information on the preparation, storage and feeding of breast milk substitutes. Provide support and education to all parents and caregivers in learning cue based feeding (including signs of hunger and fullness), recognizing signs of effective feeding and understanding the importance of attachment and skin-to-skin contact.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Collaborative Relationships to Support, Protect and Promote Breastfeeding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Action:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CFH Managers RH Manager CFH PHNs RH PHNs</td>
<td>Ensure collaboration between ROWPH and community stakeholders to support, protect and promote breastfeeding. This includes but is not limited to: breastfeeding mothers, local breastfeeding support groups, local hospitals, local community health centres, local midwifery practices, lactation consultants, family physicians, Ontario Early Years Centres, local prenatal programs and classes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## SEE ALSO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>For</th>
<th>Refer to</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introduction to the BFI and detailed BFI requirements from the BCC</td>
<td>Breastfeeding Committee for Canada BFI Integrated Ten Steps Practice Outcome Indicators for Hospitals and Community Health Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROWPH position on infant feeding and rationale</td>
<td>ROWPH Position Statement Regarding Infant Feeding, 0-6 Months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive list of baby friendly key common messages to be used by ROWPH staff</td>
<td>ROWPH Baby Friendly Key Common Messages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rights of pregnant and breastfeeding women</td>
<td>Ontario Human Rights Code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region of Waterloo (ROW) policy on Breastfeeding Accommodation for employees returning to work</td>
<td>Region of Waterloo – Human Resources Policy Manual, Breastfeeding Accommodation, # I-27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROW policy on Acceptance of Gifts, Favours, Entertainment or Social Invitations</td>
<td>Region of Waterloo – Human Resources Policy Manual, Code of Ethics and Conflict of Interest, #I-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence-informed principles and recommendations around infant nutrition in the first six months from Health Canada, Canadian Paediatric Society, Dietitians of Canada &amp; and BCC</td>
<td>Nutrition for Healthy Term Infants: Recommendations from Birth to Six Months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria for selecting resources for the ROWPH Resource Centre</td>
<td>Region of Waterloo Public Health – Standard Operating Procedures Manual, Collection Development Policy, #2-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibilities of Public Health care providers and health care facilities policy under the WHO Code</td>
<td>Ontario Public Health Association Position Paper: The WHO Code and the Ethical Marketing of Breastmilk Substitutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensuring BFI compliance of developed or purchased resources</td>
<td>The BFI Compliance Tool</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TO: Chair Sean Strickland and Members of the Community Services Committee
DATE: January 29, 2013
FILE CODE: C06-60
SUBJECT: Bill C-10 the *Safe Streets and Communities Act*

**RECOMMENDATION:**
For information

**SUMMARY:**

The Canadian new crime legislation known as C-10, or the *Safe Streets and Communities Act*, received Royal Assent on March 13, 2012. One of the roles of the Waterloo Region Crime Prevention Council (WRCPC) is to communicate changes in law and policies to applicable stakeholders specifically with a view to the impact on the community safety and related prevention opportunities. With that goal in mind this report provides a brief summary of C-10 including:

- A legislation overview
- Actions taken by WRCPC to date
- Examples of potential impacts on communities as anticipated by crime prevention researchers, policy makers and practitioners

C-10 is a complex law that has received extensive comment and national, provincial and community attention. This report is a high level overview only of the main elements of discussions related to this legislation. Further reports focusing on other aspects can be provided upon request and will likely be forthcoming in the future as the implementation of C-10 proceeds and its impacts become clearer.

**REPORT:**

1.0 **Background**

On September 20, 2011 Justice Minister Rob Nicholson tabled Bill C-10, the *Safe Streets and Communities Act*, in the House of Commons. This Omnibus Bill combined nine separate bills that had failed to pass in previous sessions of Parliament. C-10 changes the Canadian Justice System substantially by including among other measures the provision of mandatory minimum sentences. The legislation is frequently described as “tough on crime”. On December 05, 2011 Bill C-10 received third reading and was approved in a vote of 157-127. The Standing Senate Committee on Legal and Constitutional Affairs heard testimony from 100 witnesses in early 2012 including government officials, agency representatives, academics and individuals. Those who supported and opposed the legislation were equally represented. C-10 became law in the Spring of 2012. With less than one year after implementation the ability to measure the impact
January 29, 2013
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of C-10 is severely limited. However, knowledge of the justice and correctional systems combined with crime prevention expertise highlight the need to anticipate and monitor the impact of C-10 on all orders of government including that of municipalities.

2.0 Elements of the Safe Streets and Communities Law

The law includes 9 distinct areas of legislation that were passed as an Omnibus Bill. These are:

- The Protecting Children from Sexual Predators
- The Increasing Penalties for Organized Drug Crime
- Protecting the Public from Violent Young Offenders
- The Ending House Arrest for Property and Other Serious Crimes by Serious and Violent Offenders
- The Increasing Offender Accountability
- The Eliminating Pardons for Serious Crimes
- The International Transfer of Canadian Offenders Back to Canada
- The Supporting Victims of Terrorism Act
- Protecting Vulnerable Foreign Nationals against Trafficking, Abuse and Exploitation Act

The contents of each legislative piece are complex. Some comprise minor while others amount to significant changes to Canadian Justice. An exploration of these details is beyond the scope of this report.

3.0 Waterloo Region Crime Prevention Council’s Actions regarding C-10

A discussion about Bill C-10 was the main agenda item of the October 14, 2011 regular meeting of the Crime Prevention Council with a view to prevention opportunities. The summary of this dialogue formed the substance of a CPC approved position paper that was shared in a letter with members of the Senate after the opportunities for deputations to the standing committee had closed. A number of Senators expressed their appreciation for the input and responded to the position. A copy of the letter is attached.

The Crime Prevention Council also used its “Smart on Crime” website to communicate different aspects of the legislation between October 2011 and March 2012, responded to community questions, and participated in several media initiated discussions about the legislation. Overall C-10 received broad and significant attention locally, provincially and nationally and Waterloo Region Crime Prevention Council along with other crime prevention offices in other municipalities provided the community and crime prevention perspective during these times of intense discussions.

4.0 Potential Impact of C-10

The impact of C-10 has been a key area of discussion among crime prevention practitioners and criminologists as well as persons working within the justice, enforcement and correctional system. Social and health service experts especially with a view to mental health and addictions frequently join(ed) the discussions and provid(ed) their perspectives. Since the legislation has been in effect less than 12 months actual impact measures are only starting to be available. From being charged with a crime to sentencing, waiting lists can be as long as 18 months or more and the impact on correctional facilities and social and community support
programs needs yet to be asses. The following areas are briefly outlined with a view to the impact on local governments and communities as they emerge in these discussions.

Limited funds may increasingly be directed at enforcement and corrections

C-10 will result in more people being sentenced to jail due to mandatory minimums or sent to jail longer because of increased maximum sentences. Increased police presence in courtrooms and additional court costs will likely be some of the expenses incurred by provincial and municipal governments. In addition, provinces may have to build new or expand existing correctional facilities which in turn may limit their capacities to fund other programs.

Community & Social Services may be challenged to meet the demands of larger number of prisoners released into the community or returning to the community.

With many provincial governments tackling high deficits, the financial pressure of taking on large parts of the costs of C-10 inevitably will result in cuts to other areas. These may include healthcare, education and social services. These types of cuts will decrease social development efforts for crime prevention because many social, education and health programs tend to have positive impacts on community safety even if they are not designed for that purpose. Local agencies’ capacities to manage increased demands with decreased funding will create gaps and waiting lists that affect all residents.

Persons returning from correctional facilities in the future will likely do so with significant challenges that will require the attention of local services. The challenges will include among others the need for supportive housing, social benefits and start up funding, health related costs, employment support needs and addictions and mental health services.

Before the implementation of C-10 court delays had already become a significant concern across Canada. Many individuals awaiting trial are placed in prison on ‘remand’ awaiting their trial. The number of individuals in remand has increased significantly since 2000. In the year 2000 the average daily count of individuals in provincial custody was 10,842 of which 7,392 were in remand. By 2009 the number of individuals in custody had declined to 9,836 but remand counts nearly doubled to 13,600. The new legislation will likely exacerbate that trend.

Increased remand populations means individuals, presumed innocent, face some of the worst prison conditions in Canada. Remand conditions are well documented and have been publically noted even by prison guards. Remand prisoners face crowded cells, little programming and virtually no opportunity for rehabilitation. Pre-trial detention is specifically of significant concern for individuals facing mental health and addiction issues. These individuals often have few supports to begin with and being incarcerated can lead to further deterioration in their mental health and addiction status. Many of these inmates return to the community with more risks than they had when they entered the system including communicable diseases which are prevalent in overcrowded jails.

Locally, Grand Valley Institution for Women (GVI) is anticipated to see significant increases in population

Since women comprise the fastest growing population in Canada's federal prisons it can be expected that an even greater numbers of women will be incarcerated under the new legislation. The Grand Valley Institution in Kitchener is a multi-level security prison for women. Already experiencing overcrowding and accommodating over double the number of women it was
designed for, inmates are double-bunking and at times have to sleep in interview rooms and visiting areas. The number of women completing jail terms in this location and potentially being released into the local community is a concern on many levels.

An expansion of the facility is already in progress. But resources for structured programming have not expanded along with this building capacity. Increases in prison population thus will likely impact the rehabilitation and reintegration efforts and potentially successes. The ability of the community to support women upon their release is already severely stretched and future resource availabilities are uncertain. Finally many of the women incarcerated at GVI and other facilities for women across the country are mothers. The conditions for multi generational criminality are well documented in research and harder to reduce without strategic investments in programs. Many of these programs have traditionally come from the community including mandated supports such as Family and Children Services which are experiencing reduction in funding themselves.

**Ability to respond with diversion programs/restorative justice could become diminished**

Under the new legislation judges' discretion is limited and the option to divert or to engage in restorative justice measures will be decreased even though these approaches have been shown to be effective, efficient and displaying an awareness of the broader community needs.

**The availability of funding crime prevention through federal and provincial sources may decrease dramatically over time significantly with the resources required to react to crime in the way the legislation demands.**

**Summary**

Incarceration is an expensive approach to dealing with persons who do not pose a threat to the community. The cost of housing someone in a federal prison is on average $357 per day and it costs $171 per day to incarcerate someone in a provincial facility. This is considerably higher than the approximately $80 a day it costs to keep someone in the community. It is certainly higher than costs for evidence based prevention programs. Anticipating these higher costs across Canada is also in part based on the experience in the United States where similar policies led to significant deficits and even bankruptcy situations in several states and local governments.

While criminal law is the mandate of federal government and the application of many aspects of the law are provided by the provinces person who are in conflict with the law come from within communities across Canada and will return to their communities upon release. They are also family members and parents and the impact of their incarceration is often acutely felt beyond themselves by their children and others in their inner circle if in fact they have these types of connections. Prior to incarceration tend to be part of that small but resources intense group of residents that consume several services during their life time. The need for these supports tends to increase after incarceration and many of these costs are the responsibility of local governments. The conditions that lead to persons coming in conflict with the law are often preventable through evidence based early intervention programs that comprise an effective and efficient course of action which is supported by many municipalities across the country.

The national municipal network members will continue to try as best as possible to monitor the changes brought about by C-10 in crime prevention overall as well as in the municipalities in
which they are engaged. The availability of data and cross order of government collaboration is critical for this task to be a success.

For further information please refer to:
http://www.preventingcrime.ca/documents/BillC-10_positionpaper.pdf

CORPORATE STRATEGIC PLAN:

Healthy and Inclusive Communities: Enhance community safety and crime prevention

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

None

OTHER DEPARTMENT CONSULTATIONS/CONCURRENCE:

None

PREPARED BY: Juanita Metzger, Community Engagement Coordinator, WRCPC

APPROVED BY: Christiane Sadeler, Executive Director, WRCPC
December 22, 2011

Dear Honourable Members of the Senate,

Waterloo Region Crime Prevention Council (WRCPC) reviewed C-10 with an eye to prevention and impact on communities. We would like to share with you elements of this review for your consideration as you deliberate about the merits and challenges of this proposed legislation. We believe it is important that the experiences of community practitioners be included in your assessments. By way of summary we recommend:

- That the Omnibus Bill C-10 be disaggregated and reviewed bill by bill because of the vastly divergent nature of the proposed legislation.

- That all mandatory minimum sentences be evaluated in light of evidence and expenses. Given the current economic times and the potential for costs to be downloaded, directly or indirectly, to already financially stretched provincial and local governments, a common sense approach to any allocation of limited resources is needed.

- That the Government of Canada be asked to balance any investment in corrections and enforcement with strategic investments in prevention, and that specifically the Government of Canada implement a National Crime Reduction Board with the mandate to advance social development efforts that have a proven track record in preventing and reducing crime, victimization and fear of crime. The role of this Crime Reduction Board would be to augment changes in legislation, enforcement and corrections with prevention.

What brings us here?

The Waterloo Region Crime Prevention Council (WRCPC) has worked in partnership with many community organizations, all orders of government, grassroots groups and individuals to prevent crime, victimization and fear of crime since its inception in 1993. Efforts to enhance public safety and security are highly valued by us. Our mandate is to support and engage in activities of social and community development that can positively impact the roots of crime.

In this role the Council closely monitors the impact of legislation and policies at all orders of government on the safety and security of people living, working and growing up in our community. To accomplish this complex task we pay close attention to research, conduct independent and community-based research, and combine this knowledge with the wisdom and experiences of multiple disciplines in the design of evidence-based prevention and intervention strategies.

The review of C-10 conducted by the WRCPC at its regular meetings in October and November 2011 must be seen in this light.
The Waterloo Region Crime Prevention Council like other municipally-based crime prevention entities, of which there are many coast to coast, facilitates local problem solving; supports grassroots efforts; engages in research; develops policies/positions; and advocates for actions that can stop crime before it happens. We believe this proactive approach is aligned with the mandate of “peace, order and good government”.

The reactions to C-10, including those presented to the Standing Committee on Justice, have been nothing short of overwhelming. Based on a review of these reactions and a vibrant community dialogue within our community we respectfully pose to you the following questions about C-10:

**Does C-10 lead us away from good common sense?**

By failing to look at crime as an issue that is broader than the crime itself, C-10 narrows the spectrum of thinking and action to mostly moral considerations which are inevitably volatile to subjective judgments. The Canadian public is intelligent! Canadian laws should match our collective ability to understand the complexities of problems. And crime is a complex problem. Taxpayers should not be asked to pay for a strategy that defies good common sense. C-10 is based on little, if any, evidence with regards to tangible benefits, least of all benefits for victims of crime that deserve our compassion and commitment to change.

Nobody knows this better than our neighbors to the South. The United States has more than 30 years of experience pursuing a similar strategy that increased incarceration rates 600% over this period (with an equivalent increase in cost). By now 25% percent of the world’s prison population is housed in the United States.

Will Canada be on a course to match or beat that record with no substantial benefit to communities?

The U.S. has the highest documented rate of incarceration in the Western world, and yet 60% of Americans feel less safe in their own neighborhoods than they did a year ago. Canadians on the other hand report feeling safer than they did one year ago. The imbalance between intent and outcome in the US situation comes at a staggering cost of $68 billion every year, not including the loss in productivity. And yet for all the money spent, there has been no reduction in crime that can be attributed to the higher rates in incarceration.

Nor is the recidivism rate lower. In fact, mandatory minimum sentences reduce prisoners’ incentives for good behaviour, including participation in counseling for substance abuse, domestic violence issues, etc. -- and this in turn increases our overall vulnerabilities to crime upon their release. The Bureau of U.S. Justice Statistics states that half of the prisoners released in any one year in the US are expected to be back in prison within three years.

Additionally, three-quarters of new admissions to state prisons are for non-violent crimes, with the single greatest cause of prison population growth in the U.S. attributable to people incarcerated for non-violent drug offenses. WRPCPC submitted its concerns about mandatory minimum sentences for drug offences as proposed in C-15 to the Senate in July 2009 (see attached).

Many Americans are urging Canadians not to repeat their mistakes, including Republican governors and state legislators in such states as Texas, South Carolina, and Ohio which are now repealing mandatory
minimum sentences, increasing community supervision, and funding drug treatment because it is seen as a better mechanism for improving public safety and reducing taxpayers’ costs.

If passed, C-10 will take Canadian justice policies in a direction that defies good common sense not only based on research but also based on experiences in the US and elsewhere.

Legislation has to be examined on its merits not sentiments.

Regrettably, C-10 puts us on a course of more crime, less justice, less safety, less protection for the victims, and less protection for society overall at a greater cost than we currently have or are likely to be able to afford in the future.

**Does C-10 signal the end of the Canadian Government’s commitment to crime prevention through social development?**

C-10, once enacted, will lead to higher incarceration of disadvantaged populations such as people growing up and living in poverty, those with addiction and mental health issues, and Aboriginal peoples. These populations are at higher risk of being affected by multiple root causes of crime and are already overrepresented in the current justice system. C-10 tips the balance between retribution/restitution and prevention such that this situation is likely to worsen.

As far back as in 1993 the federal government appointed a commission to investigate how to deal with the rising costs of crime. The recommendation of the commission chaired by Dr. Bob Horner (MP) was that “all levels of government are responsible for crime and they must work together to prevent its occurrence”. Since that time many municipalities have worked tirelessly across the country to augment the efforts of federal and provincial governments with crime prevention through social development. They have often done so on severely limited resources and yet show significant positive outcomes.

Increases in incarceration will lead to increases in spending and those inevitably will impact the federal and provincial governments’ capacities to advance new and support existing prevention strategies. Prevention may well be left to local communities and municipalities who are already struggling to meet multiple quality of life issues.

**Does C-10 diminish the community involvement in prevention that is needed to keep Canada safe?**

The Government of Canada is attempting to solve a problem that is already on the decline and this decline is in no small part due to the efforts of many individuals, groups and local communities across the country. Canada has seen a largely consistent decline in the rates of crime. Police-reported crime rates, which measure the overall volume of crime, also continued to decline in 2010 reaching the lowest level since 1973.

With falling crime rates across the country C-10 makes a promise to develop greater safety in streets and communities by relying on the law alone. Inevitably this promise will be broken, likely leading to a call for even tougher measures in the future. Community engagement is critical to ensure that crime prevention remains the responsibility of all Canadians: parents, teachers, community leaders and many others. It is smart to continue to find ways to increase that engagement beyond the formal system of
justice. The law is too blunt an instrument to deal with the complexity of public safety and security home by home, street by street, and community by community.

All citizens need to be engaged in all facets of the prevention and justice continuum. It has taken Canadians well over two decades to see such increases in community engagement for crime prevention. It was challenging to get beyond the passivity of leaving it to the government of the day. C-10 is going “back to the future” and stands to undo the work of many who meaningfully engage in keeping their communities safe.

Similar laws are dismissed in other countries as expensive, ineffective and overly reliant on government because they ignored the capacities for pro-social measures and viable alternative approaches such as restorative justice. Measures that address the roots of crime are not only cost effective but they provide the significant savings in human suffering. Police services across the country have long recognized this potential and engage with it. Communities cannot accomplish their task by means of charity. A strategic investment at all orders of government is needed.

**Does C-10 decrease the potential for meaningful re-engagement of those who have broken the law to a point of no return?**

It costs anywhere from $70,000 to over $130,000 annually to house one person in a correctional facility. Many of these inmates have a history of low educational and employment achievements, learning disabilities, Fetal Alcohol Spectrum Disorder issues, significant mental health and addiction challenges or other mitigating factors that may have contributed to their actions. These conditions do not excuse their actions but it helps us to understand them with a view to prevention. While in the past these considerations were part of the application of the law for the purpose of rehabilitation (a key correctional mandate), providing only for aggravating circumstances in mandatory minimum sentences decontextualizes crime. This approach will without doubt create a sizable group of prisoners with little to no chance of succeeding in society upon their release.

Mandatory minimum sentences make the offender, his or her context, personality, upbringing, intellect, morality or addiction irrelevant. They fail to take into account ongoing treatment needs for addictions or mental health issues or developmental delays. Minimum sentences also adversely affect the family the perpetrator leaves behind, particularly if there are children in continued need of support. This increases the risks for children whose parents are incarcerated, extends the cycle of victimization and extends the root conditions which lead to crime to the next generation.

Simply stated, the human and financial costs of pro-social measures will always be substantially lower than costs of increased incarceration. Downloading a vast share of these costs to provincial governments, that are already financially stressed, will significantly hinder our collective ability to fund and advance rehabilitation efforts.

**Can any elements of C-10 be supported by crime prevention practitioners?**

Of course! Who wouldn’t support a greater voice for victims? Who wouldn’t agree that internet sexual exploitation of children must be stopped? Who doesn’t want to send the message that one crime is one crime too many?
WRCPC wishes for and works for safer streets and communities and we do so alongside many other municipalities.

But we are deeply troubled by the wholesale nature of the proposed legislation whereby Canadians need to accept the bad with the good. The government has a mandate to invest in the prevention of crime and to bring justice. C-10 as an omnibus bill simply cannot accomplish that.

We therefore ask that the Senate of Canada do due diligence and engage in sober second thought and review C-10 bill by bill, step by step as the only reasonable review to deal with the complexity of the legislation at hand. We also ask that prevention be taken seriously during this review. Prevention has worked, continues to work and stands a better chance of delivering safe streets and communities than C-10 in its current form can.

We would be pleased to hear from you. Please don’t hesitate to contact our Executive Director, Christiane Sadeler at 519-883-2305 or csadeler@regionofwaterloo.ca.

Yours Sincerely,

John Shewchuk
Chair, Waterloo Region Crime Prevention Council

cpcchair@region.waterloo.on.ca

cc: Christiane Sadeler, Executive Director, csadeler@regionofwaterloo.ca
REGION OF WATERLOO
FINANCE DEPARTMENT
Financial Services Division

TO: Chair S. Strickland and Members of the Community Services Committee

DATE: January 29, 2013 FILE CODE: F11-30

SUBJECT: 2013 SOCIAL SERVICES BUDGET RESOLUTIONS

RECOMMENDATION:

THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve the 2013 Social Service Grants as set out in Schedule A of F-13-008 dated January 29, 2013;

AND THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve a Private Homemakers Rate of $13.20 per hour effective January 1, 2013.

SUMMARY: Nil

REPORT:

Regional Council adopted the 2013 Operating Budget on January 16, 2013. There are a number of resolutions regarding Social Services Programs that require Council approval in order for the programs to forward grants or change rates for services provided in 2013. Due to the potential changes to programs that were under consideration as part of the 2013 budget process, these resolutions were not included in the final budget day agenda, as has been the case in prior years.

In past years, changes to the rate for funerals, food hampers and dental rates have been included in the Social Services resolutions paper. Due to the changes in the Ontario Works Discretionary Benefits program in 2013, staff is not recommending changes in hamper and funeral rates at this time pending discussion with providers. The Province has not indicated a change in dental rates. If required, a report with recommendations will be forwarded to Council for consideration at a later date.

Finally, in the Homemakers and Nurses program, there are a small number of clients who for various reasons require the use of private homemakers for service. These private contractors are paid on an hourly basis and the recommended 2013 rate reflects a 1.5% increase over the 2012 rate.

CORPORATE STRATEGIC PLAN:

Focus Area 4 of the Region’s Corporate Strategic Plan is to work collaboratively to reduce poverty.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

The 2013 Operating Budget approved by Regional Council includes sufficient funding for these programs. All grants are funded entirely by the Region of Waterloo. The Homemaker’s program is cost shared 80/20 with the Province of Ontario.
OTHER DEPARTMENT CONSULTATIONS/CONCURRENCE:

Social Services were consulted in the preparation of this report.

ATTACHMENTS

Schedule A – 2013 Social Services Grants

PREPARED BY:  L. Parent, Manager of Financial Services

APPROVED BY:  C. Dyer, Chief Financial Officer
Schedule A - 2013 Social Services Grants

**Counselling Collaborative Grants:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lutherwood</td>
<td>$44,153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shalom Counselling Services Inc.</td>
<td>20,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Counselling Centre of Cambridge and North Dumfries</td>
<td>58,742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interfaith Community Counselling Centre</td>
<td>14,381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchener-Waterloo Counselling Services Inc.</td>
<td>193,680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mosaic Counselling and Family Services</td>
<td>131,897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woolwich Counselling Centre</td>
<td>13,829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$476,982</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Peer Counselling Service Grants:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge Self Help Food Bank Inc.</td>
<td>$4,827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-W Working Centre for the Unemployed</td>
<td>15,156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$19,983</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Community Outreach Grants:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge Family Early Years Centre</td>
<td>$43,070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge Self Help Food Bank Inc.</td>
<td>82,418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mosaic Counselling and Family Services</td>
<td>126,030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Counselling Centre of Cambridge &amp; North Dumfries</td>
<td>54,483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenway Chaplin Community Centre</td>
<td>49,081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House of Friendship of Kitchener</td>
<td>137,144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchener-Waterloo Counselling Services Inc.</td>
<td>186,462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchener-Waterloo Multi-Cultural Centre Inc.</td>
<td>36,198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinbridge Community Association</td>
<td>87,289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langs Farm Village Association</td>
<td>43,645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our Place Family Resource and Early Years Centre</td>
<td>38,972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preston Heights Community Group</td>
<td>43,645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilmot Family Resource Centre Inc.</td>
<td>38,142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivational Learning Groups</td>
<td>20,674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchener Waterloo YWCA</td>
<td>33,763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,021,016</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Homelessness to Housing Stability Strategy:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>House of Friendship of Kitchener</td>
<td>$55,161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YWCA of Kitchener-Waterloo</td>
<td>55,161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge Shelter Corporation</td>
<td>91,556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lutherwood</td>
<td>95,815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-W Working Centre for the Unemployed</td>
<td>60,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchener Downtown Community Health Centre</td>
<td>20,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reaching Our Outdoor Friends (ROOF)</td>
<td>39,192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mennonite Central Committee of Ontario</td>
<td>60,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive Housing of Waterloo (SHOW)</td>
<td>101,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argus Residence for Young People</td>
<td>55,161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEP Home Collaborative</td>
<td>8,120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$643,766</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MEMORANDUM

To: Chair Sean Strickland and Members of the Community Services Committee

From: Graeme Fisken, Manager, Employment Services
       David Dirks, Director, Employment and Income Support

Copies: Douglas Bartholomew-Saunders, Commissioner, Social Services

File Code: S08-30

Subject: RENEWAL OF EMPLOYMENT ONTARIO CONTRACT

BACKGROUND

Since August 1, 2010 the Region through Employment and Income Support, Social Services has provided Employment Ontario services to the citizens of Kitchener, Waterloo and Cambridge through its offices at 235 King Street East, Kitchener, 99 Regina Street, Waterloo, and 150 Main Street, Cambridge. These services include the delivery of all five components of Employment Ontario:

- Service planning and coordination
- Resource and information
- Job Search
- Job placement
- Job training and retention services

The Region has been contracted by the Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities to obtain employment or suitable training for a total of 339 participants and provide employment resource services, including information and short term workshops, to 935 participants over the length of the contract (April 1, 2013 to March 31, 2014). Funding for 2013 has been approved with the 2013 Budget.

SERVICE TARGETS

These services continue to enhance the range of supports the Region can offer to Ontario Works (OW) participants and those seeking employment in the Region of Waterloo. Staff works in collaboration with Provincial staff and the other Employment Ontario service providers. The focus for Employment and Income Support in the coming contract year remains the more vulnerable citizen and those who struggle to find employment, as the majority of referrals come through the Ontario Works program. This presents challenges in achieving our service targets, as Ontario Works participants given circumstance are further away from job readiness than others utilizing Employment Ontario services. It can require greater time and resources to
assist an Ontario Works participant to employment. Not surprisingly, staff is more successful in moving many participants into training and educational programming that will ultimately benefit their job search and employment. The Region enjoys a high rating for “customer satisfaction” in its delivery of service.

Delivery of Employment Services will assist the Region in responding to the needs of its citizens in two Focus Areas. Focus Area Four: Healthy and Inclusive Communities; Strategic Objective 4.1 (to) work collaboratively to reduce poverty; Focus Area Five: Service Excellence; Strategic Objective 5.2 (to) improve satisfaction with Regional programs and services.

For further information please contact Graeme Fisken, Manager, Employment Services at 519-883-2101 ext 5665 or gfisken@regionofwaterloo.ca or David Dirks, Director, Employment and Income Support at 519-883-2179 or ddirks@regionofwaterloo.ca.
To: Chair Sean Strickland and Members of the Community Services Committee
From: Tom Reitz, Manager/Curator, Waterloo Region Museum
Subject: West Montrose Covered Bridge Public Information Centre
File No: R03/50-WESTM

A Public Information Centre (PIC) for the West Montrose Covered Bridge has been scheduled for Tuesday February 12, 2013 at the Woolwich Township Council Chambers, 24 Church Street West, Elmira from 5:30 to 7:30 P.M. The PIC handout materials have been attached to this memo.

The West Montrose Cover Bridge PIC is a forum to present information and gather community input on the various options and cost implications of limiting access, increasing load restrictions, improving fire protection and ongoing maintenance for the bridge.

As noted in the January 8, 2013 memo to Regional Council, the bridge is now open again to pedestrian and horse and buggy traffic. Regional staff is currently working toward opening the bridge to vehicle traffic, while reinforcing the posted load limit for the bridge and examining other potential load-regulating approaches.
Regional Municipality of Waterloo

West Montrose Covered Bridge Management Project

Township of Woolwich

INFORMATION PACKAGE

Public Information Centre

Tuesday, February 12, 2013
Drop-in from 5:30 p.m. to 7:30 p.m.
Presentation at 6:30 p.m.

At

Woolwich Township - Council Chambers
24 Church Street West, Elmira

There is a comment sheet at the back of this package. If you wish, please fill it out and deposit it in the designated box provided at this Information Centre.
1. **What is the Purpose of this Public Information Centre?**

The Region of Waterloo, in collaboration with the Township of Woolwich and local residents, is committed to maintaining the West Montrose Covered Bridge as a viable open bridge with the appropriate limitations to ensure that the heritage integrity of the structure is conserved.

This evening’s Public Information Centre (PIC) is a forum for you to provide input on the West Montrose Covered Bridge Management Project.

This is an opportunity for you to:

- Review the proposed bridge improvement work under consideration for the West Montrose Covered Bridge, including:
  - Limiting access through speed, height and load restrictions and enforcement
  - Fire protection
  - Bridge maintenance
- Provide input and comments; and
- Ask questions of Regional staff.

There is a Comment Sheet attached to this Information Package which we ask that you fill out in order to help us to finalize a recommendation for approval by Regional Council. Completed Comment Sheets can be placed in the box at the Information Centre or sent to the address indicated on the Comment Sheet. Your comments and input will be used, along with all other information obtained, to assist in determining how to proceed with this project.

2. **Why is this Project being undertaken at this time?**

On September 14, 2012 Regional staff were notified that there was a cracked timber visible on the underside of the West Montrose Covered Bridge. This was immediately investigated and as a precautionary measure the bridge was closed to all vehicular traffic.

Working with project engineering consultants IBI Group (IBI), the timber was replaced. The bridge was closed to pedestrians during the actual repair, as required by the Ministry of Labour. Following replacement of the damaged timber, the bridge reopened to pedestrian traffic on Monday November 19, 2012 and to horse and buggy traffic on Friday December 7, 2012. Temporary signage and barriers that are only negotiable by horse and buggy have been used to restrict traffic on the bridge.

IBI is in the process of finalizing an analysis of the bridge, including the cause of the timber failure and inspections for any additional structural issues. Their preliminary analysis has not identified any additional structural issues but it has been recommended that the bridge may be reopened to vehicular traffic so long as the existing 3 tonnes load limit is enforced.

The Region is in the process of reopening the bridge with additional signage that better explains the bridge’s load limitation. Through this Project, the Region is now seeking input on both the proposed options under consideration to limit access to over weight vehicles (vehicles with seating for more than 8 passengers, tractors, vehicles towing loads, delivery vehicles, motorhomes, etc.) to the bridge, and the proposed maintenance work that is being considered for the bridge.
3. Who is Directing this Project?

Region of Waterloo staff, in consultation with Township of Woolwich staff, representatives of the West Montrose Resident’s Association and volunteers from the Old Order Mennonite community, are overseeing this project. IBI Consulting Engineers (IBI) has been retained as consulting engineers for the project.

4. What Improvements are being Proposed for the West Montrose Covered Bridge?

The bridge is NOT in a state of disrepair or neglect.

A group of staff and community stakeholders met in January to discuss and shortlist potential improvements to the bridge. Based on the information shared at this meeting, the Region is considering undertaking the following bridge improvement work:

- Limiting Access through Speed, Height and Load Restrictions and Enforcement
- Fire Protection
- Bridge Maintenance

The following questions and responses contain detailed information on each item.

5. Did the Region consider improving the structure and increasing the load limit or adding physical barriers to limit access to the bridge?

**Strengthening the Structure** - The Region may consider strengthening the bridge structure with additional beams or steel plates in the future. Consideration of such upgrades would need to be balanced against the costs and benefits of the upgrades, the conservation of the historical integrity of the bridge, and the terms of the heritage designation.

**Physical Barriers** – Introducing physical barriers to limit access was considered. With the exception of a potential height limiter (see next question), physical barriers such as access gates or lane limitations could have negative impacts on the heritage attributes and aesthetics of the structure. This issue is further discussed below.

6. What Options are being Considered to Limit Access?

The West Montrose Covered Bridge can be used by slow moving, low weight vehicles. Use of the bridge by other vehicles poses a risk to the structural integrity of the bridge and access for these vehicles should be limited.

**Speed Limit**

The current posted traffic speed in the village of West Montrose is 50 km/hour. The Region is considering a posted traffic speed to cross the bridge of 10 km/hour.

**Weight Limit**

The bridge is currently posted with a 3 tonnes weight limit (approximately 6600 lbs.). Many vehicles will exceed this limit, but drivers might not realize that. For example, a half-ton pick up truck with a load of firewood, an unloaded three-quarter ton pick up truck, almost any vehicle with a trailer, farm equipment, delivery and recreational vehicles will all exceed 3 tonnes. Multiple cars or motorcycles on the bridge at one time could also exceed 3 tonnes.
More informative signage and other means of educating the community about the load limit may reduce the number of times over-weight vehicles cross the bridge.

Financial penalties and various means of enforcement including surveillance cameras have been suggested by the community; the Region is exploring what options are available, including imposing fines for vehicles that cross the bridge and exceed the posted load limit.

**Height Limit**

The current height limitation on the bridge is 3.6 m (11 feet 9 inches). As larger vehicles may also be heavier, the Region is considering the installation of a physical height limiter that would further restrict access to the bridge by lowering this height limit.

A summary chart of the proposed options for limiting access to the bridge is attached in Appendix B.

7. **Will Fire Protection be Put In Place?**

One of the primary risks to covered bridges is loss due to fire. The West Montrose Resident’s Association has shared reports on fire suppression and detection systems, and fire resistant coatings that may be appropriate in this application. The Region will explore these and other options as part of this project.

8. **What Maintenance is proposed?**

The Region proposes that the following maintenance work be undertaken.

**Roof** - The bridge roof was re-shingled in 1987. Recent inspections of the bridge indicate no visible shingle loss or shingle damage and the roof appears to have several more years of life before it needs replacement. Although small points of light are visible through the roof, for the most part these are not a concern in open structures such as a bridge, barns, etc. Some larger openings along the ridge of the roof are a result of damage to or missing sections of the ridge cap. These openings do not pose a major maintenance issue at this time, however the ridge cap does need to be repaired or replaced. The Region is seeking quotes on repair/replacement of the ridge cap.

**Lighting** - As part of this project, new interior lighting more consistent with the heritage character of the West Montrose Covered bridge is being considered.

**Painting** - The exterior of the bridge was painted by the Region in 2004 and it is not currently in need of repainting.

**Landscaping** - The Region has identified that trees at the north (village) end of the bridge in the road allotment are causing damage to the bridge, largely due to moisture retention on the roof which promotes the growth of moss, and reduce visibility for bridge users. The Township of Woolwich will be meeting with property owners immediately adjacent to the north side of the bridge, and then will be trimming and/or removing these trees.

**Other** - The bridge is inspected by the Region every two years as required under the Ontario Structure Inspection Manual (OSIM). A Preventative Maintenance plan will be developed by the Region’s Facilities Engineering and Facilities Maintenance divisions.
9. **What are the Requirements of the Heritage Designation as part of this Project?**

The West Montrose Covered Bridge, built in 1881 by John and Benjamin Bear, is the last remaining covered bridge in Ontario. In 2007, Township of Woolwich By-Law Number 60-2007 designated the West Montrose Covered Bridge to be of cultural heritage value or interest pursuant to the provisions of section 29 of the *Ontario Heritage Act*, R.S.O. 1990, Chapter O.18, as amended.

Attributes identified in the By-Law which should be retained include:

- the original location of the bridge in the Village of West Montrose spanning the Grand River
- the original dimensions of the bridge, 208 feet in length and 17 feet wide
- the original truss configuration, a hybrid Queen Post-Howe timber configuration
- the central pier
- the wood exterior sheathing and interior paneling, punctuated by louvered window openings
- the shingle gable roof
- the system of illumination by decorative electric interior lamps
- views to and into the bridge from the north and south banks of the Grand River.

The Region of Waterloo must apply to the Township of Woolwich for approval to changes to the bridge that will impact these attributes. Approval is not required for minor maintenance and repair work including pothole patching, deck washing, bridge joint maintenance and graffiti removal; or emergency repairs.

10. **When will the Bridge Improvements Occur?**

More informative signage and repairs to the ridge cap are anticipated to be completed before May 1, 2013 – in advance of the spring/summer tourist season.

Changes to interior lighting, fire protection/suppression systems and options for limiting access are being investigated; there is no date set for implementation of these changes.

11. **Will the Bridge Have to Be Closed During the Improvements?**

Any substantial construction will require that for safety reasons the bridge be closed to both pedestrian and vehicle traffic. The Region will provide advance notice of when any closures will take place.

12. **How Will This Project be Funded?**

An amount of $862,000 has been provided in the Region’s 10 Year Capital program (2013 to 2022) for improvements to the West Montrose Covered Bridge. The Region has applied for $643,500 through the Province of Ontario’s Municipality Infrastructure Investment Initiative Fund; if successful, the grant funding will permit the Region to accelerate the asset management program of the bridge as elements reach the end of their life cycles.

13. **How Can I Make my Opinions Known Regarding the Design Presented at the Public Information Centre?**

A comment sheet is attached to this Information Package which you are encouraged to fill out with your comments, concerns, questions or preference. This written record will help the Region to make decisions on the ongoing management of the bridge. Comments may be left
at the Public Information Centre or they may be mailed or faxed as outlined on the comment sheet.

14. **What Are the Next Steps in Finalizing a Decision for this Project?**

The Region will be reviewing all public comments received before recommending future improvements to the bridge for consideration by Regional Council in March 2013. Any member of the public who signs the Information Centre registration sheet or submits a comment sheet will be advised of all future Regional Committee and Council meetings and opportunities to provide further comment.

**FURTHER INFORMATION**

We thank you for your involvement and, should you have any questions or concerns, please contact:

Tom Reitz  
Waterloo Region Museum  
10 Huron Road  
Kitchener, ON N2P 2R7  
t. 519-748-1914  
f. 519-748-0009  
e. TReitz@regionofwaterloo.ca
Please complete and hand in this sheet so that your opinions can be considered in the ongoing management of the West Montrose Covered Bridge. If you cannot complete your comments today, please take this home and mail, e-mail or fax your comments by February 20, 2013 to:

Tom Reitz
Waterloo Region Museum
10 Huron Road, Kitchener, ON N2P 2R7
t. 519-748-1914  f. 519-748-0009
e. TReitz@regionofwaterloo.ca

Please indicate which of the proposed options for limiting access to the West Montrose Covered Bridge you prefer?

☐ Additional Signage  ☐ Surveillance Cameras  ☐ Fines (weight)  ☐ Height Limiter

What are your reasons for the above preference?

____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________

Do you have any comments on the proposed maintenance work?

____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________

Other Comments? (please use back of sheet if required)

____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________

Name:

Address: ________________________________  Postal Code: ____________

COLLECTION NOTICE
Personal information requested on this form is collected under the authority of the Municipal Act and will be used to assist Regional staff and the Regional Planning and Works Committee in making a decision on this project. All names and comments will be included in material made available to the general public. Questions regarding this collection should be forwarded to the staff member indicated above.

Thank you for your input.
## Evaluation of West Montrose Covered Bridge Proposed Options for Limiting Access

### Criteria

1. **What is the expected result of implementing the option in terms of limiting access?**
   - Excess weight vehicles crossing the bridge will be identified and vehicle owners would be fined. Some excess weight vehicles may not be identifiable.
   - Officers would stop excess weight vehicles from crossing the bridge. Bridge would only be monitored when the officer is in place.

2. **What steps would need to be taken to implement the option?**
   - Additional temporary signage is being developed.
   - Once the effectiveness of these signs has been evaluated, the improved signage will be made permanent.
   - Cameras would be installed with weigh-in-motion scale (Regular calibration would be required). An officer would have to view each recording or photo where a violation has been suspected, form reasonable grounds and attend the vehicle owner’s residence and serve the owner with a Provincial Offence Notice.
   - A By-law would need to be adopted that requires drivers to stop when so signaled, truthfully identify themselves, and participate in weighing activities.
   - Height limiters are currently in use on other heritage bridges within the Region and on many covered bridges. Alternative options for limiting height would be evaluated based on their effectiveness and impacts to the structure. The preferred height limiter would then be installed.

3. **How would this option impact the heritage features and/or aesthetics of the bridge?**
   - Signage which better explains the load limitations of the bridge located at the bridge would have a moderate impact. Additional signage at intersections approaching the bridge would have minimal impact.
   - Cameras and associated signage could be located in such a way that they have a moderate impact.
   - Additional signage for fines would have a moderate impact.
   - A height limiter attached to the bridge would be designed to limit visual impact and any damage that could result from a collision. A stand alone height limiter would have a minimal impact on the bridge, but could impact views of the bridge in the landscape.

4. **Are there legal or jurisdictional limitations to implementing the option?**
   - All signage must conform to existing traffic standards.
   - Under section 11 of the **Municipal Act** the Region has the authority to pass a “By-law regulating traffic on the bridges” which would enable the Region to enforce a load limit. A fine of $200-$300 per offence has been suggested (in line with the fine for driving an overweight vehicle on a logging road).
   - All physical barriers must conform to existing traffic standards.
The proposed by-law would need to create an offence of a vehicle owner (versus a driver) being guilty when their vehicle of excess weight goes over the bridge.

Video recordings or photographs would be regulated by the *Municipal Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act* and the Region’s retention By-laws.

The load limit could be enforced by Waterloo Regional Police; Ministry of Transportation Enforcement Officers; or a Region of Waterloo Licensing and Enforcement Officer, located at the bridge during times of predicted excess weight use (tourism, harvest).

5. **What are the cost considerations of each option (capital and operating)?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signage</th>
<th>Signage</th>
<th>Signage</th>
<th>Signage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Signage</td>
<td>Cameras</td>
<td>Portable scale</td>
<td>Height Barrier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weigh-in motion system</td>
<td>Staffing costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffing costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MEMORANDUM

To: Chair Sean Strickland and Members of the Community Services Committee

From: Rehan Waheed, Planner

Subject: 2011 CENSUS BULLETINS 2-6

As described in Report No. P-12-056, dated May 8, 2012, Planning, Housing and Community Services publishes a series of bulletins presenting information for Waterloo Region from the 2011 Census of Canada. The first Census Bulletin, published in 2012, was released, and dealt with population and dwelling counts.

Statistics Canada has completed the release of data collected through the 2011 Census of Population and the Census of Agriculture. The following bulletins are now available, and are attached:

- Census Bulletin 2, Agriculture
- Census Bulletin 3, Age and Sex
- Census Bulletin 4, Families and Marriage
- Census Bulletin 5, Households and Dwellings Characteristics
- Census Bulletin 6, Language

These will also be available in print through Planning, Housing, and Community Services, and electronically on the Region’s website at: www.regionofwaterloo.ca/en/doingbusiness/census.asp

Data collected through the National Household Survey (NHS) is expected to be released between May and August 2013. Based on this data, the remaining bulletins in the 2011 Census series will be completed in 2013, covering topics such as mobility and migration, employment, education and income.
The following bullets provide highlights of the 2011 Census data for Waterloo Region:

- The Census population for Waterloo Region on May 10, 2011 was 507,096, an increase of 28,975 people since 2006, or just less than 6,000 people per year. This places it as the 7th largest region in Ontario and 13th in Canada.

- The 5-year growth rate of 6 per cent was a smaller increase than from 2001 to 2006, but exceeded the provincial (5.7 per cent) and national (5.9 per cent) growth rates.

- In 2011 there were 1,398 farms with headquarters in Waterloo Region, slightly fewer (4 per cent) than five years earlier.

- Waterloo Region’s population remains relatively young, with a median age of 37.7 years, below both the provincial and national medians of 40.4 and 40.6 years respectively. While the population of Waterloo Region is comparatively young, it reflects an aging population, showing an increase of 1.3 years in median age from 36.4 in 2006.

- Census families increased by 6.3 per cent over 2006, with two person families increasing at the greatest rate to make up nearly half of families in the Region in 2011. While married couples represent the largest family structure in 2011, the number of single individuals increased over twice as fast as married couples between 2006 and 2011.

- There were 191,595 households in Waterloo Region in 2011, with one-person and two-person households continuing to be the fastest growing household size. The average number of people living in a private household (known as the persons per unit, or ppu) decreased from 2.64 in 2006 to 2.61 in 2011.

- While single-detached dwellings made up the largest dwelling type in 2011, the form of dwellings being constructed continued to evolve, with the largest percentage increases in row houses (13.3 per cent) and semi-detached dwellings (8.1 per cent) from 2006.

- English was the prevalent mother tongue spoken in 2011, spoken by over three quarters of the Region’s population. However, there were 112,495 people whose mother tongue was a non-official language, an increase of 5 per cent. The most commonly spoken mother tongues were English, German, Portuguese, Chinese, Spanish, French, Romanian, Polish, and Serbian. As of 2011, almost one in every eight residents in Waterloo Region spoke neither English nor French at home; however, 98.4 per cent had knowledge of at least one official language.
FAST FACTS
- The term Census in this document refers to the Census of Agriculture conducted by Statistics Canada every five years. The most recent Census of Agriculture was conducted in May of 2011, in conjunction with the Census of Population.
- The "headquarters rule" assigns all data collected for an agricultural operation to the geographic area where the farm headquarters is located, regardless of the actual location of the parcels of land being farmed. As a result, the data could include land located outside Waterloo Region. Conversely, land farmed in Waterloo Region may be reported with a farm headquarters outside the Region.
- To ensure confidentiality, data for the City of Waterloo has been included together with data from the City of Kitchener.
- Farm business characteristics are collected for the calendar year prior to the Census, in this case, 2010.

For more information on Census statistics please refer to Statistics Canada’s website: http://www.statcan.gc.ca

Agriculture
Statistics from the 2011 Census of Agriculture for Waterloo Region

Farm Operations
In 2011, there were slightly fewer farms and less farmland based in Waterloo Region. Despite the decline, agricultural land is still the dominant land use across the Region, accounting for 65 per cent of all land as counted by Statistics Canada in the most recent Census. A total of 1,396 farms were headquartered in Waterloo Region in 2011, a net decline of 46 farms, or four per cent, compared to 2006. As expected, the largest percentage decrease in the number of farms occurred in the urban areas of Cambridge, Kitchener and Waterloo which lost a total of 29 farm operations as shown in Table 1. North Dumfries was the only municipality to gain farms over this time period. The decrease measured in Waterloo Region (four per cent) was noticeably lower than the national (10 per cent) and provincial (nine per cent) declines over the same time period. Fewer farms may be the result of farm consolidation or land conversion.

Table 1: Total number of farms reported for Waterloo Region, 2001-2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Total Number of Farms</th>
<th>% Change 2006-2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterloo Region</td>
<td>1,444</td>
<td>1,444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchener-Waterloo</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dumfries</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellesley</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilmot</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woolwich</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>228,373</td>
<td>205,730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ontario</td>
<td>57,211</td>
<td>57,950</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Statistics Canada, Census of Agriculture 2001-2011

The total land area of farms headquartered in Waterloo Region decreased by about 5,000 net acres (2.3 per cent), to a total of 221,087 acres for 2011. The biggest losses were measured in the urban municipalities (cities) which decreased by 62 per cent from 2006. Despite the number of farms decreasing in the Region’s townships, there was an increase in the total agricultural land area in these areas in 2011 as illustrated in Figure 1.
Agricultural Land Use

Croplands were the predominant land use type for all agricultural lands in the Region. As shown in Figure 3, three quarters of agricultural land in 2011 was being used to grow field crops, hay, fruits, field vegetable, and sod or nursery crops. This was down slightly from 2006, where 78.2 per cent of lands were croplands. The largest increase in land use types was in ‘other lands’ which include Christmas trees, woodlands and wetlands, up 20 per cent since 2006.

Figure 3: Agricultural land use type, Waterloo Region, 2011

Of the total farm area by all land tenures in the Region, 68 per cent was owned by operators in Waterloo Region. This figure remained relatively unchanged from values in 2006. The remaining land was leased, rented, crop shared or used through other arrangements.

Crops and livestock

In 2011, 70 per cent of all farms were considered livestock farms. The most common type of livestock farms were cattle (beef and dairy) farms, accounting for 37 per cent of all farms in the Region. Similar to trends identified in 2006, sheep and goat farms increased, while hog and pig farms decreased significantly in 2011. Overall, the number of livestock farms has decreased since 2006 while the number of crop farms has increased. Nonetheless, livestock farms remain the principal farm type in Waterloo Region as shown in Table 2.
A total of 418 crop-orientated farms were counted in the Region this Census year. As a percentage of all farms, crop-producing farms increased by four per cent from 2006 to 2011. The majority of these farms were classified as oilseed and grain (canola, soybean, corn, wheat etc.) establishments. These, along with vegetable and fruit farms, all saw notable increases as a percentage of the total farms compared to 2006.

Table 2: Farm types in Waterloo Region, 2006-2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Farm Type</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>Change 2006-2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. of farms</td>
<td>No. of farms</td>
<td>% of total farms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livestock Farms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cattle ranching and farming</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>508</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hog and pig farming</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poultry and egg production</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheep and goat farming</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other animal production</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crop Farms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oilseed and grain farming</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vegetable and melon farming</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fruit and tree nut farming</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenhouse, nursery and floriculture production</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other crop farming</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Statistics Canada, Census of Agriculture 2006 and 2011

The number of farms reporting the sale of certified organic products rose from 35 farms in 2006 to 40 farms in 2011. An additional 44 farms reported that they sold uncertified products, while seven more farms were actively adopting practices that comply with organic standards (transitional organic).

Farm business

Total gross farm receipts rose again, to a high of $473 million for 2010. Figure 4 illustrates that the gross farm receipts and total expenses each rose about 19 per cent from 2005 to 2010, with most municipalities measuring growth in their gross farm receipts. Net income was up about 18 per cent across the Region over the same time period, a smaller increase than was seen previously in the 2006 Census. With just over 70 per cent of all farms headquartered in the Region, the townships of Woolwich and Wellesley combined for two-thirds of all gross farm receipts, and just over 70 per cent of the Region’s net income as shown in Table 3. Waterloo Region as a whole accounted for four per cent of Ontario’s total gross farm receipts.

Table 3: Farm receipts, expenses and income for Waterloo Region, 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Gross Farm Receipts ($ millions)</th>
<th>Total Expenses ($ millions)</th>
<th>Net Income ($ millions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Waterloo Region</td>
<td>472.9</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>82.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchener-Waterloo</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dumfries</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>59.5</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellesley</td>
<td>128.9</td>
<td>108.8</td>
<td>20.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilmot</td>
<td>119.5</td>
<td>94.3</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woolwich</td>
<td>149.5</td>
<td>112.0</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Statistics Canada, Census of Agriculture 2011

Figure 4: Farm receipts, expenses and income for Waterloo Region, 2006-2011

Data from 2010 shows that there are more farms across Waterloo Region reporting higher gross farm receipts compared to 2005. The total number of farms with gross farm receipts totaling $500,000 or more increased by 34 per cent over this time frame. Conversely, all farms reporting less than $100,000 in gross receipts decreased by 8 per cent from 2005 to 2010. Overall, just less than half of all farms in Waterloo Region reported receipts valued between $100,000 and $500,000 as exhibited in Figure 5. Seventy farms (five per cent) registered receipts over one million dollars, 14 more farms than in 2005.

**Figure 5: Total farms classified by total gross farm receipts for Waterloo Region, 2010**

Source: Statistics Canada, Census of Agriculture 2011

Note: farm business characteristics are collected for the calendar year prior to the Census, in this case, 2010.

---

**Farm operator** – any person responsible for the management decisions made for an agricultural operation. This is a count of distinct operators; operators of two or more separate farms were included only once in the total.

**Transitional organic** – used by certifying agencies to indicate fields in transition to becoming certified organic.

**Total farm area for all land tenures** – the total farm headquarter area in Waterloo Region owned, leased from governments, rented, leased or crop shared from others or used through other arrangements. Total farm area is the difference between ‘total area for all land tenures’ minus ‘total area used by others’.

**Farm type** – Farm types for the 2006 Census of Agriculture were derived using NAICS 2002 whereas farm-type data for the 2011 Census of Agriculture were derived using NAICS 2007. Both classifications are almost the same for the Canadian agriculture industry, making the data from the two reference years directly comparable in most cases.

**Gross farm receipts** – includes income from agricultural product sales, program payments and rebates, dividends and income from custom work. It does not include the sale of capital farms or sales of forest products.

**Total expenses** – Any cost associated with producing crops or livestock, except the purchase of land, buildings or equipment. Includes the cost of seed, feed, fuel, fertilizers, etc. Does not include depreciation or capital cost allowance.

**Net income** – gross farm receipts minus total expenses.

Source: Statistics Canada Census Dictionary, Census of Agriculture 2011

---

For further information please contact:

Planning, Housing and Community Services
Planning Information and Research
www.regionofwaterloo.ca
planninginfo@regionofwaterloo.ca

519-575-4047
TTY: 519-575-4608
**FAST FACTS**

- The term Census in this document refers to the Census of Population conducted by Statistics Canada. The most recent Census was conducted on May 10, 2011. The Census is designed to provide information about people and housing units in Canada.

- All Canadians are required to complete a Census form. Age and sex data are based on this 100 per cent sample of the population.

- The Census population of Waterloo Region on May 10th, 2011 was 507,096 as described in Census Bulletin #1, Population and Dwellings. This represents growth of almost 30,000 people over the five-year period since the 2006 Census.

For more information on Census statistics please refer to Statistics Canada's website: www.statscan.gc.ca/census

---

**Age and Sex**

**Statistics from the 2011 Census for Waterloo Region**

**Median Age**

Waterloo Region’s population remains relatively young, with a median age of 37.7 years. This is well below both the provincial and national medians of 40.4 and 40.6 years respectively, and is the second lowest median age in the Greater Golden Horseshoe, as illustrated in Figure 1. While the population of Waterloo Region is comparatively young, it does reflect an aging population, showing an increase of 1.3 years in median age from 36.4 in 2006.

**Figure 1: Median Ages for the Greater Golden Horseshoe, 2011**

Source: Statistics Canada, Census 2011 by Census Divisions

There is variation in the median age across the Region; the highest median age (42.1) is in North Dumfries while Wellesley’s is almost ten years younger, as shown in Table 1. There is a notable difference of 2.1 years in the median age between males and females in Waterloo Region as historically women have tended to outlive men.
Table 1: Median Ages for Waterloo Region, 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Median Age</th>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td>37.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchener</td>
<td>37.2</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>36.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterloo</td>
<td>37.6</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dumfries</td>
<td>42.1</td>
<td>42.3</td>
<td>41.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellesley</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilmot</td>
<td>40.4</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td>40.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woelwich</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>39.7</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The demographic group known as the baby boom generation, born between 1946 and 1965, continue to influence the age profile of the Region’s population. People in the age group between 45 and 49 years, born at the peak of the boom, represent the largest five-year age cohort in Waterloo Region in 2011, accounting for 8 per cent of the total population, as shown in Table 2. Similarly, the largest percentage change between 2006 and 2011 occurred in the population 60 to 64 years of age. The high growth rate (31 per cent) in this age category and some of the growth in the 65 to 69 years of age group represents the influence of the front wave of the baby boom. Increases are also evident in the number of 15 to 30 year olds, representing the children of the boom generation. While the population in most age groups has increased, those aged 35 to 45 have decreased over the previous five year period, as have the children in the 10 to 14 year age group, to a lesser extent.

While the population of the Region of Waterloo is generally aging, the Region maintains a positive ratio between the Region’s youth population and its senior population. In contrast to surrounding municipalities in Ontario, there are 1.5 youth for every senior in Waterloo Region. Figure 3 shows how broad age groups are changing over time.

Source: Statistics Canada, Census 2011 by Census Subdivisions

Population by Age and Sex

Figure 2 illustrates the change in the Region’s age and sex distribution over the past ten years. Aging doesn’t completely explain these changes; migration also contributes to the changing size of the age groups.

The overall distribution of the sexes remains nearly even across the Region, with 49.3 per cent males compared to 50.7 per cent females. Because females have tended to live longer, the senior years show a progressively wider spread between the number of males and females. Of the seventy centenarians in Waterloo Region in 2011, 70 per cent were female.

Figure 2: Population Pyramid for Waterloo Region, 2001-2011

Source: Statistics Canada, Census 2001, 2011 by Census Division

www.regionofwaterloo.ca • planninginfo@regionofwaterloo.ca • 519-575-4047
Table 2: Population by Age Group for Waterloo Region, 2001-2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 to 4 years</td>
<td>27,960</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>25,345</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>30,945</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 9 years</td>
<td>31,215</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>30,110</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>30,660</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>-1.8%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 14 years</td>
<td>31,820</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>32,915</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>31,370</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>-1.4%</td>
<td>-4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 to 19 years</td>
<td>30,810</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>33,885</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>34,585</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 to 24 years</td>
<td>31,105</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>35,675</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>37,220</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 to 29 years</td>
<td>30,865</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>32,790</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>35,680</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 to 34 years</td>
<td>33,405</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>33,840</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>34,370</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 to 39 years</td>
<td>38,400</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>35,875</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>35,205</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>-8.3%</td>
<td>-1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 to 44 years</td>
<td>36,595</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>40,145</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>37,075</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>-7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 to 49 years</td>
<td>31,965</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>37,375</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>40,580</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 to 54 years</td>
<td>28,230</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>32,465</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>37,410</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>32.5%</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 to 59 years</td>
<td>20,770</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>27,725</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>31,785</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>53.0%</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 to 64 years</td>
<td>16,020</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>20,335</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>26,625</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>66.2%</td>
<td>30.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 to 69 years</td>
<td>14,690</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>15,515</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>19,360</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>37.4%</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70 to 74 years</td>
<td>13,060</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>13,190</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>14,745</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75 to 79 years</td>
<td>10,630</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>11,570</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>11,830</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80 to 84 years</td>
<td>6,360</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>6,600</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>9,180</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>44.3%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85+</td>
<td>5,160</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>6,750</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>8,450</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>63.6%</td>
<td>25.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Population by Age and Sex</td>
<td>438,515</td>
<td></td>
<td>476,120</td>
<td></td>
<td>507,100</td>
<td></td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Statistics Canada, Census 2006, 2011 by Census Division

Figure 3: Population by Broad Age Categories, Region of Waterloo, 1996-2011

Youth

The youth population, aged 0 to 14, accounted for 92,975 (18.3 per cent) of the Region’s population in 2011. Although the increase in this population group was very small between 2006 and 2011, Waterloo Region was one of only six municipalities (census divisions) across Ontario that did not experience a decrease in this age group between Censuses.

The number of young children aged 0 to 4 years has shown an increase in the past three Censuses in Waterloo Region. In 2011, a 5 per cent increase was measured for these children, lower than the rate on a national level (11 per cent), but on par with the provincial growth rate in this age group.

Source: Statistics Canada, Census 1996-2011 by Census Division
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Working Age

The population between 15 and 64 years old, which represents the age often referred to as the working-age, accounts for 70 per cent of the total population in Waterloo Region. From 2006 to 2011 this age group grew by 6 per cent. Waterloo Region ranks 7th in terms of the size of its working-age population in Ontario and 13th in Canada.

The working-age population is growing older, with the percentage of population in each of the 45 to 65 age categories increasing since 2006. In 2011, the largest component (almost 78,000 people) was comprised of 45 to 54 year olds, as shown in Table 3. These people are still 10 to 20 years from the age typically associated with retirement. Those closest to retirement age (55 to 64 years) represent over 58,000 people, and experienced the largest increase, growing by 10,355 people from 2006.

Despite the aging of the working-age population, Waterloo Region has substantially more people of the age to be typically entering the workforce (15 to 24 years) than of the age to be typically leaving it (55 to 64 years). This is in contrast to the national trend.

Table 3: Working Age Population by Age Groups, Waterloo Region, 2006-2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15-24</td>
<td>61,915</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>69,565</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>7,650</td>
<td>71,805</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>2,240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>64,275</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>66,635</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>2,360</td>
<td>70,050</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>3,415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>74,995</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>76,020</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>1,025</td>
<td>72,280</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>3,740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>60,215</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>69,845</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>9,630</td>
<td>77,990</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>8,145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>36,785</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>48,055</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>11,270</td>
<td>59,410</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>10,355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>298,185</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>330,120</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>31,935</td>
<td>350,535</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>20,415</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Statistics Canada, Census 2001-2011 by Census Division

Seniors

The number of seniors aged 65 years and over was 63,565 in 2011, and remains the smallest portion (12 per cent) of the Region's population, based on the age groups in Figure 3. However, in 2011, this segment experienced the largest percentage increase compared to youth and the working age population, growing by approximately 14 per cent (8,000 people) from 2006. Since 2001, the number of seniors relative to youth has continued to converge.

More specifically, older seniors (80 years and over) represent 3.5 per cent of the population. Over the past ten years this age group has increased by 53 per cent in Waterloo Region due primarily to longer life expectancy.

Median Age – refers to the middle value when ages are ranked in order from high to low or low to high. Half the population is older and half of the population is younger.

Greater Golden Horseshoe – is a term used by the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe (Ontario, 2006) to refer to the area from the Counties of Peterborough and Northumberland in the east, to the Region of Waterloo in the west, and the Region of Niagara and Halton County in the south.

For further information please contact:

Planning, Housing and Community Services
Planning Information and Research

www.regionofwaterloo.ca
planninginfo@regionofwaterloo.ca
519-575-4047
TTY: 519-575-4608
FAST FACTS

- The term Census in this document refers to the Census of Population conducted by Statistics Canada. The most recent Census was conducted on May 10, 2011. The Census is designed to provide information about people and housing units in Canada.

- All Canadians are required to complete a Census form. Data for families, household and marital status are based on this 100 per cent sample of the population.

- The Census population of Waterloo Region on May 10, 2011 was 507,096 as described in Census Bulletin #1, Population and Dwellings. This represents growth of almost 30,000 people over the five-year period since the 2006 Census.

For more information on Census statistics please refer to Statistics Canada’s website: www.statcan.gc.ca/census

Families and Marriage

Statistics from the 2011 Census for Waterloo Region

Family profile

According to the 2011 Census conducted by Statistics Canada on May 10, 2011, there were 142,215 Census families in private households in Waterloo Region, as shown in Table 1. Census families refer to a married couple (with or without children), a common-law couple (with or without children) or a lone parent family. Census families increased by 6.3 per cent from the 2006 Census, which is growth of about 1,700 families per year. The cities had the highest number of new Census families while the townships had larger per cent increases.

Table 1: Per cent change in census families in private households, 2006-2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Census families in private households</th>
<th>Two person families</th>
<th>Three person families</th>
<th>Four person families</th>
<th>Five or more person families</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2011 Total</td>
<td>% Change from 2006</td>
<td>2011 Total</td>
<td>% Change from 2006</td>
<td>2011 Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterloo Region</td>
<td>142,215</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>65,045</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>31,740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge</td>
<td>36,250</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>15,980</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>8,490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchener</td>
<td>61,255</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>20,150</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>14,010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterloo</td>
<td>26,775</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>11,785</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>5,860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dumfries</td>
<td>2,825</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>1,285</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellesley</td>
<td>2,765</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>1,025</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td>490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilmot</td>
<td>5,715</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>2,790</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
<td>1,075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woolwich</td>
<td>6,570</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>3,035</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
<td>1,255</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Statistics Canada. Census 2006 and 2011 by Census Subdivision

Two person families make up nearly half of families in the Region (46 per cent). This is followed by three person (22 per cent) and four person (22 per cent) families. Five or more person families account for the remaining 10 per cent. This group shrank by 265 families over 2006. Among the municipalities, the relative proportions of household types are similar.

Among Census families counted in 2011 across the Region, the average number of children living at home was 1.1, remaining consistent from the 2006 Census. This number is also consistent with the Ontario average in 2011. This average is the same in all municipalities across the Region, except for Wellesley where the average number of children living at home is 1.7.
Family structure

Contributing to the changing face of families, common-law relationships increased to 16,515 in 2011. This 13 per cent increase is similar to trends seen on a national level where high numbers of common-law marriages were noted. As shown in Table 2, common-law couples in the Region without children have increased by 16 per cent and common-law couples with children increased by over 8 per cent.

Table 2: Change in family structure, 2006-2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family structure</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>Absolute change</th>
<th>Per cent change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Married without children</td>
<td>38,800</td>
<td>42,405</td>
<td>3,605</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married with children</td>
<td>60,930</td>
<td>61,545</td>
<td>615</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common-law without children</td>
<td>8,420</td>
<td>9,705</td>
<td>1,285</td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common-law with children</td>
<td>6,230</td>
<td>6,750</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lone female parent</td>
<td>15,585</td>
<td>17,450</td>
<td>1,865</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lone male parent</td>
<td>3,750</td>
<td>4,305</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Statistics Canada, Census 2006 and 2011 by Census Division

While common-law couples showed a substantial increase over 2006, married couples saw much less change. Married couples without children increased by 9 per cent, while married couples with children increased by just 1 per cent.

Noteworthy changes were also apparent in lone parent families, with an increase of 12.5 per cent over 2006. Within lone parent families in Waterloo Region, lone male parent families increased by 15 per cent; however, they remain a small part of the total family structure. From 2006 to 2011, lone female parent families increased by 12 per cent.

As shown in Figure 1, couples with children were the most prevalent family structure in Waterloo Region. Couples (both married and common-law) with children represented 40 per cent of families, while couples without children represented 37 per cent of families, and lone-parent families represented 15 per cent of families.

Figure 1: Family structure, 2011

While couples with children were more prevalent, couples without children were growing faster. As Figure 2 shows, the number of couples without children increased by 10.5 per cent, while couples with children slightly increased (1.7 per cent) over 2006.

Figure 2: Change in family structure, 2006-2011

 Married couples represented the largest family structure in the Region (73 per cent). This proportion has decreased marginally from 2006, when married couples accounted for almost three quarters of families.

The share of family structure types, shown in Figure 3, is relatively consistent across the municipalities in Waterloo Region. The cities generally have higher proportions of common-law families and lone parent families, while the townships have higher proportions of married couple families. Almost 90 per cent of families in Wellesley are headed by married couples.

Source: Statistics Canada, Census 2011 by Census Division
Figure 3: Distribution of family structure by municipality, 2011

Figure 4 shows that since 2001 there has been a steady decrease in the proportion of married individuals and a steady increase in the proportion of single individuals. This trend is consistent with the rest of Canada.

The number of separated individuals increased by 11.5 per cent, while the number of divorced individuals increased by 15.5 per cent. These increases are consistent with Regional increases between 2001 and 2006. On the other hand, widowed individuals increased by 4 per cent over 2006, which is a flatter increase as compared to the 8.5 per cent between 2001 and 2006.

Individuals living in common-law increased by 14 per cent over 2006. This is the same as the provincial increase. These large per cent increases support the trend of people waiting longer to get married.

Marital status

Among individuals 15 and older in the Region, there were more married individuals than non-married individuals (212,085 compared to 158,200). Table 3 shows that married individuals increased by 4.5 per cent in 2011. This increase is smaller than the 7 per cent increase between 2001 and 2006.

While the number of married individuals increased slowly, the number of single individuals increased by 10.5 per cent — over twice as fast as married couples. This pattern is consistent with the rest of Ontario.

Table 3: Change in marital status, 2001-2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total population 15 years +</td>
<td>347,515</td>
<td>385,745</td>
<td>414,115</td>
<td>28,370</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>9,679,835</td>
<td>24,726,810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>189,315</td>
<td>202,910</td>
<td>212,085</td>
<td>9,175</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>5,367,400</td>
<td>12,341,560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single (never married)</td>
<td>104,835</td>
<td>122,050</td>
<td>135,770</td>
<td>13,720</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>2,808,020</td>
<td>7,916,045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separated</td>
<td>11,590</td>
<td>13,415</td>
<td>14,550</td>
<td>1,035</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>319,805</td>
<td>658,240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>22,605</td>
<td>25,665</td>
<td>29,655</td>
<td>3,990</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>559,730</td>
<td>1,688,035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>19,170</td>
<td>20,805</td>
<td>21,655</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>413,880</td>
<td>1,584,530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not living in common-law</td>
<td>323,720</td>
<td>356,675</td>
<td>381,035</td>
<td>24,360</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>9,088,625</td>
<td>21,584,285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living in common-law</td>
<td>23,795</td>
<td>25,070</td>
<td>30,080</td>
<td>4,010</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>751,210</td>
<td>3,142,525</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Statistics Canada, Census 2001, 2006 and 2011 by Census Division
Census family – defined as “...a married couple (with or without children of either and/or both spouses), a common-law couple (with or without children of either and/or both partners) or a lone parent of any marital status, with at least one child. A couple may be of opposite sex or same sex.”

Children – “Refers to blood, step or adopted sons and daughters (regardless of age or marital status) who are living in the same dwelling as their parent(s), as well as grandchildren in households where there are no parents present.”

Children living at home – “The average number of children at home per census family is calculated using the total number of children at home and the total number of census families.”

Common-law status – refers to “a person who is living with another person as a couple but who is not legally married to that person.”

Divorced – defined as “A person who has obtained a legal divorce and who has not remarried. Persons living common law are not included in this category.”

Lone parents – “Mothers or fathers, with no married spouse or common-law partner present, living in a dwelling with one or more children.”

Married – defined as “A person who is married and has not separated or obtained a divorce, and whose spouse is living.”

Private households – “Refers to a person or a group of persons (other than foreign residents) who occupy a private dwelling and do not have a usual place of residence elsewhere in Canada. Households are classified into three groups: private households, collective households and households outside Canada.”

Separated – refers to “A person who is married but who no longer lives with his/her spouse (for any reason other than illness, work or school) and who has not obtained a divorce. Persons living common law are not included in this category.”

Single – “A person who has never married or a person whose marriage has been annulled and who has not remarried. Persons living common law are not included in this category.”

Widowed – refers to “A person who has lost his/her spouse through death and who has not remarried. Persons living common law are not included in this category.”

Source: Statistics Canada Census Dictionary, 2011

How to source:

Census bulletins can be accessed online at: www.regionofwaterloo.ca/en/doingbusiness/census.asp

For further information please contact:

Planning, Housing and Community Services
Planning Information and Research
www.regionofwaterloo.ca
planninginfo@regionofwaterloo.ca

519-575-4047  TTY: 519-575-4608

www.regionofwaterloo.ca  •  planninginfo@regionofwaterloo.ca  •  519-575-4047
FAST FACTS

- The term Census in this document refers to the Census of Population conducted by Statistics Canada. The most recent Census was conducted on May 10, 2011. The Census is designed to provide information about people and housing units in Canada.

- All Canadians are required to complete a Census form. Data for Household and Dwelling Characteristics are based on this 100% sample of the population. Data regarding dwelling construction and tenure has not yet been released and will be examined as part of a future bulletin.

- Census Bulletin #1 describes Population and Dwelling from the 2001 Census conducted on May 10, 2011. At this time, the Region’s Census population was 507,096 and the total number of dwellings was 202,121.

- The Region of Waterloo also estimates the number of households (occupied private dwellings) on an annual basis. For year-end 2011, the Region’s estimate was 196,420 households. This estimate is based upon the 2006 Census counts plus building and demolition activity and is estimated year end. The estimate includes temporary households as well as foreign households.

- This data release includes persons per unit (PPU) as mentioned in Census Bulletin #1

For more information on Census statistics please refer to Statistics Canada’s website: www.statcan.gc.ca/census

Households and Dwelling Characteristics
Statistics from the 2011 Census for Waterloo Region

Households characteristics

According to the 2011 Census, there were 191,595 households in the Region of Waterloo, 8 per cent more than the 178,000 households five years earlier. A household refers to one or more people living in a private dwelling. This is different from ‘census families in private households’, which only refers to married couples, common-law couples, or lone parent families, as described in Census Bulletin #4, Families and Marriage.

One and two person households continue to be the fastest growing household size in the Region. As shown in Table 1, two person households had the highest absolute increase at 5,330 households, followed by one person households with 4,840. Additionally, one person households had the highest percentage increase at 12 per cent, which is 1 per cent higher than the Ontario change.

Table 1: Per cent change in census families in Private Households, 2006-2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One Person</td>
<td>31,655</td>
<td>35,585</td>
<td>40,445</td>
<td>45,285</td>
<td>4,840</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Persons</td>
<td>46,380</td>
<td>51,420</td>
<td>57,830</td>
<td>63,160</td>
<td>5,330</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three Persons</td>
<td>25,825</td>
<td>27,400</td>
<td>30,520</td>
<td>32,565</td>
<td>2,045</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four and Five</td>
<td>38,705</td>
<td>41,410</td>
<td>43,765</td>
<td>44,525</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six or More</td>
<td>5,040</td>
<td>5,925</td>
<td>5,440</td>
<td>6,060</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>147,605</td>
<td>161,120</td>
<td>178,000</td>
<td>191,595</td>
<td>13,595</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There have been increases in all household sizes across the Region except in North Dumfries, where four or more person households decreased by 3 per cent over 2006. As shown in Figure 1, the one person households increased the most in the cities, followed by increases in two, three, and four or more person households. The townships showed greater variation in the pattern of growth of household sizes, with two person households often showing the largest increases.

Figure 1: Change in household characteristics, 2006-2011

In 2011, there were 498,615 people living in 191,595 private households in Waterloo Region. Figure 3 shows the number of each household type and corresponding calculated populations. Although two person households were the predominant household size, a similar number of individuals lived in four person households. The least number of people live in six or more person households and one person households (6 and 9 per cent respectively).

Figure 3: Population living in each household size, 2011

Across the municipalities in the Region, the cities had larger numbers of one person households compared to the townships, as shown in Figure 4. The townships had more two person households and more four and five person households than the cities. Wellesley had the largest percentage of six or more person households.

Figure 4: Distribution of household characteristics per Municipality, 2011
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The average number of people living in private households has continued to decrease, falling from 2.64 in 2006 to 2.61 in 2011. However, Waterloo Region remains slightly above the provincial average (2.59). Across the municipalities, the average number of people per household varied between 2.5 and 3.4, as shown in Figure 5. As mentioned in Census Bulletin #1, these figures represent persons per unit (PPU) as calculated using population in private households, rather than total population.

Figure 5: Total number of households and average number of people per household, Waterloo Region 2011

Occupied dwelling types

In 2011, Statistics Canada indicated that there were 191,595 occupied private dwellings in the Region, an increase of 13,470 dwellings over 2006. The 2011 breakdown of dwelling type is shown in Figure 6. Single family dwellings represent 57 per cent of dwellings in the Region, while semi-detached account for 6 per cent, row houses represent 10 per cent, apartments and duplexes represent 25 per cent, and other dwelling types account for less than 1 per cent.

Figure 6: Occupied dwelling types, 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>80,810</td>
<td>91,435</td>
<td>101,440</td>
<td>109,400</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi</td>
<td>10,115</td>
<td>11,175</td>
<td>11,940</td>
<td>12,910</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row House</td>
<td>13,395</td>
<td>15,215</td>
<td>13,860</td>
<td>20,240</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartments and Other</td>
<td>43,340</td>
<td>43,305</td>
<td>46,755</td>
<td>49,045</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>147,660</td>
<td>161,130</td>
<td>177,595</td>
<td>191,596</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Private Households**—“Refers to a person or a group of persons (other than foreign residents) who occupy a private dwelling and do not have a usual place of residence elsewhere in Canada. Households are classified into three groups: private households, collective households and households outside Canada.”

**Occupied Private Dwellings**—“Refers to a private dwelling in which a person or a group of persons is permanently residing. Also included are private dwellings whose usual residents are temporarily absent on Census Day.”

**Single-detached house**—“A single dwelling not attached to any other dwelling or structure (except its own garage or shed). A single-detached house has open space on all sides, and has no dwellings either above it or below it.”

**Semi-detached house**—“One of two dwellings attached side by side (or back to front) to each other, but not to any other dwelling or structure (except its own garage or shed). A semidetached dwelling has no dwellings either above it or below it, and the two units together have open space on all sides.”

**Row house**—“One of three or more dwellings joined side by side (or occasionally side to back), such as a town house or garden home, but not having any other dwellings either above or below.”

**Apartment or flat in a duplex**—“One of two dwellings, located one above the other, may or may not be attached to other dwellings or buildings.”

**Apartment in a building that has five or more storeys**—“A dwelling unit in a high-rise apartment building which has five or more storeys.”

**Apartment in a building that has fewer than five storeys**—“A dwelling unit attached to other dwelling units, or other non-residential space in a building that has fewer than five storeys.”

**Movable dwelling**—“A single dwelling, other than a mobile home, used as a place of residence, but capable of being moved on short notice, such as a tent, recreational vehicle, travel trailer or houseboat.”

Source: Statistics Canada Census Dictionary, 2011

**How to Source:**

---

Census bulletins can be accessed online at: www.regionofwaterloo.ca/en/doingbusiness/census.asp

For further information please contact:

**Planning, Housing and Community Services**
Planning Information and Research
www.regionofwaterloo.ca
planninginfo@regionofwaterloo.ca

519-575-4047 TTY: 519-575-4608
FAST FACTS

- The term Census in this document refers to the Census of Population conducted by Statistics Canada. The most recent Census was conducted on May 10, 2011. The Census is designed to provide information about people and housing units in Canada.

- All Canadians are required to complete a Census form. All 2011 data for Language are based on this 100 per cent sample of the population. In the 2006 Census and earlier, mother tongue was the only Language question that was posed to the entire population; other language data was based on a 20 per cent sample of the population. Due to the change in collection methodology, there may be some inconsistencies in data between 2006 and 2011.

- In the 2006 and 2011 Censuses, ‘Chinese Languages’ were broken down into seven separate languages: Mandarin, Cantonese, Hakka, Taiwanese, Chaoshow (Teochow), Fukien and Shanghainese, as well as a residual category Chinese languages not otherwise specified (n.o.s.). In this Bulletin, the term Chinese refers to the sum of all those languages listed above.

For more information on Census statistics please refer to Statistics Canada’s website: www.statcan.gc.ca/census

Language

Statistics from the 2011 Census for Waterloo Region

Mother tongue

English was the most prevalent mother tongue spoken in 2011, spoken by over three quarters of the Region's population. However, there were 112,495 people whose mother tongue was a non-official language, an increase of 5 per cent from 106,855 people in 2006. Non-official languages are languages other than Canada's two official languages, English and French. Figure 1 shows the 2011 proportion of official languages to non-official languages.

Figure 1: Waterloo Region's single responses to mother tongue, 2011

Source: Statistics Canada, Census 2011 by Census Division

The percent increase for non-official language mother tongues was about the same as the 5.7 per cent increase for English mother tongues. However, the number of people with a French mother tongue decreased by 1 per cent, which is in contrast to a 5 per cent increase between 2001 and 2006. The percentage of the population in Waterloo Region whose mother tongue was neither English nor French was higher than the percentage across Canada, but lower than the percentage in Ontario as indicated in Table 1.
Table 1: Waterloo Region population distribution by mother tongue, 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Waterloo Region count</th>
<th>per cent distribution</th>
<th>Ontario per cent distribution</th>
<th>Canada per cent distribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single responses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>375,515</td>
<td>74.8</td>
<td>68.2</td>
<td>56.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>8,080</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>21.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-official languages</td>
<td>112,455</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>19.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple responses</td>
<td>7,700</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English and French</td>
<td>1,025</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English and non-official language</td>
<td>6,280</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French and non-official language</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English, French and non-official language</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Statistics Canada, Census 2011 by Census Division

Listed in Table 2 are the top 25 mother tongue languages in Waterloo Region as of 2011. English remains the predominant mother tongue. German has a strong historical presence in the Region and despite dropping by 12 per cent from 2006, remains the second most common mother tongue while Portuguese remains third. Chinese languages, comprised mostly of Mandarin and Cantonese, remained fourth. From 2001 to 2006, Arabic saw the greatest increase, growing by 38 per cent, while Greek saw the largest decrease, shrinking by 19 per cent.

Languages spoken at home

Waterloo Region’s diversity can be seen through the number of people who speak a language other than English or French at home. The largest increases in home language were in non-official languages. From 2006 to 2011, there was a reported 5 per cent increase in this category as compared to a 4 per cent increase in English. This was a moderate increase compared to the 20 per cent increase in non-official languages from 2001 to 2006.

As of 2011, almost one in every eight residents in Waterloo Region spoke neither English nor French at home as indicated in Table 3. The three cities were comparable to the Regional average and had similar proportions of their populations speaking a non-official language. North Dumfries and Wilmot had very small percentages of non-English speaking citizens, while as a result of the large Mennonite and Amish population, there were higher percentages of residents who speak a non-official language in Wellesley and Woolwich.

Table 2: Waterloo Region’s top 25 single mother tongue languages, 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2011 rank</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Waterloo Region population</th>
<th>Per cent growth 2006 - 2011</th>
<th>2006 rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>375,515</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>German</td>
<td>16,515</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Portuguese</td>
<td>10,020</td>
<td>-11</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Chinese Languages</td>
<td>9,380</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>7,975</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>French</td>
<td>6,090</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Romanian</td>
<td>5,555</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Polish</td>
<td>5,445</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Serbian</td>
<td>5,080</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>4,425</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Panjabi</td>
<td>3,870</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Vietnamese</td>
<td>3,190</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Persian</td>
<td>2,800</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Urdu</td>
<td>2,800</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Dutch</td>
<td>2,345</td>
<td>-17</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Croatian</td>
<td>2,195</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Gujarati</td>
<td>2,165</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>1,930</td>
<td>-16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Hungarian</td>
<td>1,825</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>1,545</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>1,495</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Greek</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td>-19</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Tagalog</td>
<td>1,330</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Hindi</td>
<td>1,150</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Lao</td>
<td>1,030</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Statistics Canada, Census 2011 by Census Division

www.regionofwaterloo.ca  •  planninginfo@regionofwaterloo.ca  •  519-575-4047
Table 3: Languages most often spoken at home by municipality, 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>English per cent of total</th>
<th>French per cent of total</th>
<th>Non-Official Language per cent of total</th>
<th>English and Non-Official Language per cent of total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Waterloo Region</td>
<td>423,620 84.4</td>
<td>1,725 0.3</td>
<td>59,620 11.9</td>
<td>15,880 3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge</td>
<td>110,780 88.2</td>
<td>435 0.3</td>
<td>10,540 8.4</td>
<td>3,640 2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchener</td>
<td>175,685 81.3</td>
<td>795 0.4</td>
<td>30,570 14.1</td>
<td>6,565 4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dumfries</td>
<td>9,000 96.6</td>
<td>25 0.3</td>
<td>190 2.0</td>
<td>95 1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterloo</td>
<td>82,100 83.8</td>
<td>305 0.4</td>
<td>12,325 12.6</td>
<td>2,985 3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellesley</td>
<td>7,325 70.2</td>
<td>15 0.1</td>
<td>3,035 28.0</td>
<td>135 1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilmot</td>
<td>18,320 90.4</td>
<td>35 0.2</td>
<td>420 2.2</td>
<td>200 1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woolwich</td>
<td>19,815 87.4</td>
<td>50 0.2</td>
<td>2,545 11.2</td>
<td>255 1.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Statistics Canada, Census 2011 by Census Subdivision

Languages most often spoken at home rank differently than the most commonly spoken mother tongues in the Region. Listed in Figure 2 are the top languages in each municipality most often spoken at home (other than English). German dominates across the townships, while in the cities, a variety of languages were present. With 14 different languages being shown (including English), the diversity of Waterloo Region is apparent.

Figure 2: Waterloo Region’s top languages most often spoken at home (other than English) by municipality, 2011

Source: Statistics Canada, Census 2011 by Census Subdivision

PLANNING, HOUSING AND COMMUNITY SERVICES – 2011 Census Bulletin #6
Knowledge of official languages

Waterloo Region’s knowledge of English and French remained high. In total, 98.4 per cent of the Region’s population had knowledge of at least one of Canada’s two official languages. Among those, 92.1 per cent knew English only. Knowledge of these languages has remained consistent since 2001. While French was the mother tongue of 1.2 per cent of the population, the Census showed that 6.3 per cent of the Region’s population had some knowledge of the French language.

Mother tongue – “Refers to the first language learned at home in childhood and still understood by the individual at the time of the census.”

Home language – “Refers to the language spoken most often or on a regular basis at home by the individual at the time of the census.”

Source: Statistics Canada Census Dictionary, 2011

How to source:

Census bulletins can be accessed online at: www.regionofwaterloo.ca/en/doingbusiness/census.asp

For further information please contact:

Planning, Housing and Community Services
Planning Information and Research

www.regionofwaterloo.ca
planninginfo@regionofwaterloo.ca

519-575-4047 TTY: 519-575-4608
To: Chair Sean Strickland and Members of the Community Services Committee  
From: Susan Burke, Manager/Curator, Joseph Schneider Haus  
Subject: JOSEPH SCHNEIDER HAUS OPENS FOR THE 2013 SEASON  
File No: R12-90

The Friends of Joseph Schneider Haus have announced that the 2013 Folk Artists in Residence are Woodworkers/Performers, Trevor Ewert and Sarah Granskou of Kitchener. Trevor and Sarah's year will be officially launched when Joseph Schneider Haus opens for the 2013 season on the weekend of February 16 to 18, 2013.

On that weekend, an exhibition entitled Heartwood: The Arts of Sarah Granskou and Trevor Ewert will open that showcases the unique artistry that this local couple brings to the Schneider Haus residency. On Sunday afternoon from 1:00 to 4:00 p.m., members of the public are invited to view this new exhibit and to meet the artists at a special reception. Remarks will take place at 2:30 p.m. and for music lovers, at 2 o'clock, Sarah and Trevors' creative talents will converge in a concert, Violin Meets Fiddle, which further demonstrates their shared fascination with wood, music and storytelling.

Trevor Ewert and Sarah Granskou are versatile artists rooted in tradition and sharing a common connection to wood. Both grew up locally midst wood scraps and shavings, the children of woodworkers and both play the violin/fiddle. While Trevor creates violin bows and burled bowls, Sarah has a passion for fiddle making and cup carving. Trevor reveals the story of a tree in his workshop; Sarah tells and sings of fiddle makers and forest sprites while carving on stage. Together they gather around the woodstove with their young children, Søren and Solveg.

Trevor’s career as bow maker began with his personal search in 1996 for a quality baroque bow to play, following a passion for Early Music. Since then, he has crafted bows for an international clientele, orchestras and institutions, all of whom praise his bows both for their fine playing qualities and their workmanship. Though he specializes in reproducing baroque and classical bows, he is also known for his fine modern bows. Recently, Trevor "branched out", transitioning from working with the strong, straight grain of bows, to taming knarled, spaulted and burled woods by turning. "Once Upon a Tree" emerged, his business offering unique bowls and serving boards sourced from local fallen trees. Trevor also teaches violin and performs as a member of the Nota Bene Period Orchestra.

Sarah applies her Canadian flair for innovation to Scandinavian oral and folk art tradition and is known for her intricate, yet accessible poetic recitations and lyrics. She integrates folk music,
story, craft and puppetry in a fluid narrative, reflecting ancient processes with an altogether contemporary flair. She has developed her artistry living amongst reindeer herders and farmers, and has shared it with hundreds of festival, community and school audiences internationally. Currently, Sarah is in her element delivering oral literacy programmes in schools, gardening, composing songs with her children and building elves with her prolific green peppers.

Trevor and Sarah have planned an exciting year of demonstrations, workshops, and concerts relating to their versatile talents. Their programming begins March 2 when Trevor demonstrates violin bow-making at the Museum from 10:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m., revealing some of secrets that place him among the best of his trade. During March Break, families are invited to enjoy the entertaining stories and songs which Sarah will perform in the Historic Haus in the afternoon on March 14, 2013.

These tempting offerings are but a foretaste of what is to come in 2013 as part of the Granskou/Ewert residency sponsored by the Museum’s Friends organization. For more information please connect with www.regionofwaterloo.ca/jsh, phone 519-742-7752 for a brochure or visit the Friends of Joseph Schneider Haus facebook page.

On Saturday February 16, 2013, the Schneiders open their doors for the season, welcoming back members of the public to their historic Kitchener homestead. Discover the many tasks and activities that occupied young and old alike when the family was Housebound by winter weather at this time of year. Help out by turning your hand to needlework, tape weaving, straw working, basket making, and more. Take a break, enjoy cider and a cookie and listen to stories told in the family sitting room.

Visitors to the Museum that weekend can also take in a new exhibit in the gallery entitled Gifts of the North. In the intriguing fantasy world created by artist/sculptor Janet Hannam, 18 soft sculpture figures demonstrate different aspects of life in Northern Ontario. Each figure is made with love and precision, including beading, stitching, a mix of media, and an inspiration of colours and materials that interpret a passion for the life and heritage of the north. Some of the figures include materials from nature. Gifts of the North continue through the spring months and a reception to meet the artist is planned for a future weekend.
TO: Chair Sean Strickland and Members of the Community Services Committee

DATE: January 29, 2013

FILE CODE: S07-40

SUBJECT: SUNNYSIDE WELLNESS CENTRE

RECOMMENDATION:

For information only.

SUMMARY:

Opened in 2010, the Sunnyside Wellness Centre *Raises the Bar for Healthy Aging* in our community by offering a unique setting for older adults to exercise and maintain wellness in an inspiring, safe, accepting and barrier-free environment.

REPORT:

At the direction of the Region of Waterloo Seniors’ Advisory Committee (ROWSAC), this report provides an overview of the Sunnyside Wellness Centre – a successful health promotion model for seniors in our community.

Located on the Sunnyside Campus, the Sunnyside Wellness Centre offers a comprehensive basket of services to meet the diverse needs of older adults including; exercise and wellness programs supervised by a kinesiologist, physiotherapy and chiropractic care, a therapeutic spa, registered massage therapy, dental hygiene, foot care and education/outreach programs. Primary care is also being provided at the centre by Dr. F. Mather, for a few community seniors who formally had no family physician.

In 2009, the Sunnyside Foundation launched a fundraising campaign and successfully raised $500,000 to build, furnish and equip the Sunnyside Wellness Centre. The Centre was constructed in conjunction with the Supportive Housing project and opened in May 2010.

The Wellness Centre is operated under contract with Eglington-Bayview and Joints in Motion Inc. who effectively manage the daily operations, offering specialized services and expertise. Fitness memberships are geared towards the needs of older adults in the community and are available in a variety of formats including one month memberships and annual memberships at a discount. Members can opt out of their memberships at any time.

Residents of Sunnyside Home and tenants of Supportive Housing have complimentary memberships to the Wellness Centre fitness program. Residents and those living on the campus can access required physiotherapy services at no cost. All other services are provided at affordable rates. Full or partial subsidies, funded by the Sunnyside Foundation, are available for those who are not able to afford the programs and services.

The growing membership base of 300+ members each year reflects the Centre’s success in meeting the unique needs of the seniors’ population in this community. A program evaluation was conducted in 2011 which demonstrated a very high level of satisfaction with the services being
offered. Many members reported the significant functional improvements they had achieved and their high level of comfort in exercising in an accessible and accepting environment where there was direct supervision by a kinesiologist.

A key success factor for the Wellness Centre is the continuum of care and wide range of services available on the Sunnyside Campus; the Wellness Centre programs and services are integrated with other services on site providing access to a number of services, such as hairdressing, the Sandhills Café, a banking machine, and seniors’ day programs. The range of community partners and providers operate under one roof to make it a “one stop” shop for its members and the community at large.

The Wellness Centre is financially self-sufficient, funded through the provider contract and membership revenues.

CORPORATE STRATEGIC PLAN:

Operating the Sunnyside Wellness Centre is consistent with the Region’s Corporate Strategic Plan, objective 4.7: collaborate with the community to support older adults to live healthy, active lives.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

The Wellness Centre has no impact on the Regional levy, being fully funded through user fees and the provider contract.

OTHER DEPARTMENT CONSULTATIONS/CONCURRENCE:

NIL.

ATTACHMENTS

No attachment.

PREPARED BY: Julie Wheeler, Manager, Community Programs

APPROVED BY: Douglas Bartholomew-Saunders, Commissioner, Social Services
TO: Chair Sean Strickland and Members of the Community Services Committee

DATE: January 29, 2013

FILE CODE: S13-30

SUBJECT: COMMUNITY HOMELESSNESS PREVENTION INITIATIVE – INVESTMENT PLAN

RECOMMENDATION:

THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve submission of the Region of Waterloo's 2013/14 Community Homelessness Prevention Initiative Investment Plan to the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing;


SUMMARY:

Recent Community Services Committee reports (SS-12-044, SS-12-050 and SS-13-001) have detailed the Community Homelessness Prevention Initiative (CHPI) background, program expectations, funding and planned approach for 2013/14. This report seeks approval of the CHPI Investment Plan prior to submission to the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing (MMAH).

REPORT:

1.0 Purpose and Requirements

The Region of Waterloo entered into a Community Homelessness Prevention Initiative (CHPI) Service Agreement with the Ministry of Municipal Affairs (MMAH) and Housing effective January 1, 2013 (SS-12-050). The CHPI Program Guidelines identify the requirement to submit an annual CHPI Investment Plan to MMAH by February 15th each year. The purpose and requirements of the CHPI Investment Plan as outlined in the Program Guidelines are to identify how Service Managers will use their annual CHPI allocation for the upcoming fiscal year and to ensure compliance with both the Service Manager Service Agreement and the CHPI Program Guidelines.

MMAH has provided an Investment Plan template for Service Managers to complete. The investment Plan includes a short narrative description of how CHPI funding will be used as well as funding amounts allocated for each of the four CHPI Service Categories:

1. Emergency Shelter Solutions
2. Housing with Related Supports
3. Other Services and Supports
4. Homelessness Prevention

The Investment Plan must be approved by Council or by a delegated Service Manager Authority prior to submission to MMAH. MMAH will review and approve CHPI Investment Plans prior to
providing CHPI funding for the upcoming year beginning April 1st. Service Managers are required to update their Investment Plans three times throughout the fiscal year. Service Managers are not required to submit an Investment Plan for January 1 to March 31, 2013 but will be required to submit actual expenditures for this period. In addition, the CHPI one-time funding from the Ministry of Community and Social Services (MCSS) will be reported separately as well as any municipal contributions.

2.0 Region 2013/14 CHPI Investment Plan
The Region’s 2013/14 CHPI Investment Plan is attached as Appendix A. It includes planned allocations for the $7,653,382 in CHPI funding across the following four service categories.

Service Category #1: Emergency Shelter Solutions - there are 7 existing programs that are proposed to continue to be funded through this area for 2013/14 including six emergency shelters (Argus Young Men’s Residence, Argus Young Women’s Residence, Cambridge Shelter, Charles Street Men’s Hostel, ROOF, and YWCA-Mary’s Place) as well as Shelter Overflow into motels. The approach for 2013/14 is to pilot providing Emergency Shelter programs a grant rather than per diem as in the past. The grant for each shelter is calculated based on actual total per diem claims for 2012. Grants will be released to shelter operators on a quarterly basis. In addition, funding for Shelter Overflow will continue to be available to address demands on shelter capacity.

Service Category #2: Housing with Related Supports - this service category includes all 21 permanent, supportive housing programs previously funded through either the Consolidated Homelessness Prevention Program (CHPP) or the Domiciliary Hostel Program. In addition, this service category incorporates two time-limited housing programs (Marillac Place and Families in Transition Houses). The approach for 2013/14 is to continue to fund through a grant set at 2012 levels. A number of specialized programs previously funded through either the Domiciliary Hostel Program or Emergency Shelter per diem will be provided a grant, on a pilot basis over 2013/14, based on 2012 projected actual per diem claims. The Retirement Homes, Boarding Homes as well as the new specialized program Hugo, will remain under the Domiciliary Hostel Program and continue to receive per diem at the 2012 rate of $47.75. Tenants will continue to receive a Personal Needs Benefit (PNB) of $132.00. It is planned that eligibility and claims for the Domiciliary Hostel Program will continue to be administered by Employment and Income Support staff during the CHPI transition period.

Service Category #3: Other Services and Supports - three programs are proposed under this service category: the continuation of the Families in Transition support program; support for Lutherwood’s Housing Counselling Program; and a new program entitled Rapid Re-Housing Discharge Fund for last month’s rent. As a pilot over 2013, the Rapid Re-Housing Discharge Fund will be available primarily to those on OW and ODSP exiting emergency shelter.

Service Category #4: Homelessness Prevention - both the Rent Bank and Eviction Prevention program and the Waterloo Region Energy Assistance Program (WREAP) will continue.

Once approved by Council, the Investment Plan will be submitted to the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing for approval.

CORPORATE STRATEGIC PLAN:
Implementing CHPI in Waterloo Region is consistent with the Region’s Corporate Strategic Plan (2011-2014), Focus Area 4: Healthy and Inclusive Communities: to “reduce inequities and enhance community health, safety, inclusion and quality of life”; and specifically, Strategic Objective 4.5 to “work collaboratively to increase the supply and range of affordable housing and reduce homelessness”.
FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

The Region’s 2013 Operating Budget includes a provision of $10,431,322 for the Community Homelessness Prevention Initiative. The required 2013/14 CHPI Investment Plan identifies planned expenditures for $7,653,382 provincial funding provided through the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing only. Note the Investment Plan does not require the inclusion of the Region’s contribution ($1,260,800) or the one time transitional funding ($1,517,140) from the Ministry of Community and Social Services. The following table summarizes the 2013 Operating budget for CHPI. Funding may be reallocated among the various Service categories throughout the year to meet program demands.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Category</th>
<th>MMAH Funding</th>
<th>Regional Funding</th>
<th>MCSS Funding</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Shelter Solutions</td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
<td>$974,628</td>
<td>$425,372</td>
<td>$4,400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing with Related Supports</td>
<td>3,000,000</td>
<td>286,172</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,286,172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services and Supports</td>
<td>903,382</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>691,768</td>
<td>1,595,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homelessness Prevention</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td>700,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>450,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>450,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$7,653,382</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,260,800</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,517,140</strong></td>
<td><strong>$10,431,322</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OTHER DEPARTMENT CONSULTATIONS/CONCURRENCE:

The Finance Department has provided input on this report.

ATTACHMENTS

Appendix A    Community Homelessness Prevention Initiative Investment Plan

PREPARED BY:  Lynn Randall, Director, Social Planning, Policy & Program Administration
              Marie Morrison, Manager, Social Planning

APPROVED BY:  Douglas Bartholomew-Saunders, Commissioner, Social Services
APPENDIX A
CHPI INVESTMENT PLAN

1. Proposed Plan

Briefly describe how you intend to use your CHPI allocation to address various housing and homelessness-related needs of your SM area.

For example, you can discuss the following matters:

1) Range of services you are planning to deliver (e.g. Emergency Shelter Solutions, Housing with Related Supports, Services and Supports, and Homelessness Prevention) - and why.

2) Client groups you are planning to assist - and why.

The proposed plan is intended to be a high-level summary and should be no longer than two pages.

Please write in a box below:

The Regional Municipality of Waterloo (the Region) plans to fund services in all four service categories through CHPI as outlined below:

Emergency Shelter Solutions
There are seven existing programs that will continue to be funded through this service category including six emergency shelters as well as Shelter Overflow into motels to address demands on shelter capacity. With a 10% increase in the number of people accessing emergency shelter from 2010 and 2011 (including a 30% increase in the number of families) and an even greater increase anticipated in 2012 (data currently being finalized), these emergency residential programs continue to be in high demand. Argus Young Men’s Residence and Argus Young Women’s Residence in Cambridge and ROOF in Kitchener serve youth ages 16-24. Cambridge Shelter in Cambridge serves men and women ages 16+ as well as families. Charles Street Men’s Hostel in Kitchener serves single men ages 16+. YWCA-Mary's Place in Kitchener serves single women age 16+ and families. CHPI will be funding a total of 178 regular capacity beds, a total of 78 internal overflow beds as well as overflow into motels as per the Region's Emergency Shelter Referral Protocol.

Housing with Related Supports
There are 21 existing permanent, supportive housing programs as well as two time-limited housing programs (Marillac Place for pregnant and parenting youth and three Families in Transition Houses) that will be funded under this service category for 2013/14. The programs include both those funded through the previous Consolidated Homelessness Prevention Program (CHPP) as well as those funded through the previous Domiciliary Hostel Program funding. The Retirement Homes, Boarding Homes as well as the new specialized program Hugo will remain under the Domiciliary Hostel Program and continue to receive per diem at the 2012 rate of $47.75. Tenants in these homes will continue to receive a Personal Needs Benefit (PNB) of $132.00. No new Agreements (turnovers or changes with existing homes or new homes) will be entertained as Housing with Support programs are being reviewed and redesigned over 2013/14.
Supportive housing supports a Housing First approach, providing essential housing and support to people who would otherwise experience homelessness. The supportive housing programs serve a variety of populations across Waterloo Region. There are a total of 173 fully self-contained units which are generally for males and females (including some with children) with a variety of support needs. There are a total of approximately 310 spaces through shared living environments of which 5 are for male youth, 8 are for males post-treatment, 117 are for male and female older adults, and 180 are for males and females with a variety of support needs. There are currently more people on the waiting list for supportive housing than there are existing spaces. Wait lists for supportive housing grew 17% between 2010 and 2011.

**Other Services and Supports**

There are three programs (2 existing and one new) that will be funded under this service category. The first is the continuation of the Families in Transition support program which assists families to obtain and retain housing across Waterloo Region. The second is the continuation of Lutherwood’s Housing Counselling program with offices located in both Kitchener and Cambridge. The third is a new pilot program entitled Rapid Re-Housing Discharge Fund. Given the funding pressures within CHPI, an amount of approximately $500,000 is available (topped up to $1.5M with Ministry of Community and Social Services one-time CHPI Transition funding). The Discharge Fund Pilot will be used to assist households once in a calendar year with last months rent up to $400 for singles/couples and up to $1,000 for families. The program will seek to serve those with the lowest income levels (e.g., Ontario Works, Ontario Disabilities Support Program, Old Age Security/Guaranteed Income Supplement) who are: 1) exiting emergency shelter, 2) discharging from institutions or other time-limited housing, 3) fleeing domestic violence and connected with Women’s Crisis Services of Waterloo Region, or 4) forced to move due to their current housing being certified as unsafe/uninhabitable. The Rapid Re-Housing pilot will be delivered over 2013/14 through Employment and Income Support and will be reviewed and evaluated over this period.

**Homelessness Prevention**

The Rent Bank and Eviction Prevention Program will continue to be funded within this service category through the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing (MMAH) CHPI Allocation. This Program will continue much as it has in the past, with slightly revised criteria based on new flexibility within CHPI that will better meet local needs for 2013/14. It is anticipated that 260 households will be assisted through a rent bank loan and many others will receive eviction prevention support (information, mediation, referral etc.). One-time CHPI Transitional funding through the Ministry of Community and Social Services (MCSS) will be used to enhance eviction prevention activities as well as provide funding for utility arrears and reconnections through the Waterloo Region Energy Assistance Program.

**Other**

There are a total of 36 programs that will be funded under CHPI. As noted above, programs for 2013/14 remain largely unchanged which will allow time for consultation and planning without destabilizing the current system. All programs are moving to an April to March funding cycle from the previous calendar year funding cycle. While it is expected that CHPI funding will be fully spent, in order to manage fluctuations in program demands and unexpected impacts of the transition to CHPI, a portion of CHPI funding provided through MMAH will remain unallocated to specific programs within each service category as a contingency fund to address unanticipated pressures within the program areas. CHPI funding through MMAH is augmented with $1,260,800 through the Region and $1,517,140 one-time CHPI Transition funding through MCSS. While up to 10% of the CHPI allocation through MMAH is available for administration, the Region will only be utilizing 5.5% to administer enhanced expectations under CHPI along with extensive transition planning and support.
2. Projected Use of CHPI funding

Complete the following table to indicate how much of your 2013-14 CHPI allocation you plan to use under various service categories in each quarter.

Projected spending in each quarter may be specific to each service category:
1. Emergency Shelter Solutions
2. Housing with Related Supports
3. Services and Supports
4. Homelessness Prevention

Please refer to the Program Guidelines for examples of activities that may be provided under each service category.

Please also include the amount of funding to be used to administer the program. Service Managers may use up to 10% of their annual allocation on administration costs.

Please provide your best quarterly estimates when completing the table. Please enter information in the YELLOW HIGHLIGHTED cells only.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Categories</th>
<th>Quarter 1 Apr - Jun</th>
<th>Quarter 2 Jul - Sep</th>
<th>Quarter 3 Oct - Dec</th>
<th>Quarter 4 Jan - Mar</th>
<th>TOTAL 2013-14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Shelter Solutions</td>
<td>$750,000</td>
<td>$750,000</td>
<td>$750,000</td>
<td>$750,000</td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing with Related Supports</td>
<td>$750,000</td>
<td>$750,000</td>
<td>$750,000</td>
<td>$750,000</td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services and Supports</td>
<td>$225,845</td>
<td>$225,845</td>
<td>$225,845</td>
<td>$225,847</td>
<td>$903,392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homelessness Prevention</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Administration</td>
<td>$112,500</td>
<td>$112,500</td>
<td>$112,500</td>
<td>$112,500</td>
<td>$450,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$1,913,345</td>
<td>$1,913,345</td>
<td>$1,913,345</td>
<td>$1,913,347</td>
<td>$7,653,352</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TO: Chair Sean Strickland and Members of the Community Services Committee

DATE: January 29, 2013

FILE CODE: S13-30

SUBJECT: COMMUNITY HOMELESSNESS PREVENTION INITIATIVE – BUSINESS CASE

RECOMMENDATION:

THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve and submit the attached business case for additional Community Homelessness Prevention Initiative base funding of $1,175,000 from the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing, as outlined in report SS-13-006, dated January 29, 2013.

SUMMARY:

Recent reports to Council (SS-12-044, SS-12-050 and SS-13-001) have detailed the Community Homelessness Prevention Initiative (CHPI) background, program expectations, funding and plan for 2013/14. These reports have identified the funding reduction caused by the capping of emergency shelter funding at the same time as there has been a significant increase in emergency shelter usage in Waterloo Region. At the January 8, 2013 Community Services Committee it was identified in report SS-13-001 that Region Staff would prepare and submit for the Committee’s consideration a Business Case seeking additional 100% provincial funding. This report seeks approval of the business case for additional CHPI base funding of $1,175,000, being the difference between 2012 actual Emergency Hostel Services subsidy from the Province of $3,344,972 and the $2,170,523 provided for Emergency Hostel Services in CHPI base funding.

REPORT:

The CHPI allocation for each Service Manager is comprised of a combination of base funding from the previous five programs now consolidated under CHPI and a needs-based allocation. Base funding (the focus of this report) is a combination of:

- A Service Manager’s 2011/12 funding allocations under the previous capped programs (Consolidated Homelessness Prevention Program, Provincial Rent Bank, Emergency Energy Fund and the Domiciliary Hostel Program); and,
- A Service Manager’s three year average (2009, 2010, 2011) of expenditures for the previously uncapped Emergency Hostel Services. The Province has explained that the three year average was utilized to account for changes in demand for these services over time.

The Region of Waterloo has submitted Business Cases to the Ministry of Community and Social Services (MCSS) related to its capped homelessness prevention programs (Consolidated Homelessness Prevention Program, Emergency Energy Fund and the Domiciliary Hostel Program) for the past five years (SS-08-011, SS-09-007, SS-10-012, SS-11-019, and SS-12-014) due to continued pressure within the homelessness prevention programs. While the Provincial annual allocation for these programs did not increase, the Region was successful in obtaining in year funding to mitigate pressures. Provincial funding for these programs has been consolidated into the
The calculation of Emergency Hostel Services into CHPI means that the funding is now capped. Using a three year average to calculate funding for Emergency Hostel Services within the CHPI base does not take into consideration the continued increase in demand in Waterloo Region. While emergency shelter use in many municipalities was either holding steady or decreasing from 2009-2011, emergency shelter use in Waterloo Region has increased sharply over 2011 and 2012. This increase of 24% appears to be largely due to economic pressures in households as a residual effect of the recession (during the recession, Waterloo Region moved from having one of the lowest unemployment rates in Canada to having the second highest unemployment rate in Canada).

The chart below shows Emergency Hostel Services subsidy funding levels from MCSS (provincial share) to Waterloo Region from 2009 to 2012:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emergency Hostel Services - Year</th>
<th>MCSS Subsidy (provincial share)</th>
<th>Three Year Average Calculation Used for CHPI Base Subsidy</th>
<th>Difference Between Base Allocation and Actual Expenditures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>$1,897,365</td>
<td>$2,170,523</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>$1,915,408</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>$2,698,796</td>
<td>($528,273)</td>
<td>$1,175,000 (rounded)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>$3,344,972</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With MMAH using the three year average Emergency Hostel Services subsidy equalling $2,170,523, the Region’s allocation is reduced by $528,273 from the 2011 actual subsidy. When looking at 2012 actual subsidy, the difference between the three year average used to calculate the CHPI base allocation and current expenditures is $1,175,000 (rounded).

The one-time CHPI Transition funding of $1,517,140 from MCSS for 2013/14 relieves some of the pressure in 2013/14 only. This one-time funding will not relieve the pressure created by the gap in base funding in a sustainable way and does not allow the Region to adjust to block funding and manage within the budget allocation. While other Service Managers are able to move ahead in implementing new programs and transition their systems to implement the CHPI Program Guidelines, Waterloo Region will be challenged to manage a significant funding shortfall and system destabilization.

This information, along with a request for an additional $1,175,000 in CHPI funding and explanation of how the funding would be used to realize the objectives of CHPI in Waterloo Region is included in the Business Case (attached as Appendix A).

CORPORATE STRATEGIC PLAN:

Implementing CHPI in Waterloo Region is consistent with the Region’s Corporate Strategic Plan (2011-2014), Focus Area 4: Healthy and Inclusive Communities: to “reduce inequities and enhance community health, safety, inclusion and quality of life”; and specifically, Strategic Objective 4.5 to “work collaboratively to increase the supply and range of affordable housing and reduce homelessness”.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

The Region’s 2013 approved operating budget includes a provision for CHPI of $10,431,322 (includes $7,653,382 in CHPI funding through MMAH, $1,260,800 in Regional contributions, and
$1,517,140 in one-time CHPI Transition funding through MCSS). The CHPI Business Case requests an additional $1,175,000 to be funded entirely by MMAH.

OTHER DEPARTMENT CONSULTATIONS/CONCURRENCE:

The Finance Department has reviewed this report.

ATTACHMENTS

Appendix A       CHPI Business Case for Additional Based Funding Waterloo Region

PREPARED BY:     Lynn Randall, Director, Social Planning, Policy & Program Administration
                 Marie Morrison, Manager, Social Planning

APPROVED BY:     Douglas Bartholomew-Saunders, Commissioner, Social Services
APPENDIX A
CHPI BUSINESS CASE FOR WATERLOO REGION

Regional Municipality of Waterloo

CHPI Business Case
to Support Additional Base Funding

Prepared For:
Province of Ontario
Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing

February 2013

DRAFT
(Pending Regional Council Approval)
1.0 INTRODUCTION

The Regional Municipality of Waterloo (the Region) has been serving as the Consolidated Municipal Service Manager (Service Manager) for Homelessness since 1999. Significant effort across the community, with support of all levels of government, has occurred to create the current housing stability system in Waterloo Region. We understand this system is well regarded across the Province. Through the community’s work in creating and updating All Roads Lead to Home: Homelessness to Housing Stability Strategy for Waterloo Region (the Strategy), the system is well positioned to make use of the flexibilities created within CHPI to further transform the system towards ending homelessness. However, adequate funding from the Province will be required.

This business case provides further information and rationale for the Region’s request for $1,175,000 in additional Community Homelessness Prevention Initiative (CHPI) funding to address shortfalls in the base allocation related to Emergency Shelters.

2.0 COMMUNITY HOMELESSNESS PREVENTION INITIATIVE BACKGROUND

Introduced January 1, 2013, the CHPI consolidates the following five previous homelessness prevention programs under the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing (MMAH):

- Consolidated Homelessness Prevention Program (100% MCSS)
- Provincial Rent Bank Program (100% MMAH)
- Emergency Energy Fund (100% MCSS)
- Emergency Hostel Services (85.8/14.2 cost-shared MCSS)
- Domiciliary Hostel Program (80/20 cost-shared MCSS)

The CHPI allocation for each Service Manager is composed of a combination of base funding from the previous five programs now consolidated under CHPI and a needs-based allocation. Base funding (the area of concern for this business case) is a combination of:

- A Service Manager’s 2011/12 funding allocations under the previous capped programs (Consolidated Homelessness Prevention Program, Provincial Rent Bank, Emergency Energy Fund and the Domiciliary Hostel Program); and,

It is understood that this methodology in calculating the base allocation was intended to be fair and transparent and to maintain Service Managers at previously existing levels of funding. As part of Ministry correspondence regarding CHPI, it was explained that the three year Emergency Hostel Services average was utilized to account for changes in demand for these services over time.

3.0 RATIONALE FOR ADDITIONAL CHPI FUNDING

The area of concern for Waterloo Region is in the results of the approach used to calculate funding for Emergency Hostel Services as it moved from an uncapped to a capped funding envelope. While shelter use in many municipalities was either holding steady or decreasing from 2009-2011, emergency shelter use in Waterloo Region is estimated to have increased 24% over 2011 and 2012.
The chart below shows Emergency Hostel Services subsidy funding levels from MCSS (provincial share) to Waterloo Region from 2009 to 2012:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emergency Hostel Services - Year</th>
<th>MCSS Subsidy (provincial share)</th>
<th>Three Year Average Calculation Used for CHPI Base Subsidy</th>
<th>Difference Between Base Allocation and Actual Expenditures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>$1,897,365</td>
<td>$2,170,523</td>
<td>-*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>$1,915,408</td>
<td></td>
<td>-*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>$2,698,796</td>
<td>($528,273)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>$3,344,972</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>($1,174,499)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With MMAH using the three year average Emergency Hostel Services subsidy equalling $2,170,523, the Region’s allocation is reduced by $528,273 from the 2011 actual subsidy. When looking at 2012 actual subsidy, the difference between the three year average used to calculate the CHPI base allocation and current expenditures is $1,175,000 (rounded).

The one-time CHPI Transition funding of $1,517,140 from MCSS for 2013/14 relieves some of the pressure in 2013/14. This one-time funding will not relieve the pressure created by the gap in base funding in a sustainable way and does not provide sufficient time to transition the system. While other Service Managers are able to move ahead in implementing new programs and transition their systems to implement the CHPI Program Guidelines, Waterloo Region will be challenged to manage a significant funding shortfall and system destabilization.

4.0 REQUEST FOR AND USE OF ADDITIONAL BASE CHPI FUNDING

The Region of Waterloo requests $1,175,000 additional funding in its CHPI allocation.

This funding will be used to address the immediate pressures within Emergency Shelter Solutions service category and then to realize the CHPI Program Objectives Outcomes identified in the Guidelines by further transforming the system towards ending homelessness.

5.0 SUMMARY

Through the Strategy, the Region has clearly identified what is needed to address and end homelessness in Waterloo Region. Housing stability has been identified as a priority area and 100% Regional dollars have been committed to begin taking action. Reduced provincial funding limits, if not prohibits, the ability of the Region to take appropriate action this area. To be successful, in addition to the funding provided by the Region through the property tax base, adequate funding is required from the Province.

Providing additional funding to the Region to address and end homelessness is a sound investment. For every dollar spent, research has proven or estimates that there will be a four to ten dollar savings to the emergency health, social services, and correctional systems. The Region hopes the Ministry will look favorably upon this business case.

Thank you for considering this request.
TO: Chair Sean Strickland and Members of the Community Services Committee

DATE: January 29, 2013

FILE CODE: P07-80

SUBJECT: REGION OF WATERLOO PUBLIC HEALTH’S RADON HEALTH PROMOTION INITIATIVE

RECOMMENDATION:

For information.

SUMMARY:

Radon is a naturally occurring radioactive gas released from soil. When radon is released from the ground into the outdoor air, it becomes diluted to low concentrations and is not a concern. However, in enclosed spaces (such as a home), radon can sometimes accumulate to elevated levels, which can present a health risk with long-term exposure.

Indoor exposure to radon is the second leading cause of lung cancer after smoking\(^1\) overall. Radon in indoor air is an emerging public health issue, for which agencies such as Health Canada and the Ontario Lung Association have recently begun educational campaigns.

It is currently not possible to determine geographical areas of risk for radon. Both new and older construction can contain indoor air radon at varying levels. The only definite way to determine whether a dwelling has an elevated level of radon is to test for it. Data has begun emerging about the levels of radon in indoor air across Canada and Ontario. A recent Health Canada study estimated that 7% of homes sampled in Canada and 8.2% of homes sampled in Ontario had radon concentrations above the Health Canada guideline of 200 Bq/m\(^3\). In Waterloo Region, there were 101 homes tested, and 4 homes (approximately 4%) were above the guideline.\(^2\)

As a preventative measure, Region of Waterloo Public Health is proposing a Radon Health Promotion Initiative to increase public knowledge about radon and ways to protect their health. This initiative is comprised of three parts: increasing awareness and knowledge of radon and its associated health risk; promoting radon testing; and promoting radon mitigation as needed. It is recommended that testing be performed in dwellings, and in the lowest lived-in area of a home or building and where a person would spend more than 4 hours per day.\(^3\) It is expected that the higher up a person lives in a building, the less exposure to radon a person will have.

REPORT:

Background Information

Radon is produced by the decay of small amounts of naturally occurring uranium in soil and is a colourless, odourless, and tasteless radioactive gas. Radon can enter a home any place it finds
an opening where the home contacts the soil, such as through cracks in foundation walls and in floor slabs, construction joints, gaps around service pipes and support posts, floor drains and sumps, etc. Radon can build up to elevated levels within the enclosed space of a home, with levels typically highest during the winter months as windows and doors are usually kept closed.

The health risk linked to exposure to radon in indoor air is an elevated risk for lung cancer. The risk of lung cancer for smokers is significant due to the combined effects of radon and smoking. It is estimated that non-smokers who are exposed to elevated levels of radon over their lifetime have a 1 in 20 chance of developing lung cancer and that smokers with similar exposures have a 1 in 3 chance of developing lung cancer. Radon is estimated to cause approximately 16% of lung cancers in Canada.

It is very difficult to determine geographical areas of risk for radon. Homes and buildings across Canada, whether of newer or older construction, contain radon at varying levels. The only definite way to determine whether a home or building has an elevated level of radon is to test for it. It is recommended that testing be performed in the lowest lived-in area of a home or building and where a person would spend more than 4 hours per day. It is expected that the higher up a person lives in a building, the less exposure to radon a person will have.

A two-year study entitled "Cross-Canada Survey of Radon Concentrations in Homes" was conducted by Health Canada’s National Radon Program (published March 2012). Overall, 13,976 homes were tested in Canada and 3,891 homes were tested in Ontario. According to provincial exposure estimates from the survey, 7% of homes sampled in Canada and 8.2% of homes sampled in Ontario had radon concentrations above the Health Canada guideline of 200 Bq/m³. In Waterloo Region there were 101 homes tested; 4 homes (approximately 4%) were above the guideline.

In order to achieve an overall risk reduction for radon, strategies aimed at radon mitigation are important. The types of mitigation strategies that can be employed are diverse because radon sources, radon concentrations and radon transport mechanisms vary from building to building. The public should be made aware of, and use, trained and certified consultants and building professionals to ensure the efficiency of mitigation actions.

**Provincial Context**

The Ontario Public Health Standards require the Board of Health to increase public awareness of health risk factors associated with indoor air quality and exposure to radiation.

In order to meet the Ontario Public Health Standards and to support Public Health’s efforts with the proposed Radon Health Promotion Initiative, Region of Waterloo Public Health has proactively engaged other federal and provincial health agencies that recognize radon as a growing health concern. Region of Waterloo Public Health is working with Public Health Ontario, Health Canada, the Ontario Lung Association and other Ontario health units. Specifically, Region of Waterloo Public Health has taken a lead in coordinating best-practice and evidence-based radon promotion and prevention strategies among health units in Ontario by forming the Ontario Radon Working Group, which consists of 15 Ontario health units.

Provincially, there was a bill related to radon, Bill 36, which was brought forward on February 23rd, 2012 for its first reading. This process was interrupted when Parliament was prorogued. Bill 36, the Radon Awareness and Prevention Act, 2012, aimed to raise awareness about radon,
establish and operate an Ontario Radon Registry and reduce radon levels in dwellings and workplaces by amending the 1992 Building Code Act.

Public Health’s Radon Health Promotion Initiative

The highest levels of indoor air radon are expected in the winter months and thus Region of Waterloo Public Health is launching its Radon Health Promotion Initiative this winter. The three main parts of this initiative include:

1. Increasing awareness and knowledge of radon and its associated health risk;
2. Promoting radon testing; and
3. Promoting radon mitigation when necessary.

In order to achieve the three main parts of Public Health’s initiative, Public Health has worked to create different types of materials and methods to promote the initiative. Public Health’s website has been updated to include information about radon (www.regionofwaterloo.ca/radon). A radon information booklet entitled “Radon - What You Need to Know” was created along with advertisements for digital screens within Regional Buildings and for Facebook.

To evaluate the Radon Health Promotion Initiative, a radon survey has been developed. This survey was first run from September 2012-December 2012 (pre-initiative) to assess the public’s knowledge about radon and behaviour around radon testing. The radon survey will be run again from September 2013-December 2013 (post-initiative) to help determine the impact that the initiative has had on the public’s perception of radon.

Potential Implications for Regional and Community Partners

Public Health’s awareness-raising campaign, as well as Bill 36, may have implications for municipal government and Regional and community partners who may be asked whether they intend to test for radon and mitigate as needed. As a result, Public Health has engaged Regional, as well as other municipal and community partners, to inform them about radon and Public Health’s Radon Health Promotion Initiative. Public Health has sent radon information to the following partners in the Region of Waterloo:

- Universities and colleges;
- Hospitals;
- School boards (Public, Catholic, French Public, and French Catholic);
- Long-term care facilities and;
- Child-care centres.

Furthermore, Public Health has met and shared radon information with the following partners:

- Waterloo Region Housing and Facilities Management & Fleet Services Division; and
- By-law departments of the cities and townships in the Region of Waterloo.

Waterloo Region Housing staff will develop a Radon testing program this year focusing on lowest lived-in areas, with any potential budget issues to form part of the 2014 budget process. Where radon levels are of concern, Waterloo Region Housing will initiate remediation options. The Regionally-owned community housing portfolio consists of about 1,180 units with basement spaces (lowest lived areas); these are row housing units, as well as single and semi-detached units. There are no Regionally-owned self-contained basement units. Only 2 of the 29 apartment buildings managed by Waterloo Region may also form part of the testing program;
these 2 buildings have basement levels that are accessible to tenants and contractors for either storage or laundry services. Waterloo Region Housing also plans to communicate their plan to all Waterloo Region Housing tenants with Public Health’s assistance. Tenants in units with basement spaces have always been advised, and will be reminded again, that this space is not to be used for occupancy purposes.

In addition, Facilities Management & Fleet Services, in consultation with Corporate Health & Safety, will develop and begin implementation of a Radon testing program for the remainder of the Region’s buildings in 2013.

Region of Waterloo Public Health will be assisting our partners by:

- Creating and distributing a radon information booklet for the public and for municipal and community partners containing key information about radon, how to test for radon and how to ensure proper mitigation for radon;
- Preparing a Frequently Asked Questions document for Regional partners addressing common questions likely to be posed by the general public regarding radon;
- Adding a new radon section with informational resources to Public Health’s website and;
- Facilitating access to further resources as needed for our partners.

Conclusion

Region of Waterloo Public Health’s Radon Health Promotion Initiative aims to increase awareness and knowledge of radon and its associated health risk and promote radon testing and mitigation amongst the general public. This initiative will help Region of Waterloo Public Health meet the Ontario Public Health Standards and will ultimately help reduce radon risk within the Region of Waterloo. As new information on radon becomes available from provincial and federal agencies, Region of Waterloo Public Health will make on-going developments to our Radon Program.

CORPORATE STRATEGIC PLAN:

Supports:

**Focus Area 4:** Healthy and Inclusive Communities - Foster healthy, safe, inclusive and caring communities.

**Focus Area 5:** Service Excellence - Deliver excellent and responsive services that inspire public trust.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

NIL

OTHER DEPARTMENT CONSULTATIONS/CONCURRENCE:

Waterloo Region Housing
Facilities Management & Fleet Services
Corporate Health & Safety

ATTACHMENTS:
PREPARED BY:  Claire Paller, Graduate Student Public Health Planner  
Marla Rocca, Public Health Inspector  
Dr. Hsiu-Li Wang, Associate Medical Officer of Health  

APPROVED BY:  Dr. Liana Nolan, Commissioner/Medical Officer of Health  


http://www.epa.gov/radon/healthrisks.html  


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting date</th>
<th>Requestor</th>
<th>Request</th>
<th>Assigned Department</th>
<th>Anticipated Response Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27-Nov-12</td>
<td>S. Strickland</td>
<td>That the matter of mandatory CPR and AED training for all Regional employees be referred to staff to report back with options for a Health &amp; Safety staff training policy.</td>
<td>Public Health/Human Resources</td>
<td>Jun-2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>