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INTRODUCTION TO THE RESEARCH

This research explores the ways in which local governments support community economic development (CED) and social economy (SE) activities. It aims to identify the roles that local governments play in promoting the CED and SE sector and to highlight innovative examples of this support. The research focused on local governments in British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan, Manitoba, and Northern Ontario.

Though a diversity of activities was evident prior to undertaking the research, this project further illuminates the wide range of undertakings in which Canadian local governments in the study region are engaged. The research highlights what these local governments are doing and how their involvement in CED and SE activities assists in addressing the complex challenges they face in the current socio-political-economic climate.

Almost all of the local governments interviewed in the study region are active in CED and the SE sector, although not in a homogeneous manner. This research identified seven common roles in which local governments engage to advance CED and SE efforts. Based on the research findings, members of the research team also developed six general frameworks of engagement that they felt reflected the types of interactions and relationships local governments employ when supporting and interacting with CED and SE organizations. Further, the research describes specific examples of local government involvement with CED and SE actors and activities.

It is hoped that dissemination of these research findings will encourage dialogue among local governments and support further engagement in the CED and SE sector. Local governments play an important role in supporting healthy and resilient individuals and communi-
ties, and CED and SE activities can make a significant contribution to this. It is also hoped that sharing this knowledge will inspire local governments to learn from and build on the ideas and successes generated in other jurisdictions.

The report begins with an introduction to the research, the research background, the rationale, an overview of the scope of the study, and a summary of research definitions and concepts.

The second section of the report focuses on analysis. It describes the frameworks of engagement and highlights a specific local government example of each framework. It also outlines the seven roles that local governments can play to advance CED and SE activities, along with several examples from local governments of various sizes. This is followed by a brief qualitative analysis of research findings based on size and a quantitative summary of the involvement of various sized local governments in a range of CED and SE activities. The final section of the report includes a reflection on current opportunities for strengthening support of CED and SE activities, followed by concluding comments.

**Research Background**

This project was funded by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada through a Community University Research Alliance integrated at a national level by The Canadian Social Economy Research Partnership. The project involved collaboration between two nodes of the cross-Canada partnership — one encompassing British Columbia and Alberta and the other, Northern Ontario, Manitoba, and Saskatchewan.

The research question central to this study is: What do local government supports of CED and SE activities look like in the BC, Alberta, Saskatchewan, Manitoba, and Northern Ontario context?

Researchers conducted twenty-two interviews with local governments with populations of thirty thousand or less in each of the five provinces. They conducted ten interviews (two local governments from each province in the study area) with local governments with populations of between thirty thousand and half a million, and six interviews with local governments with populations over half a million.
**Why Does This Research Matter?**

As the level of government closest to people and communities, local governments can play a lead role in supporting CED/SE and can also have considerable impact upon and influence over CED/SE activities. As the role of local government evolves, so too does the need to explore the changing ways in which it supports CED and the SE. In the past, relatively little attention has been paid to the role of local governments because of their subordinate relationship with provincial governments. Yet the scope of services delivered at the local level has increased. As communities are faced with challenging, cross-sectoral issues such as homelessness, neighbourhood decline, and community safety, which require integrated, place-based responses, local governments are often well positioned to deliver effective solutions. Financing and funding these solutions, however, remains challenging as local governments are limited in their ability to generate revenue and must look to the provincial and federal level for this support. The new direct relationship between cities and the federal government includes some transfers of federal funds to municipalities (such as the GST rebate, gas tax, green infrastructure funds, and some heritage and cultural funding). Together, these structural changes have increased the scope of municipal control and created opportunities for investment in CED and SE activities. This study explores the role of local government in this new context.

The current focus on sustainability has also contributed to a policy climate in which many local governments are recognizing the need for integrated, cross-sectoral solutions. This is further supported with a related focus on climate change and the environment. Local governments are exploring the social, environmental, and economic opportunities that could be garnered through projects such as energy retrofitting or the creation of local green-energy systems such as wind farms, biomass generation, and planned sustainable communities. In addition, the recent focus on poverty-reduction legislation at the federal, provincial, and municipal levels of government has created yet another opportunity for CED and SE approaches to be considered as frameworks for an effective response.

Finally, a shift to a more integrated, holistic approach in community planning has created an opportunity for alignment between local government planning and a CED/SE approach. For instance, a movement away from continued decentralized greenfield development towards a greater focus on revitalizing downtown areas through mixed-use infill development and increased density creates an opening for CED and SE practitioners to contribute to an effective solution. This shift in focus has led many within local government to look at
the social factors that contribute to decay of the downtown area and try to create responsive strategies and plans that incorporate social, economic, and environmental elements, providing another conduit for local government support of CED and the SE.

**Research Limitations**

There is an underlying assumption in this research that CED and SE approaches that integrate social, economic, and environmental considerations produce beneficial results, particularly for people and communities currently marginalized from the economic mainstream. The research does not analyse different CED and SE theories or the merits of these methods as alternative economic solutions. Rather we look to CED and SE as development strategies that are used within the larger context of the mainstream capitalist economy to benefit individuals and communities.

CED and the SE sector can support innovative responses to the increasingly complex social and economic challenges faced by local governments. CED and SE approaches and organizations acknowledge the interplay among social, environmental, and economic development, and incorporate a holistic approach to local economic development that can address some of these challenges more effectively.

Researchers interviewed local government staff and/or management and in rare cases elected officials, but not CED and SE practitioners. Their perceptions of municipal support for CED and SE are thus not included in this research.

As well, although many First Nations communities face challenges similar to local governments, they are often excluded from studies on local governments as their history, structure, purpose, and activities are different from other local governments. Since no members of the research team were experts in First Nations governance, we acknowledge that this paper is focused mainly on local governments to the exclusion of First Nations. However, because the research team felt that it was important to include some examples from a First Nations context part way into the research, we sought out First Nations groups and invited them to participate via the same methods as local governments. In the end, one First Nations group became part of the study. We acknowledge the limitations of this small sample and suggest that a further study focused solely on CED, SE, and First Nations governments would result in much more informative results than this research offers.
The research revealed many innovative and excellent examples of support for CED and SE activities among the local governments interviewed. This made it challenging to determine which examples to highlight. The researchers chose to expose less well-known examples and communities, but also to ensure a balance of cases from variously sized municipalities and communities across the study range — Northern Ontario, Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta, and BC. In order to achieve this exposure of new communities and a balance of provincial representation, we have had to leave out some outstanding examples. To compensate for this, all the cases discovered in the interviews have been included in Appendix I: Role Example List.

**Definitions and Concepts**

A common and easily understood definition of CED and SE was critical for creating a cohesive research project and developing the municipal frameworks. Although we recognize that there are important and fluid distinctions between the CED and SE sector, we have chosen to define and refer to the sectors in a broadly inclusive fashion. For this reason, and also to maintain consistency, throughout this report we refer to “CED and SE” (actors, organizations, activities, projects, etc) or to “the CED and the SE sector.” The following section elaborates on some of the definitions and concepts adhered to in this research study. The terms community economic development and social economy have many conceptualizations; a common understanding of these terms was required both for the research team members and the interview participants. The researchers agreed on a set of definitions, which was then circulated to the interviewees with the interview questions prior to the interview.

CED can be understood as action by people locally to create economic opportunities and better social conditions, particularly for those who are most disadvantaged. Its characteristics are illuminated by the “Neechi Principles” articulated by Neechi Foods in Winnipeg, an Aboriginal worker-owned grocery store the principles of which have been adopted by the Province of Manitoba in its CED Policy Framework (Neechi 1993). These include:

- using local goods and services
- producing goods and services for local use
- reinvesting profits locally
- employing local residents on a long-term basis
• developing local skills
• keeping decision making and ownership local
• encouraging and maintaining a healthy citizenry (physical, mental, and emotional)
• creating a positive physical environment (sustainable, stable, and healthy neighbourhood)
• maintaining neighbourhood stability
• fostering human dignity (improving people’s capacity to better themselves)
• supporting other community economic development projects

The SE can be understood as a third sector co-existing with the private and public sectors. It includes organizations such as co-operatives, voluntary organizations, nonprofits, and social enterprises. According to the Canadian Social Economy Hub (2008), SE “foundational principles” include:

• locally-based, community “ownership”
• “democratic,” member-based control and power over decision making
• values of mutualism, collectivity, and reciprocal interdependence
• social, socio-political, and economic benefits of activities, not solely market-based profit maximization
• autonomous management of enterprises and organizations
• primacy of persons and work over economic capital and profits
• an emphasis on the importance of social capital in producing healthy societies
• principles of participation and empowerment
• sustainable, equitable, and “fair” economic and political practices
• strong links among citizens, communities, and government

Local governments are the unit of study in this research project. This report conceptualizes local government as: “a government, other than the federal or provincial government, which: has jurisdiction over a defined territory; is governed by a body which is locally elected, either directly or indirectly; and has the power to impose property taxes either directly, indirectly, or conditionally” (Bish and Clemens 1999). This subprovincial unit of governance is most commonly divided into incorporated local governments and unincorporated districts or regions and is alternatively referred to as a county, township, rural municipality, hamlet, village, town, or city (Diamant and Pike 1994). It is helpful to note that these names do not describe corresponding entities or duties from one province to the next, or, sometimes, even within one province (Diamant and Pike 1994).
Frameworks for Understanding Local Government CED and SE Relationships

This research identified six frameworks for understanding local government relationships and modes of interaction. The frameworks describe the various types of interactions/relationships that can and do occur between government and CED and SE actors. The term “frameworks” (rather than models) is used because they are descriptive rather than prescriptive. The frameworks describe what was happening in some places at the time the research was conducted. There is no value attributed to any particular framework. Rather, the focus is on understanding how each framework shapes the interaction between local governments and CED and SE actors.

The frameworks are also not mutually exclusive, especially in larger and more complex local government structures, which often revealed a variety of approaches and relationships. While one framework may be found in one functional area (i.e., affordable housing), another may be found when engaging in activities in another functional area (i.e., social enterprise finance). The frameworks are intended to enhance local governments’ strategic consideration of their developmental role in their communities and the ways in which they can best work to support the local CED and SE sector. At the same time, the frameworks are intended to help CED and SE actors understand how best to engage with, influence, and access resources within local government.

The Six Frameworks

The following section describes the six frameworks in abstract and general terms.

Solitudes
The “Solitudes” framework describes a situation in which there are no relationships between local government and CED and SE actors. We did not actually observe any instances of municipalities that can be characterized this way, but it provides a useful starting point and
contrast for the analysis that follows. Figure 1, below, shows three actors: the local government, CED and SE actors, and actors from other sectors such as business, education, health, etc. There are no lines of interaction connecting these actors; they operate in solitude.

Figure 1: Solitudes

Coffee Shop
The “Coffee Shop” framework most often applies to small local governments, where everyone knows each other, where people may assume multiple, intersecting roles, where conversations among them are frequent and informal, and resources from these diverse sources are easily and organically harnessed for creative community solutions. This is not to say that this framework cannot be seen in larger municipalities, and may be common when a particular area of activity is in its infancy. Figure 2, opposite page, depicts the intersection of roles. It may be that a mayor is also the head of a nonprofit, a councillor is the town store owner, the school principal is also a local farmer, and the town doctor volunteers as the manager of the local hockey rink. Conflicts of interest can naturally arise in such situations and must be properly handled to ensure openness, fairness, and compliance with the law. But as anyone who has reflected on inter-organizational practice knows, such fluid boundaries are invaluable for promoting the sharing of information and resources and mobilizing collective community action. This framework implies a high level of mutual understanding, an organic
process, and less reliance on formal policies. It is often accompanied by exchanges of in-kind contributions and close co-operation on human resources and social development programs.

Partnering

The “Partnering” framework applies in those instances where the actors are relatively large, formal, and well established, and are each able to bring specialized expertise and resources to the table. Partnerships need to be founded on trust, but they may also require formal municipal agreements to specify roles and responsibilities. Depending on the type of partnership, there may be exchanges or sharing of resources (funding, in-kind, information, and procurement). Local governments may play a central role in initiating the partnership, or the impetus may come from the community. It is important to appreciate the not all partnerships are equally inclusive; CED and SE actors may play a central role in the partnership, or may be excluded completely. Both possibilities are shown in Figure 3, below.
**Linking and Leveraging**

Actions at the local level are often shaped by external forces. In the municipal context, this is especially common with regard to external sources of funding and other resources. The “Linking and Leveraging” framework illustrated below depicts a specific type of local partnership that is established primarily to access external resources. For example, local governments sometimes need to demonstrate that they have local partners in order to apply for funds from higher-level governments. Local financial and in-kind resources are often required to match the external support. Local governments and CED and SE actors also may collaborate in planning, research, and advocacy efforts to attract the attention of external agencies. However, while “Linking and Leveraging” partnerships may have short-term and relatively specific goals, they can also form the basis for more sustained collective action at the local level. The success of local actors in attracting external funding and other resources, and how effectively they use them, depend partly on the qualities of the local “Linking and Leveraging” partnership.

![Diagram of Linking and Leveraging](image)

*Figure 4: Linking and Leveraging*

**Internally Integrated**

Advocates of sustainable and integrated local development have long recognized the challenges of co-ordinating the activities and actions of the different functional departments that make up larger local governments. To implement a progressive procurement policy, for example, finance, materials management, public works, and community development may all
need to be involved. As depicted in Figure 5, this framework describes a kind of “internal coffee shop,” often achieved through working groups or cross-departmental project teams. The “Internally Integrated” framework can be particularly effective for achieving organizational transformation within local government, but the challenge for external actors, including those in the CED and SE sector, is to understand how to access these internal decision-making forums so that any integrated vision is not imposed in a top-down fashion.

How Can We Help?
The “How Can We Help?” framework identified in this research and illustrated in Figure 6 is one in which local government responds to requests from networks of CED and SE actors (which may include others from sectors such as education, health, and business). These networks may be area or sector based. For example, they may be structured around a neighbourhood revitalization program, or involve all actors in a given sector such as affordable housing. The role of CED and SE actors here is to effectively communicate their needs to local government, which in turn responds with strategic and focused interventions (i.e., land use planning, procurement, or financial and in-kind contributions).
To summarize, the frameworks presented here are not intended to be mutually exclusive or prescriptive. Each framework has strengths and weaknesses, and each framework may not work in a given context. Based on our analysis of the interview data, they describe and build understanding of the ways that local governments and CED and SE actors can and do interact with each other to share resources and build stronger communities.

**Examples of Five Frameworks in Action**

In order to further illustrate these frameworks and to ground them in the research findings, the remaining pages of this section on Frameworks for Understanding Local Government describe examples of the frameworks drawn from the research interviews. Efforts were made to ensure the selected examples illustrated an array of roles played by local governments, while balancing the representation of each province in the study area and local government size. As noted above, there were no municipalities interviewed for this project that exemplified the “Solitudes” approach.

*Coffee Shop — Nipigon, Ontario*

The “Coffee Shop” framework is discernable in local governments where staff, elected officials, and community actors have intersecting roles, a high level of mutual understanding, and rely little on formal policies. It can be signified by in-kind contributions and co-operation on human resources, social development, and planning.

Nipigon, in Northern Ontario, is an example of a municipality that illustrates the “Coffee Shop” framework. Nipigon is located along the northern shore of Lake Superior and has a population of 1,752. Communities in this area relied on the mills and the booming forest trade for employment, but with the economic downturn, the crash of the forestry industry, and the loss of Nipigon’s mill to a fire three years ago, there has been a lot of out-migration from the community. Nipigon found that though neighbouring communities (both other local governments and First Nations) had a history of competition with one another, they now frequently work together on projects aiming to increase tourism, both formally (for example, through joint applications to get fishing shows in the area) and informally (for example, by using political pressure to improve the provision of local health services).

Nipigon is just beginning to see the scope and potential for municipal action in CED and the SE. Traditionally, CED and SE projects were passed around from one person to the next
as they did not fit into existing job descriptions and no time was allocated to them. Now, through informal dialogues and on the suggestion of a Lakehead University professor, Nipigon is partnering with the university’s tourism program creating opportunities for fourth-year tourism students to do research projects for the municipality. One current project is a marketing plan based on the “Paddle to the Sea” theme around which the town is orienting its downtown revitalization efforts. The Paddle to the Sea theme originates from a children’s book of that title in which narration begins at Lake Nipigon. The town has created an interactive park based on Paddle to the Sea, improving the park’s physical structure, landscaping, green areas, and benches.

The Nipigon interviewee noted that a keen awareness of the histories among people is an asset to local government in small communities. Relationships provide a common point of reference that facilitate the personal connections that are key to successful operation of the “Coffee Shop” framework.

**Partnering — Edmonton, Alberta**

Local governments utilizing a “Partnering” framework to support CED and SE activities contribute internal resources and/or expertise and partner with external stakeholders to achieve desired outcomes. This type of approach is found most commonly when there are strong and trusting relationships between local government representatives and community partners. Several CED and SE initiatives/projects in Edmonton effectively illustrate a “Partnering” framework.

The development of the Social Enterprise Fund is one example. A social enterprise is a type of business venture that has a social purpose at its core. Like any business, social enterprises are designed to be profitable or at least to break even over a given period of time, yet they combine a social mission with their business model. Social enterprises can face challenges securing funding and/or financing as they often do not qualify for traditional grants and may not meet the requirements of traditional financing institutions.

Responding to local market research indicating significant and unmet demand for financing for local social enterprises and affordable housing development, Edmonton’s Community Services Department worked with the Edmonton Community Foundation on the development of a financing organization that could respond to this need. The Social Enterprise Fund provides financing and assistance to social enterprises and affordable housing
projects. Its core products are loans (primarily bridge financing) and development support including educational seminars, “path-to-loan” grants, and technical assistance grants for business planning.

The City of Edmonton and the Edmonton Community Foundation committed $3 million each towards the capitalization of the fund. In addition to this, there was agreement to seek additional financial support. The goal was to develop a sustainable fund by allocating 38 percent of the capital investment to market investments. The interest earned on these investments would contribute to the operating costs of the organization. The remaining dollars invested would be used for affordable housing mortgages, interim financing, patient capital loans, and grants for technical assistance.

Both organizations also worked on the development of the governance structure for the Social Enterprise Fund, reviewing a number of organizational options. The final result was the development of a Part Nine (Nonprofit) Company. In addition to allowing for investments in charitable organizations, this structure also enables investment in non-charitable entities, thereby providing maximum flexibility to the organization. Representatives of both the City of Edmonton and the Edmonton Community Foundation sit on the board of directors of the Part Nine Company. A detailed memorandum of understanding was also developed to formally outline key conditions, roles, and responsibilities.

In addition to the example of the Social Enterprise Fund, the City of Edmonton has also worked in partnership with key community stakeholders on the development and implementation of Edmonton’s 10-Year Plan to End Homelessness and the REACH Report — “Building a Culture of Community Safety in Edmonton in One Generation.”

*Linking and Leveraging — Winnipeg, Manitoba*

The “Linking and Leveraging” framework highlights local government efforts to engage in partnerships to access external resources. In this way, local government works with others to leverage additional resources, often from other levels of government, to address some of their challenging issues. The City of Winnipeg offers an example of this framework.

In 2003, the City of Winnipeg, the Province of Manitoba, and the Government of Canada signed a memorandum of understanding for an Urban Development Agreement for the City of Winnipeg called the Winnipeg Partnership Agreement. The agreement focuses on encouraging community and economic growth within Winnipeg and providing all citi-
zens opportunities for full participation in the economy and society. This agreement lever-aged significant resources for the city. Together, the three orders of government committed $75 million over five years to strengthen and support long-term, sustainable community and economic development.

The city is working with a range of organizations through the Winnipeg Partnership Agreement to strengthen and support CED and SE work. The agreement makes specific reference to CED and the SE within the Building Sustainable Neighbourhoods component, highlighting CED and SE strategies and initiatives for advancing community revitalization efforts.

Another core component of the Winnipeg Partnership Agreement focuses on Aboriginal participation. Again, by leveraging the resources of other orders of government through the agreement, the city is able to support a range of community-based organizations working to increase employment opportunities and promote economic development for Winnipeg’s Aboriginal people. The Aboriginal community has played a leading role in the development and implementation of this program. Funding has been provided to projects driven and implemented by the Aboriginal community.

The Aboriginal Participation Program component has a strong focus on the development of human and social capital. Two examples highlight these efforts. Funding was provided to support the Youth in Community Services program, a partnership between the Centre for Aboriginal Human Resource Development and the City of Winnipeg. Its goal is to provide improved employment opportunities to forty at-risk Aboriginal youth, who will receive training to become recreation technicians and instructor guards with the city. A second example is the Bus Operators Outreach Program, which is designed to recruit Aboriginal people to become bus operators with Winnipeg Transit. The program focuses on increasing awareness of and interest in the opportunities, benefits, salary, working conditions, qualifications, and selection process to become transit employees.

The City of Winnipeg provides much of its support for the CED and SE through the Winnipeg Partnership Agreement, which epitomizes the “Linking and Leveraging” framework. The agreement leverages both resources and linkages with key community partners, specifically recognizing the roles of CED and SE activities and providing significant funding to CED and SE organizations and projects.
Internally Integrated — Mission, British Columbia

The “Internally Integrated” approach involves the co-ordination of activities and actions from different departments, often via internal municipal project teams and working groups, which can result in organizational change within local government. Mission, a municipality located about one hundred kilometres east of Vancouver, has a population of approximately thirty-five thousand. Mission strikes the fine balance between the diversification and co-ordination of roles required for the “Internally Integrated” approach.

Mission has developed in-house capacity by supporting the roles of social officer, economic officer, and environmental officer as opposed to contracting out to an Economic Development Corporation. In addition to co-ordinating with their municipal colleagues, each officer works with a committee and a commission dedicated to their issues. The officers also partner with Community Futures and service clubs, and frequently leverage funding together. They have recently integrated social, economic, and environmental aspects into Mission’s Official Community Plan, Development Plan, and Economic Development Strategy.

In one of their CED and SE related projects, Mission has taken on an unusual role for a local government — that of restorative justice program co-ordinator. The municipality hosts the program, dedicates staff time to it, and receives funding and expertise from community partners. Mission partners with the University of the Fraser Valley to bring in students from the Criminal Justice Program to do practicums in the city’s restorative justice program. The city provides a hundred hours of training on restorative justice facilitation to twenty-five community members a year. In other social CED and SE related initiatives, Mission is involved in equity-based hiring, having signed onto the provincial initiative to increase the hiring of people with disabilities by 10 percent by 2010.

Mission is involved in many economic CED and SE related initiatives. Working with their Downtown Task Force, Mission borrowed an idea from another BC town, Nanaimo, and hosted a “paint the town” event in which community members, including local politicians, painted buildings downtown using a shared colour scheme. The Social Development Plan provides for creating town squares and shared spaces where people feel comfortable, as well as communicating the city’s intention to foster community enterprises (though this is in its infancy).

Mission also has a Business Improvement Area within which the city levies a tax on busi-
nesses to create funding to maintain the downtown. There is also an area downtown where a revitalization tax exemption applies. If businesses make improvements of more than $15,000, they don’t pay municipal taxes on the value of the improvements for the first five years. Thereafter, taxes increase by 20 percent each year until market rates are reached.

Mission has hosted two forums on accessibility in the community. One outcome was the identification of a need for more accessible, affordable, and seniors’ housing. Mission has included an “Affordable and Accessible Statement” in its Official Community Plan, and council now requests that affordable housing components be included in new developments.

Many of Mission’s forays into CED and SE collaboration revolve around the environment. Mission’s Environmental Charter has several short- and long-term goals that involve working with community groups to enhance their initiatives. Borrowing an idea from the neighbouring community of Maple Ridge, Mission is now working with Ecosystem Restoration Associates to restore their local ecosystem. Mission also purchases from companies working to become carbon neutral by planting trees in public places. The community has a tree-farming license and estimates that once invasive species are removed, 120,000 trees could be planted in the area, potentially providing for a future community-run resource. The municipality sells backyard composters and rain barrels to community members at cost and is researching the potential for capturing methane gas from the local landfill for energy use.

Using another idea picked up from the neighbouring municipality of Agassiz, Mission supported farmers looking to increase their income and worked with groups in the Fraser Basin to get people out to farms to purchase directly from farmers. Nearby local governments in Abbotsford, Agassiz, Maple Ridge, Pitt Meadows, and Chilliwack then worked with Mission to create a circle farm tour, which included about nine farms around Mission and sixty on the whole tour (neighbouring community Langley joined the tour a year after first inception). The local governments pooled their finances, leveraged this money, and then used it to create a regional brochure.

Mission also put together a bid to a Vancouver film company that wanted to make a documentary on a community undertaking the “100 Mile Diet” challenge based on the popular book of that title. The bid was successful. The city held public information meetings about the challenge and signed up about eighty participants, who took up the challenge from June to September 2008. The documentary later aired on the Canadian Food Network.
Mission truly exemplifies the “Internally Integrated” approach. The community demonstrates well how co-ordinating the activities of different departments via internal project teams and working groups can result in organizational change within local government and ultimately in benefits to the community, the economy, and the environment.

*How Can We Help? — Saskatoon, Saskatchewan*

The “How Can We Help” framework is one in which local government responds to claims made upon it by networks of CED and SE actors (which may also include actors from other sectors such as education, health, and the private sector). These networks may be area or sector based. For example, they may be structured around a neighbourhood revitalization program or involve all actors in a given sector, such as affordable housing. The role of CED and SE actors here is to effectively communicate their needs to local government, which in turn responds with strategic and focused interventions (be it land-use planning, procurement, or financial and in-kind contributions).

In this approach, the municipality is not as apt to actually take on or lead projects itself, but instead will offer financing, planning research, and general advice to help create successful CED and SE projects and initiatives. The City of Saskatoon is particularly strong in this role and has programs aimed at supporting and strengthening existing community organizations as well as their initiatives and projects. As one municipal employee stated, “Saskatoon is really open-minded for ideas coming out of the community.”

The City of Saskatoon has a strong relationship with QUINT, a local CED organization engaged in neighbourhood renewal in Saskatoon’s five core areas. Saskatoon views working with groups like QUINT as beneficial to the city in its efforts to meet social goals. The city has supported QUINT with a number of initiatives and views its relationship with the CED organization as “deferring authority to a local body [running] autonomous to the city.” In this model, the municipality is aware that supporting CED and SE actors enables it to accomplish many of its own goals. The city helps by providing financial supports, research, or city land.

This was the case in the Station 20 West project, an inner-city development that was to include a grocery store, offices for nonprofits, a community enterprise centre, and affordable housing. Station 20 West was a project initiated by QUINT and other inner-city organizations. When the city was approached for assistance, it contributed by assembling the land
and undertaking environmental cleanup of the site. The land was then offered to the groups for one dollar. The city also planned to contribute to the success of the development by building a library and contributing money towards affordable housing development on site. However, a change in the provincial government in 2007 led to the withdrawal of significant provincial capital funds, resulting in a major setback for the Station 20 West project.

Initiatives like the Planning Education Program (PEP) also illustrate the city’s commitment to supporting the community-driven CED and SE revitalization efforts underway in Saskatoon. The PEP helps build capacity in community organizations by supporting them in the solution of their own problems.

We cover all aspects of community planning and development, related by-laws, [and] policies in our official community plan. What we stress is the importance of how to relate to council and how to be involved in the urban development and planning of Saskatoon. So, it opens up city planning entirely to the community and we spend a day with … members of CED [organizations] and we discuss how planning is undertaken and how development occurs in Saskatoon.

The Saskatoon interviewee noted:

If you want to engage the public, you have to inform the public. Otherwise they don’t know how to relate or they don’t even know what a public hearing process is. We found that a lot of the hearings and meetings we attended were unnecessarily focused on what the procedures and processes were, and what the roles of various participants were and what the city could and couldn’t do legally. So we like to clear that all up with the Planning Education Program, and what it does is tends to make our public hearing process smoother and allows people to focus on the specific issue at hand. They then don’t come to the podium and say, “I’m not sure what this is all about” or “I got a letter and I’m not sure what it means.”

While Saskatoon does not have policies that explicitly make mention of CED and SE, the city has a number of policies that in practice support CED and SE activities such as the Enterprise Zone Incentive Policy and the Affordable Housing Policy.

The enterprise zone has been in existence for six years in the seven core areas of Saskatoon. The program aims to create more economic development opportunities and stem
deterioration in the core area through a broad array of supports for incubating new businesses and retaining existing business. The city can provide grants, tax abatement, rebate fees, and changes for development that takes place in the zone to encourage further growth in the core. CED and SE organizations that are engaged in social enterprise qualify for these supports.

In terms of supporting the development of affordable housing within its boundaries, Saskatoon presently provides a 10 percent capital grant for any affordable housing project in the city, with most of the grants going to local nonprofits. Other support includes five-year tax abatements for projects and mortgage support for individuals. On the by-law and policy side, the city has changed many of its by-laws to accommodate affordable housing. The interviewee from Saskatoon commented, “We’ve learned a lot over the last couple of years about the form of affordable housing and the kind of density they need to make numbers work.” This learning was informed by nonprofit housing groups and has led to the creation of new zoning districts, density bonuses, etc., that better facilitate the development of affordable housing.
Local Government Roles

There are a variety of roles that local governments can and do play to advance CED and SE efforts, which in combination support multifaceted solutions to challenges faced at the community level. This research identified seven core roles in which local governments engage to support CED and SE activities. This section describes each role and provides examples drawn from the research.

Expressions of Intent

Expressions of intent supportive of CED and the SE include documents approved by council that guide municipal action. This can include strategic documents, policies, by-laws, and directives. One example of an expression of intent is a policy statement that can support CED and the SE by providing direction to various departments and agents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Small Municipality</th>
<th>Medium Municipality</th>
<th>Large Municipality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salmon Arm, BC</td>
<td>Thunder Bay, ON</td>
<td>Calgary, AB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• developing CED policy</td>
<td>• the Thunder Bay Food Charter supports local, sustainable food systems and CED by prioritization of production, preparation, storage, distribution, and consumption of local food, developing greater opportunities for collaboration between rural and urban areas and supporting a local food system to create greater food security and self-reliance in the region</td>
<td>• triple bottom line policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• downtown revitalization by-law</td>
<td>• five-year tax incentive for downtown business owners making improvements of $70,000+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• developed affordable housing strategy</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Examples of Expressions of Intent
of local government regarding desired practices and outcomes. Local government policies are statements by city council about a discretionary duty or standard of performance outlining what the city will or will not do (City of Edmonton 2009). Policies often address recurrent issues and provide guidelines setting out the level and manner in which the city will perform a service. Table 1, previous page, highlights examples of expressions of intent from the research interviews.

**Financial Support**

Local governments can cultivate CED and SE in their communities through the provision of financial support, which can include program or project funding, financing, incentives such as tax abatement/relief, and financial incentives such as density bonuses and grants. The following examples from the research illustrate local government provision of financial support.

**Small Municipality**
- Greenstone, ON
- initiatives recognizing the community’s need for voice in forestry
- helped finance Geraldton Community Forest using social accounting to justify funding it to the point of self-sufficiency
- the community forest business branched into mapping and geological information systems for the forestry and mining sector; a partner municipality got a forest harvesting license and used profits to fund child care

**Medium Municipality**
- Medicine Hat, AB
- offers financial assistance up to $15,000 to CED initiatives through its Community Development Grants program; grants are intended for organizations that perform valuable social services such as programs that relate to family/life skills, youth, inter-agency coordination, seniors, parent/child programs, single parents, volunteerism, neighbourhood improvement, and family violence

**Large Municipality**
- Edmonton, AB
- provided $3 million to support the capitalization of the Social Enterprise Fund at start up

Table 2: Examples of Financial Support
**In-Kind Support**

Local governments frequently contribute in-kind support to CED and SE initiatives. This can include non-monetary contributions such as labour, time, materials, equipment, land/space, and staff. An example is local government contributing city land for a community development corporation. In-kind support may also take the form of local government providing detailed property assessments on behalf of a social enterprise interested in purchasing a building. In some instances, local governments may second staff or contribute staff time to support CED and SE initiatives. The table below provides several examples of local government in-kind support.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Small Municipality</th>
<th>Medium Municipality</th>
<th>Large Municipality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DeSalaberry, MB</td>
<td>Brandon, MB</td>
<td>Halifax, NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• supported the creation of</td>
<td>• offers pro bono office space for the</td>
<td>• contributed staff time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>funeral and wind co-ops</td>
<td>Brandon Neighbourhood Renewal Corporation, a local</td>
<td>and leadership to the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• provides technical</td>
<td>nonprofit dedicated to core area renewal; the</td>
<td>creation of HRDA Enterprises, (a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assistance, networking, and</td>
<td>city also allows the BNRC to access other city</td>
<td>subsidiary of the Human</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>promotion of community</td>
<td>services including office equipment, phones,</td>
<td>Resources Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>co-ops</td>
<td>Internet, staff support, and so on (estimated</td>
<td>Association of Halifax ) which</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$60,000 in-kind support)</td>
<td>became a successful CED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>initiative that resulted in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>many citizens moving off</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>social assistance and into</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>employment in locally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>created ventures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Markell 1998)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Examples of In-Kind Support
### Planning, Research, and Advising

Local government’s role in supporting CED and the SE in planning, research, and advising includes those activities that enable organizations, enterprises, and citizens to make good decisions about what to do, when to do it, and with whom. This might include providing statistical information, best practice research, or information on by-laws and policies. Local governments of all sizes often have access to and are willing to share a range of data, research, and planning information that can be of significant benefit to CED and SE organizations that may not have the capacity or resources to secure this independently. Examples are found in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Small Municipality</th>
<th>Medium Municipality</th>
<th>Large Municipality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Williams Lake, BC</td>
<td>Red Deer, AB</td>
<td>Toronto, ON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- researching affordable</td>
<td>• Social Planning Department works closely with nonprofits</td>
<td>• for many years had a planning position that managed a development corporation that supported a business incubator and CED projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>housing and homelessness</td>
<td>and the local CED community by undertaking research designed to inform decision</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>initiatives</td>
<td>making and strategic planning for both the city and community groups such as</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- working with UBC on a</td>
<td>best-practice research on seniors’ housing and looking at neighbourhood</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>proposal for a community</td>
<td>characteristics to determine what services and programs should exist there; also interprets policies for community-based organizations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>forest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Examples of Planning, Research, and Advising
**Human and Social Capital Development**

When local governments take on the role of human and social capital development in order to support CED and SE, this often includes the provision of training, education, and other capacity building activities in the community. An example of this is local governments making their staff training programs available to other citizens or community organizations. Training and capacity building activities can include job training or job shadowing opportunities for new immigrants. Neighbourhood revitalization initiatives also build social capital within communities. Examples of human and social capital development from the interviews are identified in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Small Municipality</th>
<th>Medium Municipality</th>
<th>Large Municipality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Golden, BC</td>
<td>Saskatoon, SK</td>
<td>Winnipeg, MB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• facilitates Downtown Revitalization Committee, which provides a conduit for community businesses to discuss strategies, taxation issues, signage, planning and development, zoning, parking, etc.</td>
<td>• the Planning Education Program offers opportunities for community members to increase their knowledge and understanding of municipal practice such as community planning and development, related by-laws, policies, and the city’s Official Community Plan in order to “[open] up city planning entirely to the community” (City of Saskatoon 2009)</td>
<td>• the Aboriginal Youth Strategy includes a strong emphasis on job training and skills development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Examples of Human and Social Capital Development
Land Use

Local government support for CED and the SE can involve land regulation and use of property holdings. It may involve things such as changes to zoning by-laws, actions identified in official plans, or designation of land trusts. An example of this related to a zoning or by-law change may be an allowance for increased street-vending activities in a revitalization area. Another example would be a pedestrian commercial shopping street overlay to facilitate development of a pedestrian-oriented character in commercial and mixed-use developments in an inner-city neighbourhood to support revitalization. The table below lists further examples from the research interviews.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Small Municipality</th>
<th>Medium Municipality</th>
<th>Large Municipality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Craik, SK</td>
<td>Kamloops, BC</td>
<td>Vancouver, BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• set aside land and separated 25 lots of residential area for an eco-village</td>
<td>• the North Shore Neighbourhood Plan promoted the creation of affordable housing and green development by allowing reductions in development costs for green developments and the creation of social housing; city expedites development applications for projects with green and/or affordable elements</td>
<td>• in new neighbourhoods, the city’s policy is to designate 20 percent of new units for social housing; in established neighbourhoods, the city applies a development cost levy and some of the funds go towards affordable replacement housing in the neighbourhood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• manages 100 acres/64,000 trees of agri-forestry in hopes of having a community-owned logging industry in the future (profits would be reinvested into community projects)</td>
<td>• city hosted a Design Charette for a downtown neighbourhood and invited community stakeholders to share their development ideas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• the local golf course owned by the Rural Municipality of Craik is certified by the Audubon Society for its sustainability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6: Examples of Land Use
Procurement

Local governments can assume a leadership role in promoting social and economic objectives in their position as major public employers and large purchasers of goods and services (Cook 2004). Supportive procurement is the action or process of acquiring or obtaining material, property, or services in a way that is consciously designed to support CED and SE activities. There are both formal and informal ways for local governments to approach procurement. These can include policies, practices, by-laws, and supplier codes of conduct, to name several. Often, supportive procurement is enacted through criteria specified in requests for proposals or bids. It should also be noted that moves to eliminate so-called trade barriers may narrow the space for supportive procurement policies. The table below shows some examples from the research on local government support for CED and SE activities utilizing the procurement tool.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Small Municipality</th>
<th>Medium Municipality</th>
<th>Large Municipality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Craik, SK</td>
<td>Abbotsford, BC</td>
<td>Calgary, AB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• sourced recycled tires for municipal roof from a company in Saskatoon; used nearly 1,400 car tires; superior product is warranted for 50 years; socially and economically, it provided a period of employment for local people</td>
<td>• Abbotsford contracts with the Mennonite Central Committee for paper recycling (shredding and loose paper) services; the MCC’s recycling service employs people with mental disabilities</td>
<td>• in 2007, city council approved the Sustainable Environment and Ethical Procurement Policy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7: Examples of Procurement
This research highlighted examples of local governments of varying sizes and across all provinces in the study area that were engaged in the roles of expressions of intent, financial support, in-kind support, planning, research and advising, human and social capital development, land use and procurement. Through these activities, many local governments are actively and intentionally supporting CED and the SE and recognizing the multiple benefits of doing so. Benefits for local governments supporting CED and the SE can include significant contributions to creating the “local places” that increase opportunities for citizens and communities to determine future possibilities and improve their human circumstances.

CED and SE Activity by Local Government Population Size

In addition to the six frameworks and seven roles local governments commonly engage in with CED and SE actors, the research identified some commonalities based on the size of the municipality. Common issues of importance, areas of activity, frameworks for engagement, and types of roles assumed were often, though not always, similar for the governments interviewed based on size. These findings are discussed here first using a qualitative lens and then using a quantitative lens.

Qualitative Discussion of Interview Results by Size

Though local government interaction with CED and SE actors varied greatly from one community to another based on many complex factors, this research did show that no matter what the population and economic base of a community, there were many innovative ways in which to engage with and support CED and SE activity. Following are some general observations about local government size relative to activity in CED and the SE.

Frameworks for Engagement

Larger local governments tended to have more complex and formal interactions with CED and SE actors, while smaller local governments tended to have more informal forms of en-
gagement (for example, less lengthy policy documents). Small local governments most frequently engaged with CED and SE activities in the “Coffee Shop” and “Partnering” framework styles. And large local governments (populations over 500,000) tended to engage in multiple frameworks depending on who else was involved in an issue and how it was being addressed. Medium-sized municipalities most frequently seemed to embody the “How Can We Help?” framework because of their willingness to respond to requests from CED and SE actors and their responsiveness in creating supportive policy and offering in-kind assistance. Perhaps this is an indication of having some resources to enable participation, yet not enough to take a leadership role in initiatives.

Expressions of Intent
Small and medium-sized local governments frequently initiate Business Improvement Zones or Areas, and because of their smaller size and stronger connection to rural roots, they both sign onto and create Food Charters. They were also found to frequently create community sustainability, environmental, and social plans. Medium-sized local governments have more specifically dedicated committees and are more likely to have particular departments devoted to social, environmental, and economic development. All of the large municipalities exhibited a wide range of expressions of intent. As identified in the quantitative summary that follows, all five of the large municipalities included in the research had by-laws and policies supporting CED and SE activities.

Financial Support
Small, medium-sized, and large municipalities all use tax exemptions (although this is less common in smaller communities), provide grants to CED and SE groups, offer property improvement incentives, and collaborate with partners to match funds for community projects. Most are also involved in neighbourhood revitalization (75 percent of small and 100 percent of medium-sized and large municipalities interviewed).

In-Kind Support
Small and medium-sized local governments often provide free office space, consultation services, and administrative and technical help to community groups. Small local governments often share office space with community partners, while it is common for medium-sized municipalities to offer land to community-led affordable housing projects for a
nominal amount. Large municipalities also provide in-kind support, though the type of assistance can differ slightly. In addition to providing space, large local governments often have a wealth of expertise and resources that they can make available to support CED and SE activities. In addition, this support is often more formalized through policies and guidelines. For instance, provision of space may be facilitated through lease and licensing agreements and may be supported through nonprofit leasing guidelines or specific requests for proposals.

Planning, Research, and Advising
The research uncovered examples of both small and medium-sized municipalities engaged in researching seniors’ and affordable housing initiatives and conducting planning work aimed at the reduction of homelessness. Small municipalities are often involved in research on recreational and parks initiatives, as well as offering business mentoring and planning services. It was common for medium-sized municipalities to be working closely with community groups to help them undertake program and project planning research that they did not have the capacity to undertake on their own. Large municipalities also undertake a wide range of planning, research, and advising activities and also often participate in formalized research networks with community partners.

Human and Social Capital Development
The research uncovered examples of both small and medium-sized local governments that offer programs for under-employed and under-skilled community members, including the sponsorship of skill-development and learning events. Some small communities provide training for community groups and tend to collaborate with local educational institutions to bring learning programs into their communities. This is especially the case in transitional-economy towns, where the one major employer has recently shut down. Many large municipalities engage in targeted efforts to address the concerns of those who face barriers to accessing municipal services and/or securing municipal employment; this role is often more formalized in larger centres. Large municipalities also frequently fund CED and SE organizations that are engaged in programs that support human and social capital development.

Land Use
The research uncovered examples of both small and medium-sized local governments that actively try to attract and promote affordable housing initiatives, often by expediting appli-
cation processes. Some small and medium-sized communities also promote green building initiatives, but this is not the norm. The small and medium-sized municipalities are just beginning to be aware of how their land use and planning policies can be supportive of CED and SE projects. They can benefit from the experience of large municipalities in adopting more formalized policies such as creating land banks and trusts, inclusionary zoning, density bonuses, and formalized community usage of city land. All large municipalities are engaged in affordable housing development and many have provided some land and/or buildings for a nominal fee for use by CED and SE sector organizations.

Procurement
The research discovered examples of both small and medium-sized local governments informally purchasing from social, local, or green sources and contracting with groups who employ adults living with mental disabilities. Small municipalities usually do not have official social, local, or green procurement policies. The medium-sized municipalities are actively working to formalize these practices by passing council-endorsed environmental or social purchasing policies. In large municipalities, progressive procurement tends to be formalized as a policy guiding municipal purchases. In addition to this, various staff and/or departments often support CED and SE organizations informally through smaller purchases such as catering services.

Themes According to Size
This section highlights some of the themes common to local governments based on size. While size may drive the commonalities, the researchers were also aware that availability of provincial and/or federal funding also often determines which CED and SE activities local governments support. For instance, provincial or federal funding for municipal sustainability planning results in significantly greater activity in this area than would otherwise be the case.

Smaller Municipalities
Smaller local governments most frequently focused their activities in CED and the SE on affordable housing, downtown revitalization, and economic diversification.
There were a wide variety of reasons why small communities felt the necessity for affordable housing. In some communities, for example, a recent change in focus from resource-based to tourism-based economies had generated a large influx of both workers and seasonal residents, driving vacancy rates down dramatically and housing costs up, and thus making housing unaffordable for both long-time residents and for those moving into town for work. In other small places, the desire of long-term residents to remain in their communities as they aged rather than relocating to access seniors’ residences and long-term care facilities created a need for senior-friendly accommodation.

This was strongly connected to the issue of health and the health problems experienced when people who remain in their homes cannot access the level of care they require, thereby compounding health problems. It was also connected to a shift in focus on community recreation from amenities such as hockey arenas to things such as walking trails.

In both cases — the shift in economies and the desire of long-time residents to stay in their communities — small local governments were actively engaged in a variety of roles such as partnering, land use, and financial support to address the need for affordable housing. In doing so, they activated the partnering and the research, planning, and advising relationship frameworks with CED and SE actors. For an exhaustive listing of the approaches discussed in the research interviews, please see Appendix I.

Another common theme in small communities was the need to diversify economically in order to stem the out-migration of younger generations and to maintain the vitality of the community. Ensuring that residents have access to a good quality of life through meaningful work opportunities as well as local products and services contributes immeasurably to the retention of the population. In small communities, efforts to diversify the economy frequently focused on the traditional economic development model and in many cases the philosophy of aiming to attract big business and big box stores with the dual goals of creating employment and generating a hub for locals to encourage them to shop at home rather than in other communities. Many small communities did, however, attempt to diversify economically in concert with CED and SE actors and objectives. Common ways in which this occurred were via community-owned resources such as forests, and an emphasis on tourism, such as promoting artist districts. For a detailed list of activities undertaken by small local governments in these areas, please see Appendix I.

A third theme that frequently came up for small local governments related to rejuvenat-
ing downtown areas, which is often tied to the issues of affordable housing and economic diversification. With the out-migration of younger generations and/or the out-flux of residents to less expensive housing (and the big box stores that spring up alongside them) beyond the more expensive downtown residences, almost all small communities interviewed were engaged in downtown revitalization projects, many of which involved engagement with CED and SE actors. Activities ranged from creating a downtown theme around a popular book referencing their community, to micro-financing local small-business start-ups, to large celebrations aimed at bringing community members together to enjoy the variety in their core neighbourhoods.

For some small communities, the local government was completely consumed by trying to maintain the existing infrastructure of its core neighbourhoods. These communities lamented their inability to address the other needs (social, environmental, etc.) they saw going unaddressed while they struggled to pave roads and replace old sewer and water pipes.

One last special mention here concerns alternative energy generation, in which a surprising number of small municipalities were engaged, either in projects already underway or in exploring options in this field. This wasn’t anticipated by the researchers and may be an area that could be explored further through additional research.

The above discussion highlights several of the themes that consistently arose in discussions with small local governments and that seemed especially salient to them versus medium-sized and large local governments. The tapestry of small local government activity in CED and the SE is much richer than we can do justice to in this discussion, and the reader is encouraged to refer to Appendix I for a full list of small (and medium-sized and large) local government activities in CED and the SE that were illuminated by the research.

Medium-Sized Municipalities

As could be expected, medium-sized municipalities had a larger scope of activity and thus more support for CED and SE activities than the smaller communities. This could be attributed mainly to their larger populations and tax base and/or to higher concentrations of poverty and homelessness than smaller urban centres. Major trends that emerged among the medium-sized municipalities were strong and cohesive support for CED and SE activities in the areas of expressions of intent, financial support, and procurement, specifically in support of employment development.
Many mid-sized local governments were committed to gaining an understanding of the challenges that confront their communities and to creating strategies and policies to address the often-growing social problems such as poverty and homelessness. A handful of local governments in BC and Alberta have created social plans that include recommendations for addressing issues such as economic disparity, housing and homelessness, youth, and community capacity. Many of the policy recommendations in these plans are tied to CED and SE activities. Although some of these plans acknowledged that solutions to the myriad of social problems are often beyond the jurisdiction of many municipalities, there is still a commitment to action through trying to bring the pertinent actors to the same table.

Expressions of intent in the form of business improvement zones, economic development strategies, and enterprise zones were common among this group. Mid-sized municipalities have acknowledged that community development is an essential factor for the success of revitalization projects and that buy-in from local government, business owners, and citizens is critical. Most commonly, this commitment to revitalize inner-city neighbourhoods comes in the form of incentives for private-sector development, including decreased property taxes, reduction of development costs, etc. While these areas are not experiencing out-migration to the same degree as the smaller municipalities, they are facing greater development pressure in the form of big box development, which is negatively impacting their downtowns. A general theme was that medium-sized communities require strategies to actively attract people and businesses to their core areas.

Sustainability plans are the last expression of intent prevalent among the mid-sized local governments. In Ontario, both the Sudbury and Thunder Bay Earthcare Local Action Plans create a policy environment in which social and environmental concerns can be addressed in tandem. Policy recommendations such as the creation of local food charters help to strengthen the market for locally produced food and create support for local farmers. This was an exciting finding as it illustrated a holistic approach to sustainability by including social, environmental, and economic considerations. Adopting the concept of sustainable development in both corporate operations and in the community was a major support and impetus for much of the CED and SE work underway in many municipalities. The endorsement of these plans by the Federation of Canadian Municipalities has normalized and entrenched the concept of sustainability and its social dimensions in all sizes of local governments across Canada.

In most cases, medium-sized municipalities were not engaged in or initiating CED and
SE projects or programs themselves, but rather supported the work of nonprofits and community-based organizations through grants. These grants were wide ranging in scope, covering project-based funding, planning and administration, operations, and even formal service agreements. Although these grants are normally intended for broader community development or social service functions and are not explicitly CED and SE activities, projects relating to CED and SE were not excluded. Funding programs were often targeted at certain demographic groups such as nonprofits that serve Aboriginal people. Financial support for revitalization was also quite common in the form of grants for façade improvements, new construction, safety initiatives, etc.

It should be noted that the concept of social enterprise was not well understood among mid-sized cities, and support for social enterprise in the form of grant funding was non-existent among those interviewed. An exception was the City of Red Deer, which has provided in-kind support to SE development and is considering developing a social enterprise in its city hall.

Ethical procurement was strong among medium-sized communities and extended beyond mere purchasing into the realm of service agreements. Most commonly, municipalities contracted with local nonprofits that deliver employment opportunities for newcomers, the underemployed, and those with developmental disabilities through services such as recycling, paper shredding, and outdoor spring-cleaning. More informal purchasing took the form of ordering catering from social enterprises. Interestingly, most procurement of services from employment development groups was informal and not motivated by a specific purchasing policy. However, cities like Thunder Bay are looking to formalize these agreements because they are aware of the value-added benefits of contracting with groups. One issue that did arise with these service agreements was the necessity to involve city unions so the contracts would not be misconstrued as union busting.

Affordable housing development was also considered to be vitally important in medium-sized communities, with 100 percent of municipalities interviewed stating that some sort of affordable housing development was taking place in their area. In these cases, the housing was linked more closely to the reduction of homelessness than with aging in the community.

**Large Municipalities**

There was extensive support for CED and SE activities within all of the large municipalities included in this research. This was not limited to one or two roles or restricted to several
areas of activity. Each of the large urban municipalities engaged in some way in most or all of the seven different roles described — through expressions of intent, provision of financial support, provision of in-kind support, offering planning, researching and advising, supporting human and social capital development, and providing land use and procurement opportunities. In addition, all had by-laws or policies supporting CED and SE, all were involved in revitalization initiatives and often took a lead role, all were engaged in affordable housing development and addressing homelessness, and all took part in some way in providing assistance to social enterprise or community business.

The involvement of large municipalities in CED and SE activities was supported by the presence of policy or planning documents much more frequently than was the case in small or medium-sized local governments. This was particularly true with respect to social, ethical, or green purchasing or procurement, with four of the five large municipalities having policies in place that support progressive procurement practices. While many of the small and medium-sized municipalities engaged in this informally, very few had specific supportive policies around procurement.

The development and provision of affordable housing is another area in which all of the large municipalities were actively involved and several had specific work sections focused exclusively on this area. Many of the large municipalities have been engaged in this for a long time, and they commonly rely on strong community partnerships to carry out work and responsibilities in this area. Some of this work is tied to and integrated with overall development planning. The City of Vancouver, for example, sets aside 20 percent of all units in new neighbourhoods for social housing.

A more recent development in the large municipalities is engaging in focused efforts to develop model sustainable communities. While many have been involved in sustainability planning, these recent efforts focus on concentrated geographic areas with plans to demonstrate best practices in sustainable development. Alternative energy generation was also connected to these efforts in a few of the large municipalities. The Olympic Village / South East False Creek Development in Vancouver is one such example.

These model sustainable community development plans describe the intentional integration of social, economic, and environmental factors consistent with CED and SE approaches. As most of these efforts are quite recent, it remains to be seen whether the end results will truly reflect this integration.
The large municipalities that were part of this research utilized a wide variety of approaches in supporting social enterprise and community business. While some municipalities had active, focused involvement in this area, others were more limited. The City of Edmonton, which made a major contribution to the Edmonton Social Enterprise Fund, was perhaps the most engaged in financially supporting social enterprise initiatives among the large municipalities.

Engagement in revitalization efforts was another key area of support for CED and SE activities in large municipalities. All were involved in some capacity and many took a lead role. In two of the municipalities, these efforts were supported through agreements involving all three levels of government. The result was a significant financial investment in core neighbourhoods in each city. In the case of the Winnipeg Partnership Agreement, there was a specific focus on funding CED and SE projects.

The research highlighted the depth and breadth of supports that large municipalities are providing to CED and SE activities. While few of the initiatives, policies, and plans specifically identify CED or use the language of SE, they do reflect common principles and an approach that integrates social, economic, and environmental factors.
Quantitative Summary of Research Results

Though this research was qualitative in nature, the researchers agreed it would be helpful to generate some quantitative analysis of their data. The table opposite shows the number of local governments interviewed that are actively supporting CED and the SE. The “Area of Activity” column is derived from the research interview questions. The researchers recognize that the interviews may not have identified all of the CED and SE activities in each municipality. The chart reflects a summary of information the researchers obtained through interviews and supporting documentation. The researchers chose the areas of activity on the basis of their perceived salience and importance within the participating communities. The information gathered on support for particular activities was used to create the more generalized “Local Government Roles,” discussed earlier.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Activity</th>
<th>Small Municipality</th>
<th>Medium Municipality</th>
<th>Large Municipality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>By-laws or policies supporting CED and SE</td>
<td>5/22</td>
<td>8/8; no by-laws but many supportive policy documents</td>
<td>5/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement in neighbourhood revitalization</td>
<td>15/22</td>
<td>8/8</td>
<td>5/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement in affordable housing</td>
<td>15/22</td>
<td>8/8</td>
<td>5/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistance to social enterprise and/or community business</td>
<td>11/22; mainly done through DC or community futures or provincially legislated/ funded; more supplied in-kind</td>
<td>Not exclusive to CED but many Business Improvement Zone / Business Improvement Area groups offer support to community businesses</td>
<td>5/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social/ethical/green purchasing policy or practice</td>
<td>14/22</td>
<td>6/8</td>
<td>4/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community sustainability plan</td>
<td>5/22; beginning to address sustainability in their Official Community Plans (OCPs) or neighbourhood plans, environmental committees, or charters; integrating it into practices</td>
<td>7/8</td>
<td>4/5 (and one currently underway)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative energy generation</td>
<td>10/22</td>
<td>3/8</td>
<td>4/5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Conclusion

Currently a number of municipal, provincial, national, and international priorities that align with CED and SE approaches have given rise to opportunities for increasing local government awareness of and support for CED and SE activities. Priorities such as community sustainability planning, poverty reduction, long-term solutions to homelessness and provision of affordable housing, neighbourhood revitalization, and climate change issues all benefit from an integrated, holistic, cross-sectoral response. CED and SE approaches offer such a response and thus pave the way for increased dialogue between local government and CED and SE actors.

Existing and emerging provincial and federal funding programs to address these priorities enhance this opportunity further by increasing local government access to resources. The Neighbourhoods Alive! (NA) program in Manitoba is an excellent example. It was created by the provincial government to undertake community-based neighbourhood revitalization in inner-city areas across the province (Government of Manitoba 2009). While NA does not provide direct funding to municipalities to undertake neighbourhood-based revitalization, it does create a strong base of support for CED and SE organizations. The program exists in five communities in Winnipeg and seven outside of the city, including the interviewed municipality of Brandon. It provides core funding to a community-based organization in each of its designated areas. Its major areas of focus are affordable housing, community economic development, safety, education, and recreation. The NA program has created the basis for many Manitoba municipalities to become involved in supporting CED and SE as active partners in funding and in providing in-kind support to the community-based organizations funded through NA. Evidence of this is the strong support the Brandon Neighbourhood Renewal Corporation receives from the City of Brandon.
The Family and Community Support Services (FCSS) funding partnership in Alberta is another example of a provincial funding program that can support municipal engagement in CED and SE activities. FCSS is a unique 80/20 funding arrangement between the Government of Alberta (2010) and participating municipalities or Metis settlements. In order to be eligible for FCSS funding, services must do one or more of the following:

• help people to develop independence, strengthen coping skills, and become more resistant to crisis
• help people to develop an awareness of social needs
• help people to develop interpersonal and group skills that enhance constructive relationships among people
• help people and communities to assume responsibility for decisions and actions that affect them
• provide supports that help sustain people as active participants in the community

The FCSS philosophy articulates a belief that “local people can influence things that affect them, that communities can be innovative and creative, that citizen participation, self-help and volunteerism is encouraged and that human growth and potential are enhanced.” (FCSSAA 2010). This philosophy aligns closely with a number of the Neechi Principles that define CED and thus affords Alberta-based municipalities and Metis settlements another opportunity to support and resource these activities.

An emphasis on partnerships at all levels of government often offers further support through the provision of in-kind contributions. In addition to complementing the pool of resources, partnerships also offer opportunities to build relationships among CED and SE actors, local government administrators, and elected officials, thereby increasing awareness of the skills and expertise that each brings to the table.

An increasingly shared focus and common language around sustainability among local government networks and organizations (i.e., FCM) and the CED and SE sector also improve the likelihood of forging connections and working together to advance a common agenda.

Climate change efforts in particular offer many opportunities for further development of CED and SE ventures in many municipalities. Integrated community sustainability plans (ICSPs) are often thought of as environmental sustainability plans because of their commitment to measuring baseline emissions and setting reduction targets. As we can see from the research, the ICSPs in cities like Thunder Bay and Sudbury have opened up opportunities for CED and SE activities such as recycling and local food production. CED and SE groups can
continue to engage with local government to explore ways of fulfilling some of the policy obligations that each municipality has identified in their ICSP.

Significant social and economic benefits often accompany local, community-based actions. For example, implementation of many of the greenhouse gas reduction initiatives can create local jobs, improve quality of life, foster CED and SE, and enhance skills of the local workforce. Reducing energy requirements for housing, buildings, and transportation can also lower operating costs for government, companies, and households.

Finally, as has historically been the case, economic crises or significant economic shifts have often provided the impetus to consider alternative economic approaches such as those offered by CED and the SE sector. The global recession and the ripple effects in Canada’s economy have again given rise to opportunities for further conversations with local government about local economic alternatives.

While there are many exciting opportunities for advancing local government support of CED and SE activities, there continue to be a number of challenges. Although common terminology (particularly focused on sustainability) is increasingly used, language continues to be a barrier. The language of CED and SE doesn’t seem to have been incorporated into many municipal conversations and/or documents. Although the research highlighted a range of ways in which municipalities support CED and the SE, it is often referred to in other terms. Local government also continues to have limited involvement in CED and SE networks and organizations, and this too may be related to differences in language. This stands in contrast to other networks/organizations such as the International Council for Local Environmental Initiatives, which have successfully engaged municipalities around issues related to sustainability.

Finally, there are still a number of structural barriers. Although local governments recognize the need for increasingly integrated, cross-sectoral responses to many of the complex challenges they are attempting to address, they are often still structured as a number of separate sections or departments. This can create challenges for CED and SE actors, as it can be difficult to identify the best point of contact within local government.

Many local governments cited an inadequate municipal budget as one of the major barriers to supporting CED and SE activities. Many municipalities made mention of extremely tight budgets and shortfalls in infrastructure financing, a trend that does not appear likely to change any time soon. According to a recent report from the Federation of Canadian
Municipalities, “50 cents of every tax dollar collected in Canada go to the federal government, while 42 cents go to provincial/territorial governments. Municipal governments are left with just 8 cents of every tax dollar.” (FCM 2009) This fiscal imbalance, coupled with increasing demand on municipalities to address a greater range of social issues and climate-change initiatives, has left municipalities stretched. Interviewees from these municipalities explained that the lack of support for CED and SE activities was often determined by this lack of funds as opposed to lack of interest.

While the challenges above remain, the opportunities are substantial. Both the range and level of local government engagement in CED and SE activities suggest there is significant interest in alternative economic approaches that can help build sustainable, vibrant communities.
APPENDIX I: ROLE EXAMPLE LIST

The following list provides examples of the various roles discovered in the research interviews, presented by small, medium, and large municipality for ease of access.

Table 9: Roles of Small Municipalities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role Type</th>
<th>Small Municipality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expressions of Interest</td>
<td>Dawson Creek, BC: City Vision; Official Community Plan (reference CED and SE); Integrated Community Sustainability Plan using the Natural Step process; Downtown Revitalization Plan; Neighbourhood Plan (based on sustainability principles); Social Plan with the nonprofit Social Plan and Research Council of BC (looks at social conditions and creates priorities for social planning); fuel efficient vehicle policy; idle reduction strategy; Energy Plan (retrofits and solar heating for municipal buildings)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dryden, ON: Sustainable Waterfront Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Greenstone, ON: policies on the role of CED; resolution related to gas tax to “green” Greenstone; audits its carbon footprint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Port Alberni, BC: 2 community revitalization tax exemptions (investments of more than $50,000 in either an existing business property or new business building in a certain area are given a 10-year tax exemption on the increase of the value they bring to their property; the second by-law provides businesses with a $15,000 tax exemption, which provides an average $200 annual discount in taxes for exterior painting, installation of awnings, and maintaining properties to a standard developed by high school social studies classes in conjunction with city’s planning department); strategic plan and budget account for CED; uptown redevelopment strategy; industrial revitalization by-law; council changed zoning to benefit a BC housing program for interim housing for the hard-to-house; commercial tax exemption also applies to</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Expressions of Interest

multi-family housing; implementation of Climate Change Committee recommendations; city entered or entering into memorandums of understanding with neighbouring First Nations and with International Centre for Sustainable Cities; city also signing Community Centric Agreement with Ministry of Community Development’s Rural BC Secretariat; implementing recommendations provided in “Review of Port Alberni Forest Industry Report”

Revelstoke, BC: community plan has economic, social, and environmental goals; uses gas tax to fund sustainable community plan

Williams Lake, BC: revitalization tax exemption policy in Business Improvement Zone (tax relief for up to 3 years on improvements to property); Quality of Life Strategy Plan; homelessness strategy; idle-free policy

Salmon Arm, BC: developing policy on CED; have 5-year tax incentives for business owners in downtown area to make improvements of over $70,000; affordable housing strategy

Selkirk, MB: has a social development housing by-law

Craik, SK: businesses tax incentive based on the number of employees (if you purchase an existing business or start a new one, there’s a 3-year reduction on taxes from 25 percent to 50 percent)

Hazelton, BC: Community Charter for Food Action

Mission, BC: has social, economic, and environmental officers who all have committee and commissions they work with in addition to municipal staff; the official community plan (OCP), development plan, economic development strategy, policies in the OCP, refer to social, economic, and environmental aspects; has a Business Improvement Area with a tax levy on businesses creating funding to clean up the downtown; created a downtown tax revitalization exemption area, where improvements upwards of $15,000 are not taxed by local governments on the value of improvements for the first 5 years, and thereafter increasing by 20 percent each year until market rates are reached; OCP has statements on affordable and accessibility; council requests affordable component to be included in new housing developments; social development plan will cultivate community enterprises; Environmental Charter; working on sustainability plan

Portage la Prairie, MB: was involved with a program that identified gaps in the workforce and then trained youth who didn’t have the qualifications for those jobs in an apprenticeship-like program
Expressions of Interest

Golden, BC: town by-law enables funding to Golden Area Initiatives, a non-profit CED organization; official community plan (addresses sustainability, sustainable housing, adaptation of brownfield sites, low-flow toilet by-laws, recommends adoption of non-cosmetic pesticide use by-law, and maybe one day grey-water recycling and storage); funds CED officer at Golden Tourism

Leduc, AB: recently completed a Genuine Wealth assessment and has integrated updates into their corporate strategic planning process

Athabasca, AB: does not have a specific CED policy or by-law, but a number of council motions have supported CED and SE activities (e.g., a council direction for administration to be involved in a Community Economic Development Committee)

Financial Support

Dawson Creek, BC: provides funding and partners with groups on social services; gives grants to groups that further the vision of the city; formed and funded a watershed society to advise the city on watershed management

Greenstone, ON: grants and a $100,000 fund for strategic community projects; provided funding to Thunder Bay Housing for administration of low-cost and seniors’ housing; helped fund Geraldton Community Forest until it reached self-sufficiency

Port Alberni, BC: provides some core funding and grants-in-aid to many community nonprofits; partnered with 2 First Nations on a project that invests profits in initiatives to reduce greenhouse gases

Revelstoke, BC: provides some funding to community projects; established a nonprofit community housing society to deal with affordable housing, providing $100,000 towards operating costs

Nipigon, ON: provides funding to service groups on a case-by-case, as-needed basis

Williams Lake, BC: provides monetary contributions for partnerships on regional economic development and tourism initiatives; waives development cost charges for nonprofits developing seniors’ affordable housing and transition housing; has a fee-for-service with the water conservation society on educational campaign

Salmon Arm, BC: provides financial support to community improvement projects

Gravelbourg, SK: provides grants to community groups; assists in community fundraising; provides tax credits for low-income housing
Financial Support
Selkirk, MB: significantly subsidizes local recreation such as kayaking and hockey; supports community housing (a 22-unit apartment with mixed funding for people with mental health issues and seniors; the city expedited zoning; waived $22,000 in development fees and deferred the increase in taxes on a $2 million building until after the mortgage is paid off)

Craik, SK: contributes to Craik Housing Authority, which manages suites for seniors and sometimes low-income people; partnered with the RM of Craik to establish a small business loans association that provides non-asset-based loans up to $15,000 (from a pool of $100,000) with 3 percent interest (to pay for administration) to buy a business or start a new one

Hazelton, BC: provides some grants to community groups; provides rebates when people replace old stoves with fuel-efficient ones

DeSalaberry, MB: provides financing for seniors’ housing

Mission, BC: augments funding for community groups; sells backyard composters and rain barrels at cost from the municipality; worked with groups in the Fraser Basin to get people out to farms to buy things from producers (Agassiz, Abbotsford, Maple Ridge, Pitt Meadows, Chilliwack, Langley, and Mission make a circle farm tour with about 8–9 around Mission and 60 on the whole tour; towns pooled money, leveraged it, created a regional brochure)

Golden, BC: Official Community Plan provides for development density bonuses if developments provide a percentage of affordable housing; toilet rebate program (a rebate on your utility bill if you replace an old toilet with a dual flush or 6–litre toilet); rebate program to replace wood stoves

Leduc, AB: provides funding for a number of local community organizations primarily through Family and Community Support Services

In-Kind Support
Dawson Creek, BC: partners on projects with regional economic development groups and local organizations (skateboard park, walking trail development; arts centre); assists the Enterprise Centre (which provides business training for youth and others on business skills, social enterprises, etc.)

Dryden, ON: partners on projects with regional economic development groups and local organizations (playground equipment, skateboard parks, and youth centre)

Port Alberni, BC: staff are available as resources to community businesses and organizations; provides space and technical assistance; assists community groups in writing grant applications
In-Kind Support

Revelstoke, BC: provides technical and other assistance on community projects; helps co-ordinate community groups; helps organizations apply for grants

Williams Lake, BC: provides staff support for partnerships on regional economic development and tourism initiatives; supports Thompson Rivers University and UNBC in identifying and delivering on educational needs in the community; partners with a water conservation society on educational campaigns

Salmon Arm, BC: provides in-kind and technical support on community improvement projects

Gravelbourg, SK: manages low-income housing; business incubation centre provides inexpensive office space for start-up businesses; provides advice and business planning

Gimli, MB: administers programs on a project-to-project basis for other organizations that don’t have the capacity; provides rent-free building to the Evergreen School Division tied to Red River Community College

Selkirk, MB: provides a rent-free space in the park for the local canoeing and kayaking club; contracts maintenance of cross country skiing trails to club; subsidizes costs, provides space, and partners with local seniors’ organization

Craik, SK: acts as corporate head for co-ops and nonprofits so they can access federal funding

Hazelton, BC: works with community partners (Storytellers Foundation) on Food Action Program (local grown organic food, which received $50,000; the foundation has started a community garden that’s tied to the Food Action Program; town lost a grocery store because of the economy, so for $25–$30, people get 2 weeks worth of local vegetables)

DeSalaberry, MB: provides technical assistance, networking, and promotion for co-ops such as a funeral co-op project and a wind farm co-op project

Portage la Prairie, MB: provided low-rent space in a municipal building for a seniors’ centre that provides recreation, meals on wheels, etc.

Golden, BC: facilitates collaboration and networking among community groups (chamber of commerce, social service delivery networks such as Interior Health, women’s resource centre, Community Futures of East Kootenays); helped create “Kicking horse mercantile,” a directory of key businesses, products, and services; provides technical support and services to the Golden farmers’ market
In-Kind Support
Leduc, AB: provides staff support for partnerships, partnering extensively with neighbouring Leduc County; also involved in a tri-municipal partnership that brings three local governments together to develop affordable housing; partnership gives each small municipality a larger amount of money to work with because they pool their resources and rotate the location of the affordable housing development each year.

Athabasca, AB: provides staff support for participation in the local CED committee.

Planning, Research, and Advising
Dawson Creek, BC: partnered with the Community Services Network (a local group of around 70 social agencies) to form the social plan (identified 70 social issues, prioritized 20, then focused on the top 5: housing (shelter, assisted living, affordable, accessible, and market housing); addictions, drug treatment, and crime prevention; youth engagement and support for existing youth programs; education and skills training; youth and high school drop-out rates); works with the University of Northern British Columbia, University of Victoria, researching a community forest license; looking at using bio-energy with an ethical imperative to not use a food source, intensive agriculture, or a competing industry (peletizing and burning waste from forestry and agriculture — the 44 thousand tonnes of fescue grass straw left in the field that must be removed before it is re-seeded — as fuel for public buildings.)

Dryden, ON: worked with health organization to improve local health care; researched proposals for solar farms, solar heating for pools, solar energy for airport, and biomass; partners with First Nations on employment strategies.

Greenstone, ON: Department of Community Services (focusing on recreation and social services); funds, staffs, and participates on committees exploring community resource development; has undertaken significant research into alternative energy and participated in pilot projects.

Port Alberni, BC: economic development manager has a CED background; human resources and community development manager has community development background; plans to develop an artists’ precinct; participates in the Community Stakeholders Initiative to End Homelessness in the Alberni Valley, a community group that makes recommendations to council to resolve homelessness, such as by-laws for secondary suites, increased density, and provision of land and technical assistance; supports investigation of social enterprises; involved with youth social enterprise groundwork; works with Vancouver Island and Royal Roads Universities and University of Victoria on community development matters; assisting health co-op to locate funding and attract doctors; developed a business plan and application for...
community forest; connects community groups to likely funders

Revelstoke, BC: has a Community Economic Development Department; involved in community education and training when needed

Nipigon, ON: community development officer engages in CED; collaborates with neighbouring local governments and First Nations to work for better local health services; researching assisted living facilities; researching alternative energy generation

Williams Lake, BC: the Economic Development Office, Economic Development Corporation, and social development co-ordinator work on CED issues; lobbied provincial government for grants for transition housing; appointed a community sustainable committee; working with collagen plant to find alternative water source; encouraging clean energy projects; working with UBC on proposal for a community forest

Salmon Arm, BC: extensive research on affordable housing especially re: attracting and retaining younger workforce; supports affordable housing committee; looks to partner with companies involved in alternative energy; has geothermal heating in city hall

Gravelbourg, SK: works with local college to identify community educational needs; researching building assisted living for seniors; has a business incubation centre; extensive research and feasibility studies into business ideas such as Mustard Capital Inc.; works with community green committee to develop green community plan; researching incorporating sustainability into community plan; developing a community centre to provide services for young families and services for new immigrants such as language training, banking, and tax filing

Gimli, MB: planned affordable housing for young families and single parents; developing a community sustainability plan; supports environmental committee

Louise, MB: community development position active in health-care advocacy; researching using used canola oil from restaurants as fuel for municipal vehicles

Craik, SK: works with community groups on business development and environmental sustainability

Snow Lake, MB: working with University College of the North to develop an intro to mining course; helps with business research, plans, and feasibility studies, tourism development
Planning, Research, and Advising

Hazelton, BC: has been involved in alternative energy generation and is supportive of this

DeSalaberry, MB: Climate Change Partnership Program with provincial government explores renewable technologies, green retrofits, etc. (based on the Natural Step program)

Mission, BC: task force on how to attract new postsecondary facilities to Mission; hosted 2 community forums on accessibility in the community

Golden, BC: collaborates with College of the Rockies; setting up an Affordable Housing Committee in addition to Seniors’ Housing

Leduc, AB: engaged in a genuine wealth assessment as part of their strategic corporate planning process; assessment measured how Leduc was doing on a number of social wellness indicators; council takes this information into account when planning and setting corporate priorities and program and service levels; includes consideration of things such as affordable housing, activities for youth, community safety, and resources for seniors

Athabasca, AB: supports the work of the Athabasca Regional Development Committee in its planning work

Human and Social Capital Development

Dawson Creek, BC: has an Aboriginal Employment Partnership Initiative (a commitment to find opportunities to include Aboriginals in the workforce as well as cultural training for staff); youth planning strategy focuses on recreation and employment opportunities for youth at risk; has free access or assisted access to recreation programs; provides access to community members when speakers are brought in; Sustainability Vision involved training a couple of hundred people in the community; working with the local trades college, Northern Lights, to deliver training to plumbers, electricians, etc. to install alternative energy systems

Dryden, ON: works with local schools to bring distance diplomas, skills retraining, or co-op work terms to the community; works with the mill to retrain employees in two skill sets

Greenstone, ON: pays for some training and education for staff; leave can be negotiated for training; allows up to 15 percent of staff time for online research for job improvement

Port Alberni, BC: undertakes extensive staff training and opens this up to community partners (First Nations, small businesses, and community organizations); city staff provide training to community members on board governance, legal issues, strategic planning and capacity building; Recreation
Human and Social Capital Development

Department runs “our town” program throughout the summer, New Year festivals and events aimed at children and families, and “Nights Alive” program (Fri. and Sat. evening program directed at pregnant teens to familiarize them with programs and services available); city staff volunteer for variety of community events

Revelstoke, BC: signed onto the provincial program to increase employment of people with disabilities by 10 percent by 2010

Nipigon, ON: partners with Lakehead University’s tourism program (fourth year students do tourism research for municipality)

Williams Lake, BC: education and training for staff on economic, social, and environmental concerns; partners with Thompson Rivers University in creation of new campus at Williams Lake

Salmon Arm, BC: provides coaching and mentoring services to struggling businesses in the area; has workshops for forestry sector individuals who have lost their jobs; has trade fair to educate those who have just lost their jobs about the local services they can access

Gravelbourg, SK: community education about recycling; promotes investing locally

Craik, SK: writes letters of support for youth for Youth Build Saskatchewan program (workforce preparation for unemployed youth without high school education)

Hazelton, BC: politicians and staff attend 2–3 community-led workshops on CED a year

Mission, BC: hosts a restorative justice program (with dedicated staff) with funding and expertise from other partners (provides 100 hours of training to 25 community members a year to create restorative justice facilitators); signed onto the 10-by-10 in BC — aimed at increasing the hiring of people with disabilities by 10 percent by 2010; sponsored documentary on 100-mile challenge in community

Golden, BC: provides coaching to community groups when requested

Leduc, AB: supports a number of internal training programs as well as a supervisory development program through a partnership with an educational institution; supports a number of programs addressing issues of diversity and equality in the workplace; supports a range of learning programs through Family and Community Support Services (FCSS) in response to identified community needs
Athabasca, AB: supports a range of internal training opportunities; board development training has been offered through FCSS program

**Land Use**

Dawson Creek, BC: undertaking the Charette process for land use; is donating land as part of a partnership for a new transitional housing unit; similar partnership for Aboriginal seniors’ assisted living designed by Douglas Cardinal

Port Alberni, BC: provides land for Habitat for Humanity; proposed low-barrier housing units and a safe-and-sober centre in an old building the city owns (conversion versus building new facilities is more cost-effective); implementing recommendations provided in “Uptown and Waterfront Redevelopment” study; city staff on Somass Basin Water Management board, which addresses land use and habitat issues in watershed

Revelstoke, BC: has a community tree farm license in partnership with local companies; 50 percent of the wood harvested goes to the companies and 50 percent to the municipal forestry corporation; the forest is a funding source they can tap into for big projects such as a new aquatic centre or a district energy corporation, where they take wood from the mills and burn it to heat water and heat buildings; set aside over $20 million of land for affordable housing

Selkirk, MB: partnered with the Farmers’ Markets Co-operative of Manitoba to establish a Selkirk Farmers’ Market on Waterfront Drive; beyond the $25 vendor’s license, the city charges no fees for the use of public space nor do they attempt to recoup the cost of street closure every Saturday

Craik, SK: set aside land and created 25 residential lots for an eco-village (people with approved sustainable house plans can purchase lots for $1; includes an interpretive centre with a restaurant, meeting rooms, golf course club house, geothermal heating, straw bale construction, earth tombs for cooling, solar hot water collected from roof and treated in building); municipality manages 100 acres/64,000 trees of agriforestry in hopes of having a community-owned logging industry in future (profits would be reinvested into community projects); local golf course owned by the municipality is certified by the Audubon Society for its sustainability

Mission, BC: town has a tree farming license

Golden, BC: partner with the Golden Food Bank on a community garden that produces food for the food bank

Leduc, AB: jointly fund the Leduc-Nisku Economic Development
Land Use

Authority, which works to attract and retain businesses in the Leduc business park; affordable housing development; community recreation and arts facility development; encourage urban reforestation through partnership with Leduc Environmental Advisory Board

Athabasca, AB: supports Athabasca Regional Development Committee; supported the development of the community recreation facility and ongoing operations; provides land for affordable housing development through their involvement in the Greater North Foundation and other partnerships

Procurement

Dawson Creek, BC: green buildings policy deals with energy management, water recycling, and procurement; all cleaning supplies are biodegradable; on the board of Branding the Peace (promotes and labels food items from the Peace region); working towards deriving electricity through solar and wind

Dryden, ON: purchasing policy addresses buying locally and environmentally; working towards LEED (Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design) standards in new buildings and retrofits

Greenstone, ON: local purchasing preference if seller is within 10 percent of the lowest bidder

Port Alberni, BC: developing a sustainability plan that will address local and ethical procurement

Revelstoke, BC: when new vehicles are needed they are purchasing hybrids

Williams Lake, BC: purchasing hybrid vehicles for city; draft policy under consideration includes purchasing guidelines that foster a local economy and environmental protection, and encouraging environmentally friendly practices in bids

Gravelbourg, SK: doing energy assessments on all town buildings to try and make them more efficient and sustainable

Gimli, MB: developing green purchasing policy; favour local tenders

Craik, SK: informally purchase environmentally friendly products; supported eating-local challenge; re-shingled the old town hall with recycled tires (contracted to a company in Saskatoon; product is superior to others and is warranted for 50 years; project provided employment for locals)

Hazelton, BC: considering greening when renewing infrastructure

DeSalaberry, MB: investigating signing food charter; supportive of the local
**Procurement** farmers’ market; printing, catering, janitorial are done on a local level

Mission, BC: works with companies that provide carbon offsets; exploring using clean building materials

Golden, BC: preference for local providers if they are within 10 percent of the lowest bidder; building an Amenity Hub at municipal campground to LEED specifications (geothermal, solar panels, etc.); use biodiesel with all town vehicles; visitor centre was built to LEED (Silver) specification

Leduc, AB: purchases “green” products; purchasing policy considers ethical or fair trade products and services; expansion to recreation centre being built to LEED standards
Table 10: Roles of Medium-Sized Municipalities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role Type</th>
<th>Medium-Sized Municipality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expressions of Interest</td>
<td>Red Deer, AB: corporate strategic plan explicitly mentions CED: “Foster an understanding and awareness of Community Economic Development as it relates to the economic, social, environmental, and cultural well-being of our community.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Saskatoon, SK: created a Municipal Enterprise Zone to encourage businesses to locate or expand their operations in order to create more economic activity within an area in need of revitalization; incentives include property tax abatement, grant in lieu of tax abatement, façade appearance grant, reduction or waiver of off-site development charges, rebate of direct service charges, relocation assistance, and land exchange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Abbotsford, BC: “Abbotsford Cares” report resulted in creation of the Abbotsford Social Development Advisory Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sudbury, ON: Earthcare Sudbury Local Action Plan sets out framework for developing a local food security strategy as well as a local food charter; details include trying to create an economic development strategy for food and working with food retailers to support the local food industry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thunder Bay, ON: Thunder Bay Food Charter promotes the “production, preparation, storage, distribution and consumption of local food as an integral part of the Thunder Bay economy”; charter seeks greater opportunities for collaboration between rural and urban areas to sustain rural farmers and communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kamloops, BC: Kamloops Social Plan created to provide guidance on the growing social challenges facing the city; plan addresses social issues not directly the responsibility of local governments but sets out what Kamloops can do within its jurisdiction to address these issues; plan focuses on issues such as housing and homelessness, youth, building social agencies and community capacity, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medicine Hat, AB: has a Social Policy Statement: “By addressing social issues such as economic disparities and the diversity of the population of Medicine Hat, and by identifying vulnerable groups such as the poor, youth, seniors and people with special needs, the City’s role in supporting the potential of all citizens is insured.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brandon, MB: Brandon Downtown Economic Development Strategy 2008 acknowledges that business development is not the only factor for successful</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
downtown revitalization; plan points out “that community development, which fosters economic growth and improves the quality of life for residents,” is an essential factor for success and that buy-in from local government, business owners, and citizens is essential

**Financial Support**

Saskatoon, SK: gives 10 percent grant to all new affordable housing projects; Saskatoon Collaborative Funding Partnership includes many local funders, including the City of Saskatoon, the city’s Social Services Grant, and the Saskatoon Urban Aboriginal Strategy, which provides support to urban Aboriginal communities by “promoting self-reliance and increasing life choices for Aboriginal people living in urban centres”; partnership created to make it easier for community-based organizations in Saskatoon to apply for grants; priority funding areas include initiatives that increase the availability of and access to economic development opportunities such as enterprise pre-development and/or employment, and initiatives that assist those at risk of facing poverty, of returning to poverty, and/or managing the effects of poverty

Abbotsford, BC: supports nonprofits and social agencies through property tax exemptions

Kamloops, BC: offers social planning grants that community organizations can apply for; in some cases, can be used as operating grants; city also has service agreements with various groups (Boys and Girls Club, YM/YWCA, etc.); city centre revitalization tax exemption applies to a portion of Kamloops’s downtown; incentive was created to encourage revitalization and new development in the area; city is starting to build up a housing reserve fund that will be used for funding affordable housing initiatives

Medicine Hat, AB: community development grants available to organizations that provide social services

Red Deer, AB: agency capacity grants assist organizations with their administration, planning and operations needs

Thunder Bay, ON: Core Area Renewal Programs offer financial incentives to help property owners and tenants in the downtown core rehabilitate buildings; incentives include planning and building fee rebates, façade loans, and tax increment-based grants; grants under the Community and Cultural Funding Program are available to nonprofit organizations in the health and social services sectors; program has three components: sustaining grants (3–5 years), operating grants, and project grants

Brandon, MB: provides the Brandon Neighbourhood Renewal Corporation
with an annual cash contribution of $55,000 on a multi-year contract; Renaissance Brandon Grants Program 2009 encourages redevelopment in downtown Brandon and can be used for new construction, business relocation, safety initiatives, etc.

**In-Kind Support**

Red Deer, AB: city staff provide direct support to CED organizations and community associations; looking at creating space in the new city hall for a social enterprise but no firm commitments yet

Saskatoon, SK: new development Station 20 West — city assembled land, did environmental clean-up, and provided it to QUINT, a local CED organization, for $1; location currently has a new library, affordable housing, and office space; QUINT intends to create a community enterprise centre, space for its own offices, and space for the Child Hunger and Education Program, another CED organization; Community Development Department has a mandate to work with community associations, assisting them to develop their projects, helping with community consultations for the city, and supporting local neighbourhood-based initiatives

Medicine Hat, AB: directory of local food producers helps people find local growers; many of the producers are from the local Red Hat co-op

Abbotsford, BC: partners with Community Futures South Fraser to deliver the Abbotsford Connected Neighbourhoods program, which supports the creation of connections among neighbours through community events and projects

**Planning, Research, and Advising**

Red Deer, AB: Social Planning Department supports strong organizations; believes planning is one of the key strategies to help agencies stay strong and become more sustainable; department also actively involved in social research to inform decision making and strategic planning for both the city and community groups

Saskatoon, SK: Community Development Department provides assistance to groups in carrying out local projects; Local Area Planning Program identified 11 core areas that need long-range improvement plans; local area plans cover all aspects of civic responsibility including transit, parks, traffic, safety, and land use; program’s research has shown where neighbourhoods are moving the wrong way in terms of economic and social development; information is valuable to community groups in program planning

Kamloops, BC: social plan identifies that the city should put a process in place to “assist agencies seeking to expand or develop a new facility, to help address community concerns and minimize community opposition”;
Venture Kamloops, the city’s economic development agency, has a business start-up, retention, and expansion program, which provides business coaching and mentoring and assistance to the community for economic development projects.

Human and Social Capital Development

Red Deer, AB: committed to including more Aboriginal residents through a partnership with Red Deer Aboriginal Employment Services pre-employment program, which includes life and employability skills training and a work placement with the City of Red Deer; has a municipal integration strategy team looking at the municipality’s role in social inclusion; sponsors learning events related to CED for community organizations and is active in the province’s CED network; partners with the community foundation to support a leadership training program for people coming from the private, public, or nonprofit sectors (participants undertake individual and group projects; one group is currently interviewing local nonprofits to ask about their understanding, capacity for, interest in, and willingness to engage in social enterprise); city is looking at policies and procedures for creating secondary suites and taxation related to affordable housing; first city in Canada to undertake ending-homelessness planning; has a commitment to end homelessness by 2018.

Saskatoon, SK: Planning Education Program offers opportunities for community members to increase their knowledge and understanding of municipal practice; goal is to educate citizens and groups on all aspects of community planning and development, related by-laws, policies, and the city’s official community plan; thus far most of the uptake has been from the core areas of Saskatoon; most heavily used by members of community associations and CED groups.

Kamloops, BC: has hosted a number of social enterprise workshops.

Medicine Hat, AB: has held workshops on topics such as community planning; workshops usually have a capacity building focus.

Land Use

Saskatoon, SK: has implemented some higher density zoning districts and density bonuses in the inner-city for the benefit of affordable housing projects; also offers reductions or waives development charges in its enterprise zone.

Kamloops, AB: is very active in affordable housing and tries to encourage affordable housing development through tax incentives, expedited development applications, and development cost rebates.

Procurement

Abbotsford, BC: contracts with the Mennonite Central Committee (MCC).
Procurement for paper recycling (shredding and loose paper) services; has close connections with the local MCC office; recycling is done through an MCC program that employs people with mental disabilities; city’s recycling depot (shared between Abbotsford and Mission) is run by Abbotsford Community Services, another organization that employs adults with developmental disabilities.

Thunder Bay, ON: research is underway towards creating a Sustainable Environmental and Ethical Purchasing Policy (SEEPP); the EarthWise Thunder Bay Community Environmental Action Plan (2008, 65) set the stage for its creation, although it is not yet passed by council; city has a good relationship with Community Living Thunder Bay and has contracted the group to assist in conducting waste audits, working in the storage department, providing clerical activities, cleaning bus shelters, etc.; hope is to use the SEEPP policy to purposefully support community groups in Thunder Bay.

Medicine Hat, AB: city’s Social Development Department often purchases catering from a local nonprofit called Worlds of Women Together, a catering training program for new Canadians that bakes and makes many ethnic foods.

Sudbury, ON: city’s Earth Care Local Action Plan explores the idea of eco-procurement and recognizes that it can achieve many of its environmental goals through this policy; document also mentions creating a “community-wide eco-procurement initiative”.

Brandon, MB: city’s purchasing section and the environmental co-ordinator are working on a green procurement policy expected to be implemented in 2010.

Kamloops, BC: has a policy that supports green procurement which implements life-cycle cost analyses and minimizing environmental impact.
Table 11: Roles of Large Municipalities

All of the large local governments researched have a range of policies, strategies, and plans that align with and support elements of CED and SE, including policies and procedures related to each of the roles identified in this summary. Several specific policies are highlighted below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role Type</th>
<th>Large Municipality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expressions of Interest</td>
<td>Calgary, AB: adopted a triple-bottom-line policy; developed the Sustainable Environmental and Ethical Procurement Policy; recognizes that it can improve environmental, ethical, and economic outcomes through purchasing decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Edmonton, AB: has a number of polices and procedures related to CED and SE activities, including a Public Art Policy, an Affordable Housing Policy, and Non-Profit Leasing Guidelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Winnipeg, MB: the Winnipeg Partnership Agreement, signed in 2004, is a 5-year agreement focused on strengthening Winnipeg’s communities; one element is encouraging sustainable economic development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vancouver, BC: has a Green Building Policy that supports environmental objectives; the Vancouver Agreement is an urban development agreement involving all three levels of government; signed in 2000 and renewed until 2010; focuses on promoting and supporting sustainable economic, social, and community development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Toronto, ON: has adopted a fair wage policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Support</td>
<td>Calgary, AB: provides financial support to many organizations through Family and Community Support Services (FCSS) funding for preventative social service activities; in 2009, contributed $7.2 million to FCSS funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Edmonton, AB: contributed $3 million to support initial capitalization of the Social Enterprise Fund, which provides flexible financing and business development services to help not-for-profit organizations and co-operatives create or expand social enterprises or social or affordable housing projects; through grant programs such as FCSS, Community Investment operating grants, and others, provides financial support to a wide range of preventative social and recreational programs; in 2008, FCSS funding totalled more than $10 million to 67 agencies for 98 programs in the City of Edmonton; also provided financial support to the Art of Living Implementation plan, which includes development of Arts Habitat, an organization that will work on the development of arts space, including artists’ live/work space; provides financial support to</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Financial Support

a wide range of CED and SE organizations through partnership arrangements and decisions made as part of budget processes; under its nonprofit leasing guidelines, city leases available city-owned space to nonprofits for $1/yr plus operating costs; offers the Affordable Housing Projects — Municipal Fee Rebate Program, which rebates the cost of municipal fees and charges paid during construction on qualifying affordable housing projects (includes development, building and occupancy permit fees, city service costs including sanitary sewer truck fees, lot grading fees, paving and lane requirement fees, footing and foundation, and electrical and mechanical permit fees)

Winnipeg, MB: Community Services Department provides incentive grants to nonprofit organizations carrying out projects with environmental innovation and sustainable development; Winnipeg Partnership Agreement involves all 3 levels of government, committed $75 million over 5 years to projects that strengthen Winnipeg’s communities (including $640,000 to Winnipeg’s Aboriginal Youth Strategy for Job and Skills Training; agreement also funds 5 CED projects; supports community-driven economic development designed by local residents to benefit the community as a whole)

Vancouver, BC: has made a significant contribution to and investment in social and cultural facilities; has 85 nonprofit capital asset sites worth an estimated $110 million that are fully occupied by nonprofit organizations; spaces are available to nonprofits for nominal rents

In-Kind Support

Several of the large local governments interviewed provide space to some CED and SE organizations at a nominal rate (often $1/yr).

Calgary, AB: provides in-kind staff support to CED and SE activities in 2 areas in particular; social workers with the Community Development Program work with residents and organizations to address neighbourhood issues; city staff also assist with area redevelopment plans, often in partnership with community associations; work can include CED and SE activities; one staff member is working with FCSS-funded CED and SE organizations; this role has also recently included exploration of interest in developing a Social Enterprise Fund in Calgary

Edmonton, AB: provides in-kind support to CED and SE activities through provision of staff, space, and access to other municipal resources (e.g., time contributed to the development and ongoing operations of the Social Enterprise Fund)

Winnipeg, MB: provides in-kind staff support to several Winnipeg Partnership Agreement initiatives (e.g., staff support in co-ordinating the Aboriginal Youth Strategy); Community Services Department provides community de-
development staff to work with Aboriginal and geographic communities across the city.

Vancouver, BC: in 2003, city council approved a motion supporting development of a just and sustainable food system for the city; have developed a food action plan and a food policy council, which is supported through the allocation of 2 full-time city staff.

### Planning, Research, and Advising

Calgary, AB: through FCSS, and in partnership with several other community partners, undertook a research project to better understand current social enterprise and earned-income activities in the human service nonprofit sector; report considers community readiness for a social enterprise stimulant and recommendations for this activity; city has engaged in a number of activities to plan for population growth and changing social, environmental, and economic conditions; planning initiatives include ImagineCalgary, the Municipal Development Plan, and the Calgary Transit Plan; council endorsed a long-range sustainability plan that makes specific reference to CED.

Edmonton, AB: conducted market research to explore the demand for a social enterprise financing tool; research identified strong demand, which supported development of the Social Enterprise Fund; city completed research on the space needs of nonprofit organizations; research will support development of a policy to support nonprofits in finding appropriate and affordable space.

Vancouver, BC: the Vancouver Agreement included several planning activities including the Economic Revitalization Plan; city recently completed a Culture Plan, which sets out the city’s role in the creative sector; includes a grants program review, a public art review, a cultural facilities priority plan, and a cultural tourism strategy.

### Human and Social Capital Development

Calgary, AB: in 2008, city council approved a new social sustainability framework to guide FCSS investments; framework aligns with the city’s Triple Bottom Line Policy; two key priorities are to strengthen neighbourhoods and to increase social inclusion; city provides support to the Youth Employment Centre, which provides training and job search support for at-risk youth; city supports “City Links,” which provides home-support services to low-income seniors (people providing the services are involved in a 12–16 week training program in which they get work and life-skills training and receive an allowance; during the training, they provide home maintenance work required by the seniors).

Edmonton, AB: is currently working on the development of “The Way We Live,” Edmonton’s Social Plan; through the Neighbourhood and
Community Development Branch of Community Services, often works with community partners to offer training and learning events to voluntary sector organizations; city established an Office of Diversity and Inclusion

Winnipeg, MB: as part of the Winnipeg Partnership Agreement, the city is implementing the Aboriginal Youth Strategy, which funds organizations and projects that support Aboriginal youth employment either within the city administration or elsewhere in Winnipeg; the city focuses on equity and diversity (e.g., the police service worked with the Centre for Aboriginal Human Resource Development and a local technical institution to develop a police officer training program)

Vancouver, BC: is currently working on a broad-based social development plan for the city; through the Economic Revitalization Plan, part of the Vancouver Agreement, the city is focusing on 3 key strategies to generate local employment — increasing demand for the downtown eastside’s products and services, strengthening capabilities of local suppliers, and increasing employment opportunities; the city recently issued an RFP that invited proposals from nonprofit organizations to operate social enterprises as part of a new development in downtown Vancouver

Toronto, ON: through the Homelessness Partnership Initiative, focused on creating skills training and employment opportunities

Calgary, AB: the city has an affordable housing strategy that defines 8 municipal roles in fostering affordable housing development; roles include managing and operating subsidized and affordable housing units through Calgary Housing Company, administering affordable housing programs, direct funding and development, strategic partnerships, planning and regulation, community development and education, research, and advocacy; city has a target to develop or facilitate the development of 2,000 nonmarket housing units per year; city established the Forever Green Program, which encourages tree planting to support a range of environmental and aesthetic objectives

Edmonton, AB: through the Land Enterprise Fund, the city purchases land for special neighbourhood improvement projects as directed by city council (activities are not profit driven); created “Cornerstones: Edmonton’s Plan for Affordable Housing,” which will create over 3,800 long-term affordable housing units by 2010 through 18 initiatives that include establishing a land bank, building and purchasing new units, and offering rent supplements; also has a Housing First Policy for surplus city-owned land; in partnership with 5 organizations, established the Edmonton and Area Land Trust, which focuses on conserving natural areas
Winnipeg, MB: supports affordable housing development through the Winnipeg Housing and Homelessness Initiative; supports the Housing Rehabilitation Investment Reserve, which includes 5 housing programs; adopted the Ecologically Significant Natural Lands Policy and Strategy in 2007; Community Garden Policy fosters a positive climate for community gardening and identifies the principles for developing, managing, and maintaining community gardens on city-owned land; city believes community gardens contribute to healthy communities and are tools that support food security, neighbourhood revitalization, job training, and community building.

Vancouver, BC: has a Property Endowment Fund and an Affordable Housing Fund to assist in the development of social housing; in new neighbourhoods, the policy is 20 percent of the units for social housing; in established neighbourhoods, the city applies a development cost levy and some of the funds go towards affordable replacement housing in the area; in 2003, city council approved a motion supporting development of a just and sustainable food system for Vancouver; city provides a wide range of programs and services related to urban agriculture including community gardens, farmers’ markets, rooftop gardens, composting facilities, and commercial enterprises.

Toronto, ON: funds and administers a range of social housing programs; adopted the Strong Neighbourhoods Strategy to strengthen priority neighbourhoods through targeted investments.

**Procurement**

Calgary, AB: implemented a Triple Bottom Line framework that commits the city to take social, environmental, and economic impacts of decisions into account; in 2007, approved the Sustainable Environmental and Ethical Procurement Policy, which builds on the Green Procurement Policy previously in place (directs administration to implement purchasing procedures that consider environmental and ethical implications in addition to financial criteria; is intended to ensure that the city purchases items manufactured or produced in accordance with certain environmental standards and codes of conduct regarding wages, working conditions, etc.)

Edmonton, AB: recently approved a sustainable procurement policy; Kids in the Hall, a social enterprise providing training to street youth, is located in city hall and provides catering for many city functions; city also supported the development of Flavour Budzz, a catering business and social enterprise that provides training to people with chronic mental-health problems; it also has catered some city events.

Toronto, ON: adopted a policy on responsible procurement in 1999; Materials Management reviewed specifications for contracts and tenders.
Procurement and placed an emphasis on purchasing environmentally preferred products and services; adopted a fair wage policy that is now part of Toronto’s Municipal Code (core principle is the prohibition of the city doing business with contractors, subcontractors, and suppliers who discriminate against their workers)

Vancouver, BC: has incorporated fair trade purchasing criteria into its procurement process; in 2005, implemented an ethical purchasing policy
APPENDIX II: INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

Introduction

Community economic development is action by people locally to create economic opportunities and better social conditions, particularly for those who are most disadvantaged. Its characteristics can include:

- the use of local goods and services
- production of goods and services for local use
- local reinvestment of profits
- long-term employment of local residents
- local skill development
- local decision making and ownership
- healthy citizens (physical, mental, and emotional)
- positive physical environment (sustainable, stable, and healthy neighbourhood)
- neighbourhood stability
- human dignity (improving people’s capacity to better themselves) and
- support for other community economic development projects

The social economy can be understood as a third sector co-existing with the private and public sectors. It includes organizations such as co-operatives, volunteer organizations, non-profits, and social enterprises.

Questions

1. Does your municipality support community economic development and the social economy through a designated staff person, a department, or by devolving authority to a local body such as a community or economic development corporation?
2. Does your municipality partner with other groups (such as service clubs, nonprofits, First Nations, etc.) on community economic development or social economy related projects?

3. Does your municipality have by-laws or policies that commit your support to or define your role in community economic development or social economy activities?

4. Do you have any equity-based hiring and training practices?

5. Are you involved in the support of any education or training related programs either internally or externally?

6. Is your municipality involved in neighbourhood revitalization?

7. Are you involved in the development of affordable housing, such as housing for seniors, the disabled, or those with low incomes?

8. Do you have any programs that aid in the emergence, convening, incubating, or revitalization of community businesses or social enterprises?

   If yes, what are the criteria you use for qualifying businesses as a social enterprise?

9. Do you support any community loan funds or micro-lending programs that could support community economic development or social enterprises in your municipality?

10. Do you have a purchasing policy that addresses the purchase of local, “green” (environmentally friendly), or “ethical” (such as fair trade) products and services?

   If yes, do you believe these policies have made a difference within your community?

11. Does your community have a sustainable community plan (related to the federal gas tax rebate)?

12. Does your municipality promote or engage in any community resource management projects?

13. Are you involved in the support of “green” programs?

14. Do you have any alternative energy generation in your municipality?

   If yes, what affect does this have on your community? How are profits shared?

15. What tools, methods, approaches, or supports would you like to see your municipality take forward into the future to support community economic development and social economy activities?

16. Is there anything that you think we’ve missed that you’d like to discuss or any final thoughts you’d like to add?

Thanks so much for giving your time today to help us with this research!
Appendix III: Research Guiding Principles

The objectives of this research are: to explore and analyse municipal government support for CED and the SE sector in a Canadian context; to explore and analyse key areas of involvement in specific sectors (such as affordable housing, green/sustainable cities, social enterprise development, training and employment, financing, etc.); to identify examples of how different municipalities engage with CED and SE sectors; to address key success factors for strengthening municipal government support for CED and the SE (a typology of the actual and what is possible); to explore the issue of scale by comparing the role of local government in supporting CED and the SE in different geographic regions and in large urban versus rural contexts; to make recommendations for advancing support of CED and the SE at a municipal level; and to explore co-ordinating and co-designing research across more than one node in the Canadian Social Economy Hub.

The benefits of this research include: increased understanding of the role municipal government plays in supporting CED and the SE; increased awareness of how to further engage municipal government in supporting CED and the SE; and cross-node discussions about definitions and development of policy alternatives.

The study and data-gathering process were guided by the following sub-questions:

• What is the intermediary role of municipal governments in CED and the SE?
• What opportunities are there for strengthening this role?
• How can CED and the SE sector be advanced within municipal governments?
• How can alliances form between municipal governments and other CED and SE actors in order to promote CED and the SE to other levels of government?

The impetus for this project came from a number of stakeholders. Early in the BALTA
research process, dialogue between two BALTA research clusters identified an interest in exploring the municipal role in CED and the SE. There was recognition that while provincial and federal government support for CED and the SE had been explored, limited attention had been paid to the role of local government. As the level of government closest to the community and increasingly having to respond to pressing community issues, researchers felt there was an opportunity to learn more about the role it plays. There was also discussion about the municipal role at the Northern Ontario, Manitoba, and Saskatchewan research cluster meeting. This group was aware that the Canadian Community Economic Development Network (CCEDNet) and Le Chantier de l’économie sociale in Quebec have both done extensive research on the role of provincial and federal policy in promoting CED and the SE in Canada. While CCEDNet had completed an inventory of municipal support for CED and the SE across Canada (Canadian CED Network 2003), it had not undertaken any further analysis of the topic. When the two research nodes discovered that they had proposed similar research projects, they contacted one another and decided to combine research efforts to allow for comparability of data across projects.
**Appendix IV: Research Challenges**

Soliciting participation from local governments presented numerous challenges. These included how to locate appropriate potential interviewees and co-ordinating interviewee and researcher schedules — especially when summer holidays came into play or when several interviewees at one municipality necessitated group interviews and the co-ordination of multiple people’s schedules.

Co-ordinating the schedules of the research team — individuals working within five different institutions across three time zones — aligning research goals and details to satisfy the ethics approval process of three academic institutions, and grappling with ways to harmonize interview questions to satisfy the interests of various student theses and project requirements meant constant attention to methods and methodology, goals, outcomes, and above all, deadlines. Very early on in the research, it became apparent that clear and timely communication among research team members was indispensable. Additionally, team members had to be willing to go back to previously settled, collectively made decisions and rehash the reasons behind these decisions and repurpose the decisions themselves on an ongoing basis.
Appendix V: Research Methodology

The research group for this project has collaborated on the identification of research questions, a common methodology, and the division of labour for interviews. Interviews were conducted by Emma Sharkey, a master’s student in dispute resolution at the University of Victoria, Jenny Kain of the City of Edmonton and a graduate student in the CED program at Cape Breton University, and Robyn Webb, a graduate student in the University of Manitoba’s City Planning Department. The research team also received advice, especially at the analysis stage, from Brendan Reimer of CCEDNet, and Peter Hall, Professor of Urban Studies at Simon Fraser University.

Research Framework

Researchers included both practitioners and academics. The research team placed high value on ensuring the research was useful and beneficial to municipal government administrators and elected officials as well as community groups undertaking valuable work on the ground. The figure on the opposite page depicts the research framework. The researchers used a qualitative approach with a case study methodology and interview method. Analysis sought to identify key themes that emerged from the data and to identify opportunities for strengthening the municipal role in CED and the SE.

Data Collection

Primary data was collected through telephone interviews with municipal officials who work on initiatives related to CED and SE activities (planning, economic develop-
ment, social planning, etc). This is the group that can provide a perspective of the challenges and potential involved in supporting CED and the SE at the municipal level.

The telephone interview method was chosen because it enables cost-effective yet in-depth and detailed examination of personal perspectives on municipal activities in a way that is compatible with unpacking complex systems and allowing for clarification and deep understanding. The interview questions sought to address the research questions as well as to take into account the gaps in knowledge on this subject. The interview questions were open-ended in nature so as to ensure rich answers and allow for greater interpretation. The qualitative data collected in this way facilitated the development of descriptive municipal framework profiles. Interviews were conducted over the phone and were audio recorded. Interviews usually took between half an hour to an hour, with hour-and-a-half interviews sometimes resulting when more than one interviewee was participating. Appendix II contains a complete list of the interview questions.

The recruitment process involved researchers contacting potential participants. In some cases, the researchers had professional relationships with the participants, but in most cases the researcher and participants did not know each other prior to the commencement of the research. Contact information for participants was obtained from publicly available phone and e-mail listings. Recruitment was carried out over the phone or e-mail, at which time potential participants were provided with details of the study. Once a prospective participant agreed to participate, he/she was asked to sign a participant consent form. While the interview was designed to be conducted with one participant from each local government, several participants identified colleagues with further information/knowledge in the areas we were researching. This was particularly the case in the large local governments, where staff roles are more specific to a particular area. Multiple interviews or interviews with more than one person provided the research team with a wider range of responses to the questions; these interviews were generally of longer duration.
Primary data was supplemented with secondary research data. This was particularly the case in the larger municipalities, where few of the interviewees were familiar with and/or involved in all of the areas. In these situations, interviewees often referred the researcher to a specific area of their website for more detailed information and documentation. Data collection took place between spring 2008 and fall 2009. Data analysis and report writing took place in the summer/fall of 2009.

**Data Analysis**

The research team developed a framework for data analysis at a meeting in Vancouver in July 2009. The group determined that it would be useful to classify the identified examples of municipal support into roles and to describe how local governments support the sector based on the different roles they play. The roles are as follows: Expressions of Intent; Financial Support; In-Kind Support; Planning, Research, and Advising; Human Social Capital Development; Land Use; and Procurement (described earlier in this research report, beginning on page 21).

As a second major means for analysing the data, the research group identified five frameworks for describing in general terms how the local governments under study relate to the CED and the SE sector and their various modes of interaction. These five frameworks are as follows: Coffee Shop; Partnering; Linking and Leveraging; Integrated; and How Can We Help?. The frameworks are helpful in identifying how the different roles (policies, funding, procurement, etc.) may be combined to support CED and the SE sector and build communities.

Finally, the researchers decided to consider some analysis of the practices across provinces and across size categories to see if there were common practices among local governments in a certain province and among local governments of a particular size.
Appendix VI: The Role/Jurisdiction of Local Government

Local government responsibilities can include public education (elementary and secondary); protection (police, fire, and emergency planning and services); animal control; roads (traffic control, parking, street-lighting); public transit; environment (water, sewage, and garbage collection and disposal); land-use planning and regulation; building regulation; economic development and promotion; public libraries; parks and recreation; public cultural facilities (museums, concert halls, art galleries); business licensing and regulation; and sometimes electricity, natural gas, telephone, local health, and social services (Sancton 1994). Actions of local governments in these areas may have direct or indirect consequences for CED and SE actors.

Provinces institute either single or multi-tier local government systems based on a number of factors. “A single-tier system works well when there is no undue pressure for the delivery of services that go beyond the financial capacity of the municipality,” which generally occurs in Canada’s less populated provinces (Diamant and Pike 1994). Multi-tier systems work well in areas with large populations, which can support an additional level of government and the resulting increase in bureaucracy. Multi-tier systems can decrease the need for the consolidation of neighbouring local governments due to financial trouble or under-population; they can increase the control and monitoring of jointly delivered services; and they can increase opportunities for municipal co-operation (Diamant and Pike 1994). While BC and Ontario both have multi-tier systems, the upper tier (regional districts and counties, respectively) are not examined in this study.

Historically, the role of local government focused primarily on physical infrastructure and traditional economic development. Local governments concentrated on core city opera-
tions such as roads and sewers, waste disposal, water, etc. Little, if any, attention was paid to the role of local government in addressing social issues (Torjman and Leviten-Reid 2003). Few assumed an explicit social role, and if they did have a role, it was generally limited to sponsorship of a particular program or a specific community event (Torjman and Leviten-Reid 2003). Social issues were largely the jurisdiction of provincial and federal governments.

A shift from a historical industry-focused economy to a global service-based economy and the accompanying labour market and social changes has more recently resulted in a growing awareness of the critical role that local government plays in our current context (Bradford 2002). It has forced many to rethink the role of local government. As a result of these changes, cities are faced not only with an abundance of opportunities but a plethora of social problems, including rising rates of poverty and inequality, unemployment and underemployment, environmental degradation, and shortages of affordable housing and homelessness (Bradford 2002).

The important role of local governments in this new economy is well recognized by urban and local government theorists. There is awareness that “local spaces” are important arenas for solving today’s most challenging public policy issues (Bradford 2002, 1).

Accompanying this is recognition that local governments continue to face significant financial challenges to respond effectively. There is a large and growing mismatch between the fiscal capacity of local government and the range of responsibilities that have been laid on their doorstep (Torjman and Leviten-Reid 2003). Although other levels of government have downloaded many of these responsibilities, there has been no ongoing commitment to a sustainable source of revenue that would allow local governments to effectively respond to them.

Local governments are therefore experiencing significant changes, which are gradually being addressed by a range of emerging provincial and federal tools that provide some financial and policy support to innovative municipal approaches to addressing these challenges (Bradford 2008). Well positioned in our current economic context to have a significant impact on economic, environmental, and social well-being, local governments must carefully consider the roles and responsibilities that will sustain and benefit citizens and communities in the future.

Local governments of all sizes across Canada are looking beyond fragmented and singular solutions to present-day challenges. Many are moving towards more integrated, compre-
hensive, community-based approaches to effectively address these complex community issues. There is intense interest in the current problems and prospects of cities, and a lot of dialogue on innovative fiscal and policy tools, financing mechanisms, and revitalization frameworks that local governments could pursue in response to these (Bradford 2002).
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Announcing a new ejournal from the Canadian Centre for Community Renewal

{i/4} is an ejournal about crafting creative, democratic, and sustainable economies in this century of unprecedented challenges. Published by the Canadian Centre for Community Renewal (CCCR), {i/4} is about the endeavour here in Canada and around the world to Inspire, Innovate, Incite, and Invent ways of life and work that nourish people while respecting the planet.

Twice monthly, {i/4} will supply you with reports from people engaged in strengthening community resilience and transforming local and regional economies, social entrepreneurs, researchers, policy-makers, activists, municipal and regional officials, business owners, managers, planners, thinkers, organizers. Following in the tradition of *Making Waves* magazine, they'll give you the straight goods, in French or in English: what's happening, what's working, what isn't, why — and what's next.

{i/4} goes live in November 2010 from communityrenewal.ca and renouveaucommunaute.ca. Join us!
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