

Community and Protective Services Committee

Report

12th Meeting of the Community and Protective Services Committee
August 31, 2021

PRESENT: Councillors J. Helmer (Chair), S. Lewis , M. Salih

ABSENT: A. Kayabaga, S. Hillier, Mayor E. Holder

ALSO PRESENT: J. Bunn and J. Taylor

Remote Attendance: Councillors M. Cassidy and M. van Holst;
G. Belch, C. Cooper, K. Dickins, Deputy Fire Chief R. Hayes, G.
Kotsifas, D. Purdy, M. Schulthess, J. Smit, C. Smith, B. Somers,
S. Tatavarti and B. Westlake-Power

The meeting was called to order at 4:00 PM; it being noted that
Committee Member Councillor M. Salih was in remote
attendance.

1. Disclosures of Pecuniary Interest

That it BE NOTED that no pecuniary interests were disclosed.

2. Consent

Moved by: S. Lewis

Seconded by: M. Salih

That Items 2.1 to 2.7 BE APPROVED.

Yeas: (3): J. Helmer, S. Lewis, and M. Salih

Absent: (3): A. Kayabaga, S. Hillier, and E. Holder

Motion Passed (3 to 0)

2.1 Research Into Labour Market Participation Rates in the London Economic Region - Final Report

Moved by: S. Lewis

Seconded by: M. Salih

That, on the recommendation of the Deputy City Manager, Social and Health Development, the staff report dated August 31, 2021, with respect to the final report on the Research Into Labour Market Participation Rates in the London Economic Region, BE RECEIVED. (L04A)

Motion Passed

a. (ADDED) Revised Page

2.2 Homeless Prevention COVID-19 Response Extension (Single Source Procurement SS21-29, Council Approved June 22, 2021)

Moved by: S. Lewis

Seconded by: M. Salih

That, on the recommendation of the Deputy City Manager, Social and Health Development, the following actions be taken with respect to the

Homeless Prevention COVID-19 response Extension (Single Source Procurement SS21-29, Council Approved June 22, 2021), as per The Corporation of the City of London Procurement Policy Section 14.5 a. ii, requiring Committee and City Council approval for single source procurements greater than \$50,000:

- a) extensions to existing Purchase of Service Agreements BE APPROVED as set out in the Housing Stability Services COVID-19 Response Allocations, as appended to the staff report dated August 31, 2021; it being noted that a combined total funding amount up to \$3,055,000 (excluding taxes) in 2021-2022 to provide COVID-19 Response Housing and Support Services;
- b) the Civic Administration BE AUTHORIZED to undertake all administrative acts which are necessary in relation to this matter; and,
- c) the approval given, herein, BE CONDITIONAL upon The Corporation of the City of London entering into and/or amending Purchase of Service Agreements with Agencies outlined in the above-noted staff report. (2021-S08/S14)

Motion Passed

2.3 Community Safety and Well-Being Plan

Moved by: S. Lewis

Seconded by: M. Salih

That, on the recommendation of the Deputy City Manager, Neighbourhood and Community-Wide Services, the following actions be taken with respect to the City of London Community Safety and Well-Being Plan:

- a) the Community Safety and Well-Being Plan, as appended to the staff report dated August 31, 2021, BE ADOPTED in accordance with the Police Services Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. P.15, Section 143 (1);
- b) the above-noted Plan BE SUBMITTED to the Ontario Ministry of the Solicitor General; and,
- c) the remainder of the above-noted report BE RECEIVED. (2021-S08/P15)

Motion Passed

2.4 London Fire Department Emergency Apparatus Procurement

Moved by: S. Lewis

Seconded by: M. Salih

That, on the recommendation of the Deputy City Manager, Neighbourhood and Community-Wide Services, the following actions be taken with respect to the staff report dated August 31, 2021, with respect to the London Fire Department Emergency Apparatus Procurement:

- a) the above-noted staff report BE RECEIVED in accordance with Section 14.2 of the Procurement of Goods and Services Policy;
- b) the funding for this procurement BE APPROVED as set out in the Sources of Financing Report, as appended to the above-noted staff report. (2021-F17/V01)

Motion Passed

2.5 London Fire Department Single Source Apparatus Procurement

Moved by: S. Lewis

Seconded by: M. Salih

That, on the recommendation of the Deputy City Manager, Neighbourhood and Community-Wide Services, the following actions be taken with respect to the staff report dated August 31, 2021, with respect to the London Fire Department Single Source Apparatus Procurement:

- a) in accordance with Sections 14.4(d) and (k) of the Procurement of Goods and Services Policy, Fire Administration BE AUTHORIZED to enter into negotiations with 12000 Darch Fire of 9-402 Harmony Road, Ayr, Ontario, N0B 1E0 for pricing for a single source contract for one (1) year for the provision of one fire Engine for the London Fire Department;
- b) the above-noted approval BE CONDITIONAL upon The Corporation of the City of London negotiating satisfactory prices, terms, conditions, and entering into a contract with 12000 Darch Fire to provide one fire Engine to the London Fire Department;
- c) the Civic Administration BE AUTHORIZED to undertake all the administrative acts that are necessary in connection with the above-noted authorization; and,
- d) that the funding for this procurement BE APPROVED as set out in the Sources of Financing Report, as appended to the above-noted staff report. (2021-F17/V01)

Motion Passed

2.6 Investing in Canada Infrastructure Plan: Community, Culture, and Recreation Stream – Transfer Payment Agreement

Moved by: S. Lewis

Seconded by: M. Salih

That, on the recommendation of the Deputy City Manager, Neighbourhood and Community-Wide Services, the proposed by-law, as appended to the staff report dated August 31, 2021, BE INTRODUCED at the Municipal Council meeting to be held on September 14, 2021, to:

- a) approve the Investing in Canada Infrastructure Plan Transfer Payment Agreement between Her Majesty the Queen in Right of the Province of Ontario, as represented by the Minister of Infrastructure for the Province of Ontario and The Corporation of the City of London, as appended to the above-noted by-law;
- b) authorize the Mayor and the City Clerk to execute the above-noted Agreement;
- c) delegate authority to the Deputy City Manager, Neighbourhood and Community-Wide Services, or written designate, to approve and execute any further amendments to the above-noted Agreement if the amendments are substantially in the form of the above-noted Agreement; and,
- d) delegate authority to the Deputy City Manager, Neighbourhood and Community-Wide Services, or written designate, to undertake all the administrative, financial and reporting acts that are necessary in connection with the above-noted Agreement. (2021-F11/R05B)

Motion Passed

2.7 Canada-Ontario Community Housing Initiative (COCHI) and Ontario Priorities Housing Initiative (OPHI) Approval of Ontario Transfer Payment Amending Agreement

Moved by: S. Lewis

Seconded by: M. Salih

That, on the recommendation of the Deputy City Manager, Planning and Economic Development, the proposed by-law, as appended to the staff report dated August 31, 2021, BE INTRODUCED at the Municipal Council meeting to be held on September 14, 2021 to:

- a) approve the Ontario Transfer Payment Amending Agreement, as appended to the above-noted staff report, and satisfactory to the City Solicitor, between Her Majesty the Queen in the Right of Ontario, as represented by the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing and The Corporation of the City of London;
- b) authorize the Mayor and the City Clerk to execute the above-noted Agreement; and,
- c) delegate authority to the Deputy City Manager, Planning and Economic Development, or written designate, to authorize and approve such further and other documents, including an Investment Plan, and including agreements that may be required in furtherance of the above-noted Agreement that are consistent with the requirements contained in that Agreement and that do not require additional funding or are provided for in the City's current budget and that do not increase the indebtedness or contingent liabilities of The Corporation of the City of London, subject to prior review and approval by the Deputy City Manager, Planning and Economic Development and the City Solicitor. (2021-F11/S11)

Motion Passed

- a. (ADDED) Staff Report

3. Scheduled Items

None.

4. Items for Direction

4.1 4th Report of the London Housing Advisory Committee

Moved by: S. Lewis

Seconded by: M. Salih

That the following actions be taken with respect to the 4th Report of the London Housing Advisory Committee, from its meeting held on July 14, 2021:

- a) the following actions be taken with respect to the Notice of Planning Application dated May 12, 2021 from C. Maton, Planner II, related to an Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendments for the property at 2009 Wharncliffe Road South:
 - i) the Civic Administration BE REQUESTED to attend the next London Housing Advisory Committee to provide additional information with respect to the above-mentioned application; and,
 - ii) the above-mentioned Notice BE RECEIVED;
- b) the following actions be taken with respect to the staff report dated May 17, 2021, from C. Saunders, City Clerk, related to the Advisory Committee Review – Interim Report VI:
 - i) the Governance Working Group BE ADVISED that the London Housing Advisory Committee (LHAC) endorses the continuation of an

advisory committee dedicated to addressing housing and homelessness issues in the City of London;

ii) the Governance Working Group BE REQUESTED to consider broadening the mandate of LHAC; and,

iii) the above-noted report BE RECEIVED;

it being noted that B. Westlake-Power, Deputy City Clerk provided an overview with respect to this matter; and,

c) clauses 1.1, 2.1, 3.1, 3.2, 3.4, 5.1 and 5.2, BE RECEIVED.

Yeas: (3): J. Helmer, S. Lewis, and M. Salih

Absent: (3): A. Kayabaga, S. Hillier, and E. Holder

Motion Passed (3 to 0)

4.2 London's Opioid Crisis

Moved by: S. Lewis

Seconded by: M. Salih

That it BE NOTED that the following actions be taken with respect to the delegation from C. Ryan and J. Scott with respect to London's Opioid Crisis:

a) the presentation, as appended to the Agenda, and the verbal delegation from C. Ryan and J. Scott, with respect to London's Opioid Crisis, BE RECEIVED; and,

b) the above-noted presentation BE FORWARDED to the Civic Administration for consideration in updating the City of London website. (2021-S08)

Yeas: (3): J. Helmer, S. Lewis, and M. Salih

Absent: (3): A. Kayabaga, S. Hillier, and E. Holder

Motion Passed (3 to 0)

Voting Record:

Moved by: M. Salih

Seconded by: S. Lewis

Motion to approve the delegation request from C. Ryan and J. Scott to be heard at this meeting.

Yeas: (3): J. Helmer, S. Lewis, and M. Salih

Absent: (3): A. Kayabaga, S. Hillier, and E. Holder

Motion Passed (3 to 0)

5. Deferred Matters/Additional Business

5.1 Deferred Matters List

Moved by: S. Lewis

Seconded by: M. Salih

That the Deferred Matters List for the Community and Protective Services Committee, as at August 4, 2021, BE RECEIVED.

Yeas: (3): J. Helmer, S. Lewis, and M. Salih

Absent: (3): A. Kayabaga, S. Hillier, and E. Holder

Motion Passed (3 to 0)

6. Confidential

Moved by: S. Lewis

Seconded by: M. Salih

That the Community and Protective Services Committee convene, In Closed Session, for the purpose of considering the following:

6.1. Land Acquisition / Solicitor-Client Privileged Advice / Position, Plan, Procedure, Criteria or Instruction to be Applied to Any Negotiations

A matter pertaining to the proposed or pending lease of land by the municipality, including communications necessary for that purpose; advice that is subject to solicitor-client privilege; commercial and financial information, that belongs to the municipality and has monetary value or potential monetary value and a position, plan, procedure, criteria or instruction to be applied to any negotiations carried on or to be carried on by or on behalf of the municipality.

Yeas: (3): J. Helmer, S. Lewis, and M. Salih

Absent: (3): A. Kayabaga, S. Hillier, and E. Holder

Motion Passed (3 to 0)

The Community and Protective Services Committee convened, In Closed Session, from 4:32 PM to 4:43 PM.

7. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 4:44 PM.

Report to Community and Protective Services Committee

To: Chair and Members
Community and Protective Services Committee

From: Kevin Dickins, Deputy City Manager, Social and Health Development

Subject: RESEARCH INTO LABOUR MARKET PARTICIPATION RATES IN THE LONDON ECONOMIC REGION – FINAL REPORT

Date: August 31, 2021

Recommendation

That, on the recommendation of the Deputy City Manager, Social and Health Development, the following report, OLMP Research into Labour Market Participation Rates in the London Economic Region – Final Report, **BE RECEIVED** for information.

Executive Summary

In 2020, the City of London, with support from regional stakeholders, entered in an agreement with the Ministry of Labour, Training and Skills Development (MLTSD) to conduct an Ontario Labour Market Participation (OLMP) research into the low labour market participation rates in the London Economic Region (LER).

Pricewaterhouse Coopers LLP (PwC) was contracted to: conduct research on the reasons for this low labour market participation focusing on prime-age (25-54 years of age) non-participants; estimate the number of non-participants who may be available to participate should barriers be addressed; and identify actions that could be taken to increase labour market participation. In their analysis, PwC identified eight (8) profiles among prime-age respondents and the six (6) top drivers of non-participation, noting these conditions are often mutually reinforcing. PwC has provided recommendations for addressing the main barriers to participation and estimates between 30,000-40,000 prime-age non-participants may be available to enter the labour market if these barriers were addressed.

PwC presented their research findings and analysis during a Lunch and Learn session held on August 9, 2021. Attendees of the session included representation across the LER from employment sector councils and agencies, economic development offices, regional workforce development offices, municipal council members and civic administration. The PwC report and recording of the session will be made available through the City of London website.

These OLMP research findings will help inform current and future employment, economic and social development strategies being implemented across the LER to re-engage non-participants and address current labour market demands and recruitment challenges experienced by employers.

For the City of London, there are many strong linkages between the findings and strategies being developed or currently underway. These linkages can apply to internal practices of the City of London as well as to community based strategies with examples that include, but not limited to: the London Community Recovery Network, the Mobility Master Plan and Transportation Management Association, London's Newcomer Strategy, London Strengthening Neighbourhoods Strategy, London & Middlesex Local Immigration Partnership, and the Community Diversity and Inclusion Strategy.

Linkage to Community Recovery

The City of London is committed to working in partnership with the community to identify solutions that will drive a strong, deep and inclusive community recovery for London as we move out of and beyond the global COVID-19 pandemic. This report, and the items

within, align with several initiatives of the London Community Recovery Network including:

- 3.6 Matching Employers and Job Seekers to Advance London & Area Economic & Social Recovery
- 3.7 Childcare and summer day camps
- 3.8 Recruitment of Registered ECEs during COVID 19
- 3.9 Connecting Businesses with Licensed Child Care
- 3.10 Inter-Ministerial Resource Team for Licensed Child Care
- 3.11 Short term Skills Development
- 3.12 Circular Economy Work and Training Platforms

This report, and items within, support recovery efforts by providing valuable information regarding labour market participation and will inform further economic and social recovery initiatives.

Linkage to the Corporate Strategic Plan

Strengthening Our Community

- Londoners have access to the supports they need to be successful.
- Londoners have access to the services and supports that promote well-being, health, and safety in their neighbourhoods and across the city.

Growing Our Economy

- London creates a supportive environment where entrepreneurs, businesses, and talent can thrive.

Leading in Public Service

- The City of London is a leader in public service as an employer, a steward of public funds, and an innovator of service.

Analysis

1.0 Background Information

1.1 Previous Reports Related to this Matter

Research into Labour Market Participation Rates in the London Economic Region – Request for Proposal 20-24 (CPSC – September 9, 2020)

Labour Market Partnership Agreement – Market Research Increased Labour Market Participation in the London Economic Region (CPSC – February 19, 2020)

Employment Ontario Transformation – Service System Manager Update (CPSC – January 21, 2020)

Employment Ontario Transformation – Service System Manager Competition (CPSC-June 17, 2019)

1.2 Background

In March 2020, the City of London, with support from regional stakeholders, entered into an agreement with the Ministry of Labour, Training and Skills Development (MLTSD) to conduct original, participatory research to:

- Assess the reasons for relatively low labour market participation in the London Economic Region (LER), focusing on prime-age participation
- Estimate the number of people in the LER currently not participating, but may be available to participate if barriers are addressed
- Identify actions that can be taken to increase labour market participation in the LER

An Advisory Committee was established to guide the project, contribute their expertise, and aid with selection of the researcher, review of preliminary and final reports,

development and promotion of online survey, and participation in the PwC Report Release: Lunch & Learn session. Members reflected regional representation and included:

- London Economic Development Corporation (LEDC) – Robert Collins
- Local Employment Planning Council (LEPC) – Deb Mountenay
- St. Thomas Economic Development – Cindy Hastings
- City of St. Thomas – Heather Sheridan
- County of Middlesex, Economic Development – Cara Finn
- Fanshawe College – Robert Downie
- County of Oxford – Lisa Lanthier
- London Community Foundation – Vanessa Dolishny
- Ministry of Labour, Training and Skills Development – Janet Neeb
- City of London – Jack Smit

Through a competitive RFP process, Pricewaterhouse Cooper LLP (PwC) was selected as the researcher for this project.

1.3 Challenges Faced

The research project was challenged connecting with individuals not engaged in the labour market and not necessarily connected to any community services, thus making it more difficult to complete surveys exclusively by phone as originally planned. In response to this challenge, the research modality was modified to include an online survey. The research timelines were extended to increase the number of respondents.

The COVID-19 pandemic impacted the research in a number of ways: the initial start date of the project was delayed as City operations were reduced to essential services, impacting the procurement process; many organizations were developing and adapting to new protocols and procedures, affecting ability to fully participate; COVID-19 impacted people's perception of the labour market and their ability to attain employment or enter the market. As a result, the research was delayed to a point in time where people and organizations were better equipped and prepared to deal with COVID-19 and the economic outlook seemed more stable.

2.0 Discussion and Considerations

2.1 Findings of the Survey

PwC connected with 447 respondents from across the LER who were not participating in the labour market through phone and on-line surveys. Attached as Schedule 1 PwC's final report.

PwC developed 8 (eight) profiles among prime-age respondents in their analysis:

- 1) Women
- 2) Immigrants
- 3) Visible minorities
- 4) Persons with Post Secondary education
- 5) Persons without Post Secondary education
- 6) Health conditions
- 7) Low-income
- 8) Residents outside of the City of London

Top drivers of non-participation in LER:

- Mismatch between Skills and Available Jobs
 - Including "job attractiveness" such as pay, alignment with skill set, desired schedule
 - Elements of mismatch affect almost all profiles described in this report, making it one of the top issues driving non-participation
- Discouragement
- Health Barriers
 - 28% of respondents cited health conditions as a reason for not participating

- Childcare responsibilities
 - 29% of women cited access to childcare as a barrier
- Perceived discrimination
 - One of the top reasons cited by prime-age immigrant and visible minority respondents for not participating
- Lack of access to transportation
 - Top barrier to participation for prime-age respondents without a post-secondary education and those with low income
 - Larger barrier for those in the City of London compared to other parts of the LER

It is important to note that these conditions are often mutually reinforcing. For example, those with low-income are less likely to be able to pursue post-secondary education, and vice versa.

PwC notes in their report that whether a job's pay is sufficient is unique to the individual and reflects their personal circumstances such as the costs they need to incur in maintaining the job, alternative income sources available to them, childcare needs, commute time, and access to transportation. PwC also notes that many survey respondents had relatively low income when they last worked: 55% of prime-age respondents who are not participating due to lack of jobs that pay enough made less than \$40,000 per year when they were last employed.

PwC estimates between 30,000 and 40,000 prime-age non-participants could be available to enter the labour market if their barriers to participation were addressed.

2.2 Recommendations / Considerations

Based on the survey findings and evidence in secondary research, PwC developed considerations for regional and municipal governments, educational institutions, employers, community organizations, employment agencies and economic development agencies. PwC identifies that conditions contributing to non-participation are often mutually reinforcing, therefore the inclusion of multi-faceted interventions would be required in order to accommodate overlapping participant profiles and the unique combination of barriers for each individual. Examples includes:

- Mismatch between skills and available jobs
 - Increase focus and funding on active labour market programs and increase coordination with employers
 - Increase access to labour market information (primary, secondary and post secondary student, job seekers)
 - Increase visibility of support programs and services to increase uptake by both employers and job seekers
- Health Barriers
 - Flexible working options such as the ability to work from home, part-time, and flexible hours
- Childcare
 - Increase access to affordable childcare
- Flexibility
 - Increase flexible working options such as the ability to work from home, part-time and flexible hours
- Access to transportation
 - Consider impacts on labour market participation when assessing changes to transit system
 - Increase flexible working options such as the ability to work from home, part-time and flexible hours
 - Involve employers in providing transportation solutions in increase access to the workplace for employees or potential employees
- Discrimination
 - Examine the framework around reporting and investigating incidents of discrimination
 - Communicating actions to address discrimination in the workplace
 - Be transparent about wages and opportunities

2.3. Lunch and Learn

PwC presented their report through a virtual Lunch & Learn event held on August 9, 2021, from 12:00pm-1:00pm. Brief comments on PwC research findings and recommendations were provided by the following speakers:

- Workforce Planning and Development Board – Deb Mountenay
- Fanshawe College – Darlene O’Neill
- LMLIP / Employment Sector Council – Jennifer Hollis
- Employment Sector Council – Carol Stewart

Approximately 80 persons were in attendance and the audience were representative of:

- Employment Sector Council members and Employment Sector agencies
- Economic Development offices (Elgin, Oxford, Middlesex, London)
- Regional Workforce Development offices
- Municipal Council members (Elgin, Oxford, Middlesex, London)
- London Community Recovery Network (mix of employers, community training and employment agencies)
- Mayor’s Jobs Now Taskforce Members
- Civic Administration?

The presentation from the Lunch & Learn session was recorded. Both the Lunch & Learn session as well as the PwC report will be publically shared on the City of London website – See <https://london.ca/living-london/community-services/ontario-works>

2.4. Next Steps / Implications

Labour market participation is a complex and multi-dimensional issue and doesn’t have an easy fix, nor a simple solution. PwC’s research findings will help inform current and future strategic planning in a multitude of areas. The PwC report will be shared with community stakeholders from across the London Economic Region to support strategic planning that municipalities, economic and workforce development organizations, education and training institutions, community agencies and businesses are undertaking. Advisory Committee members have begun referring to the report and its use in its development and updating of strategic planning.

For the City of London, the PwC report will be shared with strategic leads of various working tables to inform work currently in progress with the goal to identify further opportunities to address barriers and facilitate and encourage labour market engagement. The finds can be applied to internal practices of the City of London as well as to community based strategies. Examples include, but not limited to: the London Community Recovery Network, Mobility Master Plan and Transportation Management Association, London’s Newcomer Strategy, London Strengthening Neighbourhoods Strategy, London & Middlesex Local Immigration Partnership, and the Community Diversity Inclusion Strategy.

3.0 Financial Impact / Considerations

This project was 100% funded by the Ministry of Labour, Training and Skills Development through the City’s Ontario Transfer Payment Agreement - Ontario Labour Market Partnerships with the Ministry effective March 9, 2020, and amended March 2, 2021, to extend the expiry date to October 29, 2021. The total funding provided by the Ministry for this program is \$123,669, which includes an allocation to fund the work awarded to PwC in the amount of \$115,101 plus applicable taxes, resulting in no financial impact to the City’s budget.

As per the agreement with the Ministry, the City’s contribution to this project is in the form of “in-kind contributions” provided from existing City resources. These contributions consist of utilizing meeting facilities and staff time along with contributions from other project partners.

Conclusion

Labour market participation is a complex and multi-dimensional issue and doesn't have an easy fix, nor a simple solution. The PwC report highlights the strong intersectionality between contributing factors to labour market non-participation.

The OLMP project provided the opportunity to address labour market participation as a regional employment issue. The issues underlying labour market participation are not new to the London Economic Region. There are multiple strategies currently underway addressing contributing factors. The PwC report provided considerations for various levels of government, educational institutions, employers and community organizations. The report will be utilized to inform economic and workforce development plans, transportation strategies, anti-racism, anti-oppression and inclusivity initiatives across the region.

Prepared by: Jack Smit, Manager, Employment Strategies
Social and Health Development

Submitted by: Shirley Glover, Director of Life Stabilization
Social and Health Development

Recommended by: Kevin Dickins, Deputy City Manager
Social and Health Development

Labour market participation in the London Economic Region

Final report
August 2021



This project is funded in part by the Government of Canada and the Government of Ontario.

Contents

Contents	2
Executive summary	4
1. Introduction and scope	12
2. Approach and methodology	14
3. Labour market data	15
4. Literature review	23
5. Survey findings	31
6. Considerations for addressing low labour market participation	52
Appendix A: Limitations	62
Appendix B: Methodologies	63
Appendix C: Survey targets	65

Disclaimer

Our Services were performed and this Report was developed in accordance with our contract dated December 16, 2020 and are subject to the terms and conditions included therein.

Our work was limited to the specific procedures and analysis described herein and was based only on the information made available at the time we prepared the report. Accordingly, changes in circumstances after the date of this report could affect the findings outlined herein.


We are providing no opinion, attestation or other form of assurance with respect to our work and we did not verify or audit any information provided to us.

Executive summary

Introduction

The London Economic Region (referred to as “London ER” onwards), has one of the lowest labour market participation rates in Canada. Labour market participation refers to the share of the population that is either working (employed) or looking for work (unemployed).¹ A particular concern is the relatively low participation of those aged 25-54 (“prime-age”), because they are typically not expected to be pursuing education or retired. Though the traditional view of prime-age individuals is changing, as individuals of all ages seek to return to school, this does not explain the relatively low participation in the London ER. Policymakers focus on labour market participation as a sign of economic health because, all other things being equal, higher participation creates higher potential for economic growth, and a larger tax base. Figure 1 provides an illustration of the components that make up labour force participation. The figures in brackets provide an example illustrating labour force components as a proportion of the 15+ population, with the participation rate being 65% in our example (65 in the labour force, 100 in the total 15+ population).

Figure 1: Components of labour force participation



In that context, the City of London and its partners engaged PwC to conduct a study to:

- Assess the reasons for relatively low labour market participation in the London ER, focusing on prime-age participation.
- Identify actions that can be taken to increase labour market participation in the London ER.
- Estimate the number of people in the London ER that are currently not participating, but may be available to participate if barriers were addressed.

¹ “Looking for work” entails searching for part-time or full-time employment, in any industry, for pay or profit, as per [Statistics Canada’s definition for employment](#)

To address this scope, PwC undertook a literature review, collected secondary data, and collected primary data in the form of a survey of non-participants in the London ER. The survey was distributed through both web and phone channels. In total, we received 447 responses. 301 responses were collected through the web survey and 146 responses were collected through the phone survey. 249 respondents were in the prime-age demographic (aged 25 to 54). While the proposed target for the proportion of prime-age respondents was set at 75%, the sample obtained approaches the 90% confidence level with a 5% margin of error. This is compared to 163 focus group participants for the Local Employment Planning Council (LEPC) study completed in 2017.

This Employment Ontario project is funded in part by the Government of Canada and the Government of Ontario. The content and analysis presented in this report are not that of the Government of Canada or the Government of Ontario.


The following groups provided valuable support and participation in this study:

- The City of St. Thomas
- The City of London
- Elgin Oxford Middlesex Workforce Planning and Development Board
- Elgin County
- Fanshawe College
- London Community Foundation
- London Economic Development Corporation
- Middlesex County
- Oxford County
- The Province of Ontario

Labour market participation in the London ER

Since 2009, the prime-age participation rate (aged 25 to 54) has been lower for London than for Ontario as a whole, and has been on a decreasing trend over this time. Prime-age participation is a particular concern because prime-age individuals would typically not be in school or retired, and are the group that generally has the highest participation rate. Figure 2 below shows recent trends in the London Census Metropolitan Area (CMA). The London CMA is used here as a proxy for the London ER because labour data by age group is not available for London ER, and the London CMA contains over 75% of the prime-age population in London ER. This figure illustrates the decreasing participation trend in the London CMA, compared to a relatively flat trend for Ontario as a whole. Youth participation (aged 15-24) and mature-age participation (aged 55+) in the London CMA also decreased in this period. In contrast, the participation rate increased for the mature-age cohort in Ontario, while youth participation in Ontario decreased at a similar rate to the London CMA.

Figure 2: London CMA participation rates for prime-age individuals, 2005-2019



Although this study does not provide a complete answer as to why the participation rate in the London ER is lower than other parts of Ontario, it identifies factors that are likely contributing to this trend, including:

- **Poverty and low income:** The London CMA has the second-highest rate of low income in Southwestern Ontario, which is likely mutually reinforcing with low participation. Low income can be a barrier to participation in the labour market, as it is often associated with poor health and challenges searching for jobs, accessing transportation, and pursuing education and training.
- **Health conditions:** The London CMA has a higher incidence of social assistance collection than the province as a whole, which could be an indicator of worse underlying health. As noted in this report, health conditions are a common barrier to participation.
- **Shifts in industrial activity:** A loss of manufacturing and other trades-oriented jobs has affected the labour market outcomes in the London ER. Our survey results suggest that younger cohorts (aged 25 to 44) are finding less employment in trades-based occupations when they last worked, despite being more likely than older cohorts (45+) to have specifically trained for those roles.
- **Mismatch between skills and available opportunities:** As described in our survey results, many non-participants have a post-secondary education of some kind. However, they are unable to match with jobs that meet their requirements in terms of pay, schedule, and other job conditions, and often had a low income when they last worked. This suggests that there is a poor match between individuals' skills and those required by available jobs. It is beyond the scope of this study to determine why this is more so the case in the London ER than elsewhere.
- **Homelessness and housing:** Though higher costs of living and housing costs has been a trend seen across Canada and Ontario, relatively higher rates of homelessness in the City of London compared to other CMAs in Ontario reinforce the idea that there are relatively higher rates of poverty and unaffordable costs of living for residents in the London region compared to the rest of the province.
- **Transportation:** Compared to the average Ontarian, employed London ER residents are more likely to travel to work by driving a personal vehicle, and are also less likely to travel by public transit. Given the relatively low population density of the London ER, the need for a vehicle to access labour market opportunities has implications for low-income residents, and could significantly affect labour market outcomes in the London ER compared to the rest of Ontario, particularly areas with better access to public transportation.

Survey findings

We analyzed the survey results to identify the reasons and circumstances for non-participation among prime-age respondents (aged 25 to 54) and mature-age respondents (aged 55+), with a specific focus on eight profiles among prime-age respondents. We note that most respondents belong to multiple categories (e.g. a prime-age respondent who is an immigrant who also has a health condition); as a result, the sum of responses for each various profile in Table 1 exceeds the total number of respondents in the survey.

We also assessed the share of non-participants that could be available to participate in the labour market with adequate support to mitigate or resolve the factors driving their non-participation. We estimated this share using responses in four areas of the survey: why the respondent was not participating, which factors need to change in order for them to participate, to what extent their non-participation was linked to COVID-19, and the free-form text answers that were provided at the end of the survey when participants were invited to share additional information. To reflect some uncertainty inherent in this approach, we have estimated these shares as a range. For example, for those with health circumstances preventing them from participating, the lower bound assumes that all respondents who indicated that they would require improved health circumstances before entering the labour market would not be available to participate, whereas the upper bound assumes that some of these respondents would be available to participate based on their additional answers (e.g. if they indicated that they would be interested in working with certain accommodations). More details on the methodology used to determine who would be available to participate are presented in Appendix B.

Using this approach, we estimate that between 30,000 and 40,000 prime-age non-participants could be available to enter the labour market if all their barriers to participation were addressed.

We note the contrast between this range and a previous study which estimated that 7% of non-participants in the London ER would be willing or able to work under the status quo (i.e. without barriers being mitigated or addressed).² This is equivalent to around 3,500 non-participants who are available to work under the status quo, which departs from the range of 30,000-40,000 non-participants available to participate if their barriers are addressed in our study.

Table 1: Availability to participate if barriers to participation were addressed by non-participant profiles

	Responses in survey	% available to participate if barriers were addressed ³	Non-participants in London ER (2019) ⁴	Potential participants in London ER ⁵
Total survey (15 years or older)⁶	447	52% - 69%	228,500	
Prime-age non-participant profiles				
Total prime-age (aged 25 to 54)	249	65% - 86% ⁷	46,900	30,000 - 40,000
Women	145	65% - 88%	33,500	22,000 - 29,000
Immigrants	46	87% - 91%	9,300	8,000 - 8,500
Visible minority	31	71% - 87%		
With post-secondary education ⁸	179	72% - 87%	20,500	15,000 - 18,000
Without post-secondary education	70	47% - 81%	26,300	12,000 - 21,000
Health conditions	69	14% - 72%		
Low-income	99	63% - 90%		
Residents outside the City of London	46	67% - 87%		
Respondents aged 55-64	181	38% - 47%	30,100 ⁹	12,000 - 14,000

Prime-age non-participants

Although each profile of prime-age individuals who are not participating has unique barriers to participation, a recurring issue across most groups is the lack of attractive jobs for them within the London ER. For the purpose of this report, we refer to jobs' "attractiveness" based on a number of dimensions that affect individuals' desire to work. These include pay, alignment with their skill set, and desired schedule. We note that whether a job's pay is sufficient is unique to each individual and reflects their personal circumstances, such as the costs they need to incur in maintaining the job, alternative income sources available to them, childcare needs, commute time, and access to transportation. We note that many survey respondents had relatively low income when they last worked: 55% of prime-age respondents who are not participating due to lack of jobs that pay enough made less than \$40,000 per year when they were last employed.

² Local Employment Planning Council report. London Economic Region Labour Market Participation, (2017).

³ Rounded to nearest whole percentage—potential participants reflect numbers derived using more precise percentages.

⁴ Extrapolated using data from the Labour Force Survey and figures from the Local Employment Planning Council report London Economic Region Labour Market Participation (2017), and rounded to the nearest hundred.

⁵ Rounded to nearest thousand.

⁶ Potential participants removed due to the small sample size of respondents aged 15-24 and 65+.

⁷ The lower bound (7.3%) represents the availability to work number reported by Statistics Canada for the London Economic Region in 2015.

⁸ Includes all diplomas, certificates, and degrees beyond a high school education.

⁹ For London CMA only.

Other than job attractiveness, prevalent barriers include discouragement, child care responsibilities, perceived discrimination, and the lack of access to transportation. It is important to note that these conditions are often mutually reinforcing. For example, those with low-income are less likely to be able to pursue post-secondary education, and vice versa.

Women

Child care responsibilities are a barrier that affects women much more significantly than men. However, the majority of prime-age women who are not participating due in part to child care responsibilities also identify other barriers to their participation, which include the lack of jobs with their preferred schedule, the lack of jobs that pay enough, and the lack of transportation. Given a higher share of women are not participating due in part to child care responsibilities, prime-age women often are out of the labour market for longer periods of time compared to men. Despite prime-age women having as much post-secondary education as prime-age men, women were more likely to have last worked in lower-paying industries. As a result, prime-age women may be less incentivized to enter the labour market if well-paying jobs with their preferred schedule are not available to them.

Immigrants

For prime-age immigrants, discouragement is indicated as the top reason for their non-participation. Among prime-age immigrants who were discouraged, non-participation due to perceived discrimination and the availability of jobs that require their skill set are highly correlated. Despite higher rates of post-secondary education and employment in Knowledge industries, prime-age immigrants do not earn more than prime-age non-immigrants, supporting the idea that discrimination and other barriers are affecting their labour market outcomes. For this group, the inability to find opportunities that are attractive and aligned with their skills, despite high levels of post-secondary education drives non-participation. However, if these barriers were addressed, this group could have a relatively high availability to participate.

Visible minorities¹⁰

Over half of prime-age visible minorities in the sample are also immigrants, leading to similar barriers faced between the two groups. Among prime-age visible minorities, the top reason that they indicate for non-participation is discrimination from employers. The lack of attractive jobs contributes to the non-participation in this group, as well as discouragement and a lack of technical skills that employers are looking for. Prime-age visible minorities are less likely to collect social benefits such as Ontario Works (OW) and Employment Insurance (EI). However, a greater share of prime-age visible minorities are collecting Ontario Disability Support Program (ODSP) benefits, as a greater share of these respondents have a disability or physical health barrier affecting their participation. A greater share of prime-age visible minorities with post-secondary education are working in Service industries compared to prime-age respondents who are not visible minorities and have a post-secondary education. This could indicate that barriers that the respondents have identified with discrimination and the lack of technical skills are stronger in Knowledge industries.

Those with post-secondary education

Respondents who have a post-secondary degree are defined as those who have graduated with a university, college or CEGEP degree, certificate or diploma (below, at or above a bachelor's level) or an apprenticeship/trades diploma or certificate. Although a large share (72%) of prime-age respondents have a post-secondary education, a lack of attractive jobs is the main contributor to non-participation, with the lack of jobs that pay enough as the top reason for non-participation. The lack of jobs that pay enough is often correlated with a lack of jobs that require their skill set and discouragement. A considerable amount of prime-age respondents with a post-secondary education work in low- to mid-paying industries, with retail trade as the most frequent industry that respondents in this group last worked in. These factors suggest that among this group, a poor match between their skills and available jobs is a driver of non-participation. The lack of attractive jobs that align with their skills leads non-participants in this group to work in industries with lower pay, leading to discouragement and labour market exits.

Those without post-secondary education

Lack of transportation and poor health circumstances are the primary reasons for non-participation among prime-age respondents without a post-secondary education, while a lack of attractive jobs also contributes. A lack of technical skills

¹⁰ Refers to [Statistics Canada's existing operational definition](#) as of 2021, which takes from the Employment Equity Act's definition of "persons, other than Aboriginal peoples, who are non-Caucasian in race or non-white in colour". The use of this term to refer to individuals who identify as part of this group is currently under review by the Government of Canada, and is subject to change.

that employers are looking for also affects this group more so than those with a post-secondary education. Not having a post-secondary education is often correlated with having low income and being in poor health, all factors that contribute to non-participation. These factors are mutually reinforcing: a lack of transportation is likely driven by lower income, while poor health conditions are often barriers to participation and education.

Those with health barriers

Over two-thirds of prime-age respondents with at least one health condition state that they would require improved health circumstances to enter the labour market, which suggests that they would be unlikely to be able to enter the labour market, even with other types of support. In order to participate, this group would also require greater availability of jobs that fit their qualifications and desired compensation (e.g. wages, benefits), and better access to transportation and training opportunities, among other factors. Potential pathways to participation for this group are not one-dimensional: health conditions are often barriers to education, leading to lower income levels. Therefore, even with improved health circumstances, support is required in other areas in order to create labour market opportunities among this group.

Low income

Among prime-age respondents who made less than \$30,000 when they were last employed, the lack of access to transportation is the top barrier to participation. As those with low income are less likely to be able to afford a car, the lack of transportation can make jobs inaccessible if public transit is not a viable option. In addition, the lack of attractive jobs such as the lack of jobs that pay enough or are relevant to their skill set are commonly indicated as barriers to non-participation, as well as discouragement. Non-participation due to discouragement among these respondents is also highly correlated with the lack of jobs that pay enough. Factors correlated with low income may also be barriers to education, which leads to a higher share of respondents who lack the technical skills employers are looking for. As lower income levels, health conditions, and lower education levels are mutually reinforcing conditions, it is important to consider how these factors interact and affect labour market participation choices for this group.

Regional variations

The top reasons for non-participation among prime-age respondents who reside in the London ER but outside the City of London (in Elgin, Middlesex and Oxford counties and the City of St. Thomas) are similar to those in the City of London, which is a lack of attractive jobs. Those outside the City of London were more likely to not be participating due to child care responsibilities (mainly for women), and having sufficient household income, compared to those in the City of London. On the other hand, those in the City of London were more likely to cite lack of transportation as a barrier, compared to those outside the city. This is likely due to higher reliance on public transit as a main form of transportation. While prime-age residents outside the City of London have lower levels of post-secondary education, they did not make less than those living in the City of London when they last worked. Industry profile when last working shows similar opportunities in mid-to-high skilled industries for those both outside and inside the City of London. As many of the top reasons for non-participation are related to the lack of attractive jobs, this may indicate opportunities to non-participants in the London ER outside the City of London are limited, or they are a poor match for London ER residents.

Mature-age cohort

Although many mature-age respondents are retired, there is interest in returning to the labour market under the right conditions. Up to 15.5% of retirees in the mature-age cohort would be available to participate if there are attractive jobs available that pay enough, fit their schedule, or require their skill set. 92% of retired respondents who potentially would be available to participate have a post-secondary education, suggesting that those with specialized skills and knowledge are more likely to be attached to the labour market.

Changes in industry

A divide between industries that younger and older respondents last worked in signifies a shift in industry opportunities. While respondents aged 25-44 more commonly worked in Service industries, respondents aged 45 and over are more likely to have worked in Industries with trades occupations. Despite a larger share of respondents aged 45 and over who last in Industries with trades occupations, a relatively larger proportion of respondents under 44 years of age have an apprenticeship or trades certificate or diploma. This indicates that while younger respondents continued to pursue careers in trades, there could be limited opportunities offered to individuals within this demographic, as the gap between respondents aged 25-44 and 45+ who do not participate due to lack of technical skills is larger for those who last in

Industries with trades occupations compared to Service and Knowledge industries. This could also signify that younger respondents pursuing trades certification may be less likely to enter the more in-demand trades occupations.

While employment in industries with trades occupations continue to be in demand in the London ER, these opportunities are not always allocated evenly among age demographics. While the share of mature-age employment has been growing within the past decade due to the trend of delayed retirement, the share of mature-age workers in trades has increased faster than the share of mature-age workers in all industries.

As the mature-age cohort is able to leverage their experience to remain competitive in the labour market, this could explain why despite greater educational attainment in trades among those 25-44 years old, employment in Industries with trade occupations is more common among those who are aged 45 and older.

Indigenous groups

While the survey did not contain sufficient number of Indigenous respondents to conduct an analysis on labour market participation, secondary research shows that the key factors behind low labour market participation and other labour market outcomes for the Indigenous population in Canada include a lack of jobs, a skills mismatch, child care, and higher prevalence of disability and health conditions. The considerations outlined should include tools to target increased labour market participation with a specific focus for this group.

Considerations in addressing low labour market participation

Based on the findings of our survey and evidence in secondary research, we developed considerations for governments and employers in addressing barriers for non-participants, focusing on what regional and municipal governments can achieve. As conditions contributing to non-participation are often mutually reinforcing, the inclusion of multi-faceted interventions would be required in order to accommodate overlapping participant profiles and the unique combination of barriers for each individual. The interventions in this section are ordered from top to bottom by the number of non-participants that would be supported by the interventions.

Mismatch between skills and available jobs

For prime-age non-participants in the London ER, the top drivers of non-participation are related to a mismatch between individuals' skills and the jobs that they would like to have. Many non-participants are not able to access jobs for which they are suited and that pay enough and offer conditions they prefer (such as scheduling), leading them to become discouraged and exit the labour market. Elements of mismatch affect almost all the profiles described in this report, making it one of the top issues driving non-participation.

Evidence shows that active labour market policies, such as job training and job search services, have a positive return when considered in the long-term. These policies are particularly important for those changing occupations, as many non-participants may require retraining in order to access jobs that suit them. Local governments should consider increasing focus and funding on active labour market programs. Post-secondary institutions should also work to increase their coordination with employers, including developing program offerings with skill demand in mind, and providing work opportunities such as co-op and internship placements. The relatively high share of non-participants with post-secondary education suggests that some post-secondary education is currently not well-aligned to job availability. Introducing career education and increasing labour market information access in secondary schools would also help align skills to growing industries and support a more robust transition from school to industry. In addition, improving the visibility of support programs in post-secondary schools through employment and training providers may boost awareness and uptake of these programs.

Health barriers

28% of survey respondents cited health conditions as a reason for not participating, which encompasses physical health, mental health, and disability. Some individuals facing health barriers will not be able to enter the labour market under any circumstances. However, in written responses, others indicated a desire for changes in work conditions that would allow them to participate. These include flexible working options such as the ability to work from home, part-time, and flexible hours, and improved job search services and training/upskilling programs to connect individuals with jobs and careers that are relevant to their needs and abilities.

Childcare

Access to childcare is a barrier for 29% of women in our survey, and years away from the labour market to care for children can have a lasting impact on employment and earnings outcomes. Although some individuals will prefer to care for children regardless of childcare availability outside the home, research confirms that access to affordable childcare has a significant positive effect on labour market participation. Recent federal announcements to pursue \$10 per day childcare within five years are likely to address this issue and encourage participation. We note that individuals facing barriers due to access to childcare also face other barriers including flexibility and access to transportation; therefore, a coordinated response by government and employers is required.

Flexibility

Lack of available jobs with a preferred schedule was identified as a barrier to participation for 18% of prime-age respondents, with higher shares for immigrants and women. In other jurisdictions, such as Holland, increased availability of part-time jobs has been associated with increased labour market participation, particularly among women. Employers should consider providing part-time or other flexible options such as working from home, and should provide similar hourly pay and advancement opportunities to equivalent full-time roles where feasible.

Access to transportation

Lack of transportation is the top barrier to participation for prime-age respondents without a post-secondary education and those with low income. It is a larger barrier for those in the City of London compared to those in other parts of the London ER. Municipal and regional governments should consider impacts on labour market participation when assessing the costs and benefits of changes to transit systems. Employers may also consider providing transportation to employees that require it. This issue should also be considered in delivering active labour market policies described above. Finally, where roles allow it, employers should consider providing the option to work from home, which can help address transportation barriers.

Discrimination

Discrimination is one of the top reasons cited by prime-age immigrant and visible minority respondents. It is beyond the scope of this study to identify potential changes to legal frameworks at the provincial and federal level to addressing discrimination, but the examination of existing frameworks around reporting and investigating incidents of discrimination could be considered. Regional and municipal governments in the London ER may highlight to the provincial government the fact that discrimination appears to be discouraging labour market participation in the London ER. It should also be considered that frameworks around providing licenses for the skills and abilities of workers would help reduce discrimination among immigrants and other minority groups. In addition, employers should consider communicating openly with potential employees about their actions to address discrimination in the workplace, and being transparent about wages and opportunities.

1. Introduction and scope

Introduction

The London Economic Region (referred to as “London ER” onwards), has one of the lowest labour market participation rates in Canada. Labour market participation refers to the share of the population that is either working (employed) or looking for work (unemployed). A particular concern is the relatively low participation of those aged 25-54 (“prime-age”), because they are typically not expected to be pursuing education or retired. Policymakers focus on labour market participation as a sign of economic health because, all other things being equal, higher participation creates higher potential for economic growth, and a larger tax base.

In that context, the City of London engaged PwC to conduct a study to:

- Assess the reasons for relatively low labour market participation in the London ER, focusing on prime-age participation.
- Identify actions that can be taken to increase labour market participation in the London ER.
- Estimate the number of people in the London ER who are currently not participating, but may be available to participate.

The purpose of this report is to summarize our study’s findings. The rest of this document is organized as follows:

- Section 2 describes the study’s approach and methodology.
- Section 3 provides context on labour market participation in the London ER.
- Section 4 summarizes previous secondary research on the topic.
- Section 5 analyzes the study’s survey results.
- Section 6 provides considerations for addressing low labour market participation.

This Employment Ontario project is funded in part by the Government of Canada and the Government of Ontario. The content and analysis presented in this report are not that of the Government of Canada or the Government of Ontario.

Acknowledgements

The following groups provided valuable support and participation in this study:

- The City of St. Thomas
- The City of London
- Elgin Oxford Middlesex Workforce Planning and Development Board
- Elgin County
- Fanshawe College
- London Community Foundation
- London Economic Development Corporation
- Middlesex County
- Oxford County
- The Province of Ontario






Limitations

These findings are subject to the methodology and assumptions described in this report, and the limitations described in Appendix A: Limitations. This report has been prepared solely for the use and benefit of, and pursuant to a client relationship exclusively with the City of London. The City of London may share this report with third parties in its entirety. No person or entity shall place any reliance upon the accuracy or completeness of the statements made herein. In no event shall PwC have any liability for damages, costs or losses suffered by reason of any reliance upon the contents of this report by the City of London or any other person.

2. Approach and methodology

The table below summarizes our approach to conducting this study.

Summary of study approach

Phase	 1. Literature review	 2. Secondary data collection	 3. Survey	 4. Analysis	 5. Reporting
Objective	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review and compile existing literature on labour market participation in the London ER and elsewhere. Inform approach to survey design and targeting. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Collect labour market and participation data on the London ER and elsewhere. Inform approach to survey design and targeting. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conduct a survey of non-participants (those not working or looking for work) in the London ER via web and phone channels. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Analyze survey data to address reasons for non-participation, non-participant profiles, and the number of non-participants that may be available to participate. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Present our findings in this report.

Survey approach

We collected survey data through a web survey and through phone outreach. The web survey ran from February 9 to April 5, 2021, and the phone outreach ran from February 3 to March 5, 2021. The web survey was promoted to non-participants through community organizations and in the media. In total, we received 447 responses. 301 responses were collected through the web survey and 146 responses were collected through the phone survey. 249 respondents were in the prime-age demographic (aged 25 to 54). The confidence level of the prime-age sample approaches the 90% level with a 5% margin of error, while the overall sample achieves a 95% level of confidence with a 5% margin of error.

Non-participants are a difficult group to reach, and have a variety of different profiles. We designed our survey approach using both web and phone components to reach a wide range of demographic groups, including by age and socioeconomic status. The phone survey employed a strategy for outbound calling to find non-participants, while the web survey was accessed by the non-participants through community outreach and social media channels and advertising. As a result, the web survey results had a wider age demographic distribution than the phone survey results.

Because of challenges in reaching non-participants, the sample collected does not provide an exact representation of the London ER. For some profiles (as seen in Appendix C), sample sizing was not adequate to derive meaningful insights or non-participant profiles in some areas. For example, there is an over-representation of City of London non-participants and a smaller representation among those living outside the City of London compared to the distribution of residents in the London ER in 2016.

3. Labour market data

This section reviews key trends in the London ER and CMA labour market, focusing on the last five years of data leading up to the pandemic. Several previous studies by organizations such as the Local Employment Planning Council (LEPC) and the Elgin Middlesex Oxford Workforce Planning and Development Board (WPDB) address trends in earlier data.


Labour market participation as an economic indicator

This study focuses on labour market participation, which is often used as an indicator of economic and labour market health. Labour market participation refers to the share of the population that is either working (employed) or looking for work (unemployed). Those who are not working and not looking for work are referred to as “non-participating.” On an economy-wide level, labour market participation is linked with higher GDP growth because more labour is available to produce goods and services. Historically in Canada, economic growth has been driven largely by increases in labour market participation, accounting for about half of Canada’s real GDP growth between the 1980s and the 2010s. Additionally, higher participation creates a higher income tax base, which means that tax rates can be lower while providing a similar level of revenue and services.¹¹ Low labour market participation can be a sign that workers are discouraged because of not finding jobs through past searches. For this reason, policymakers often look at the employment rate (people employed as a share of total population) as a complement to the unemployment rate in assessing overall labour market health.

Low prime-age (25-54) labour market participation is a particular concern in the context of an aging population: as the population ages, participation will go down as more people reach retirement age. Therefore, maintaining the participation rate among prime-age individuals, who typically have the highest participation rate of any age group, is especially important.

A diagram of the components that make up labour force participation is shown below in Figure 3. The figures in brackets provide an example of the labour force components as a proportion of the 15+ population, with the participation rate being 65% in our example (65 in the labour force, 100 in the total 15+ population).

Figure 3: Components of labour force participation



¹¹ Bank of Canada, [Trend Labour Supply in Canada: Implications of Demographic Shifts and the Increasing Labour Force Attachment of Women](#), 2007.


We note that on an individual level, participation is not always preferable to non-participation (not working or looking for work). This is because individuals' choice to participate or not is based on factors specific to them, such as pursuing schooling, choosing to retire, or caring for family. Unpaid work can be meaningful and have a benefit to the wider society that is difficult to quantify. For example, a US study found that prime-age men not participating in the labour force reported low levels of emotional well-being and did not find meaning in their daily activities. However, prime-age women who were not participating in the labour market reported well-being as high as women who were employed, as long as they were primarily taking care of home responsibilities.¹² Therefore, whether low labour market participation is a negative sign for the well-being of London ER's residents depends on the reasons why individuals are not participating.

As discussed later in this report, our survey finds that in the London ER, factors driving the majority of non-participation are indicative of labour market problems. The top reasons for non-participation, which are explored further in this document, include a mismatch between individuals' skills and preferences and the jobs available, health barriers, and perceived discrimination, which suggests that the low participation seen in the London ER is a negative signal about the health of the labour market as well as the well-being of individual non-participants. This suggests that policymakers can improve outcomes for individuals and the economy as a whole by pursuing policies that promote participation.

Participation trends in the London CMA and ER from 2015-2019

Looking at recent data on the labour market in the London Census Metropolitan Area (CMA), it can be seen that labour force participation continued to decline since 2015 for prime-age individuals in the region, as seen in Figure 4. London CMA data was used here as a proxy for the London ER as labour data by age group is not available for London ER, and because the London CMA contains over 75% of the prime-age population in London ER. In contrast, Ontario saw an increase in prime-age participation during the same period. Furthermore, participation for all individuals in the London ER decreased significantly, especially compared to Ontario rates.

Figure 4: London CMA participation rates for prime-age individuals, 2005-2019



Previous studies by the LEPC and WPDB had indicated that participation in the London ER decreased from 88% to 84% between 2005-2015 for prime-age workers (aged 25 to 54). The decline for the London ER was much more significant than other economic regions in Ontario, demonstrating the second-largest decline in participation rate (second to Windsor-Sarnia).

Analysis of trends since the 2017 study indicates that total labour force participation for all age groups in both the London ER and the London CMA have continued to decrease up to 2019. While data for 2020 is available, the analysis focuses


¹² Krueger, Alan, *Where Have All the Workers Gone? An Inquiry into the Decline of the U.S. Labor Force Participation Rate*, 2017

on the structural participation issue in the London ER up to 2019, and excludes the effects of COVID-19 on the labour market in 2020. While retirements and lower youth participation (partially due to opting for educational attainment) explain part of the non-participation, prime-age participation (which is typically not affected by retirement or education) continues to decline. This is contrary to the growth in prime-age participation seen in Ontario over the same time period.

As seen in Figure 5, the London CMA participation rate for the prime-age population declined from 84% in 2015 to 82% in 2019. While female prime-age participation stayed the same at 79%, male participation has declined for this age group from 89% in 2015 to 85% in 2019. Meanwhile, Ontario's participation rate for prime-age individuals increased from 85% to 86% during this period.


Between 2015 and 2019, labour force participation for all individuals aged 15 years or older in the London CMA declined from 64% to 59%, a decrease of over four percentage points. Youth participation (for those aged 15-24) also decreased from 62% in 2015 to 59% in 2019. Similar patterns are seen for the population aged 55 and over, with participation decreasing from 38% to 35%. However, participation for women over 65 increased slightly, as well as for men aged 55-64. These are the only two subsets of the population where participation grew during this period.

Figure 5: London CMA participation rates by Age and Sex, 2015-2019




The number of individuals in the London CMA not in the labour force has grown significantly from 2015 to 2019. For individuals 15 years old and over, the number of individuals not in the labour force grew from 152,900 to 181,700 between 2015 and 2019, increasing by 28,800 individuals. While over 80% of those additional individuals not in the labour force were 55 years old and over, the number of prime-age individuals not in the labour force increased by 4,100 (accounting for nearly 15% of the increase), as seen in Figure 6. The proportion of individuals not in the labour force relative to the labour force increased nearly 2 percentage points for the prime-age population during this period.

Figure 6: Number of individuals not in the labour force in the London CMA by Age Group, 2015-2019



While data is not available by age group for the London ER as a whole, we note that the participation rate for all individuals aged 15 years or older declined slightly from 63% in 2015 to 61% in 2019, a decrease of 2 percentage points. This decrease was significantly larger than Ontario as a whole, which remained the same at 65% over the same time period, as seen in Figure 7.

Figure 7: Participation rates by select Economic Regions, Ontario and Canada, 2015-2019



Furthermore, urban regions in the London ER had lower participation than rural regions, based on our analysis of the 2016 Census. The participation rate in urban municipalities was 63%, compared to 69% in rural areas.¹³ The gender gap

¹³ Based on the Statistics Canada definition of urban and rural regions: Population Centre and Rural Area Classification, 2016.

in participation was larger for men, with a rate of 67% in urban regions compared to 74% in rural regions. For women, the participation rate was 59% in urban regions compared to 64% in rural regions.

Broader regional labour market trends

This section looks at trends affecting London ER and CMA in the context of broader economic, demographic and labour market trends such as population growth and unemployment.

Population trends

Slow population growth could be linked to the lagging participation rate in the London region, as migration often flows where employment opportunities exist. This may suggest that employment opportunities could be limited in London compared to other regions in Canada, which could contribute to both lower participation and slow population growth. According to the London Poverty Research Centre at King's College,¹⁴ the London CMA's population grew at a rate of 11.8% between 2001-2015, which was in the bottom third of Canada's 33 CMAs. Canada's population growth was nearly twice as much, at a rate of 20.7%. Gains in employment in the London CMA lagged behind population growth, with the employment rate increasing by only 7.8% during this period. Similarly, wage and job growth in the London CMA stagnated compared to Toronto CMA and Ontario as a whole: From 2010 to 2019, job gains in the Toronto CMA outpaced population growth (55% of Ontario's population growth compared to 66% of Ontario's job gains concentrated in Toronto), while job growth in London CMA was slower than population growth (4% of Ontario's population growth compared to 1% of Ontario's job gains).^{15 16}

According to the 2017 LEPC report, population decline was a contributing factor to the decrease in participation. There was a simultaneous decrease in the 25-44 population and the number of people in the labour force from 2005-2015, with the decline in labour force size larger than the decrease in population. This signifies that more labour force participants were leaving the London ER than the number of participants arriving. The decline in the number of men aged 25-44 who participated in the labour force was almost equal to the size of decline in population in this group suggesting that, on a net basis, male prime-age participants left the London ER while male prime-age non-participants stayed. For women in this age group, about half of those that left were labour market participants. According to our analysis using Statistics Canada data, the trend of decreasing prime-age population has reversed since 2015: The population for the 25-44 age group in the London ER has experienced net growth of 18,314 individuals coming to the region.

Participation of older workers

While participation for prime-age individuals has been decreasing in the London ER, older workers experienced gains in participation. Participation for older men aged 55-69 has shown a small increase in recent years in the London CMA, which has been a pattern displayed throughout Canada. This could be attributed to several factors. According to Statistics Canada,¹⁷ complementary patterns are shown where older men were more likely to stay in the labour market if their spouse continued to work. In addition, educational attainment of older individuals has been rising for the past 20 years. It is also estimated that rising debt, higher wages and longer life expectancies contributed to the decision to stay in the labour force.

Participation and unemployment

Research by the Bank of Canada¹⁸ shows that participation rates dropped after a period of increased unemployment, using the recession of 2008-2009 as an illustration. This was true for London CMA following the 2008 recession; an increase in the five-year averaged unemployment rate (between 2002-2006 and 2007-2011) from 6.5% to 8.14% was followed by a decrease in the five-year averaged total participation rate (between 2004-2008 and 2009-2013) from 69.1% to 65.1%.

Provincial, national, and U.S. trends in participation

Although participation is lower in the London ER compared to Ontario and Canada (and has been so since 2009), all these regions are experiencing a trend of declining participation. As noted by the Ontario's Panel on Economic Growth

¹⁴ London Poverty Research Centre at King's. An Overview of Recent Demographic and Economic Trends Impacting Low Income and Social Assistance Use in London and Neighbouring CMAs in Southwest Ontario, 2017.

¹⁵ Financial Accountability Office of Ontario. Labour Market Report 2019, 2020.

¹⁶ Statistics Canada. Population estimates, CMA and provinces.

¹⁷ Statistics Canada. The impact of aging on labour market participation rates, 2017.

¹⁸ Bank of Canada. Changing Labour Market Participation Since the Great Recession: A Regional Perspective, 2015.

and Prosperity,¹⁹ participation in Ontario decreased for all age groups, including prime-age, and has been steadily declining since 2003. Our analysis of Statistics Canada labour force participation data²⁰ finds that the participation rate for Ontario decreased from 69% in 2003 to 65% in 2019 (a decrease of 3.4 percentage points). This follows the overall trend of declining participation in Canada, where the participation rate decreased from 68% in 2003 to 66% in 2019 (a decrease of 1.9 percentage points). However, the decline was much more significant in Ontario.

The overall trend in the participation rate for all ages reflects the impact of population aging in Ontario and Canada, as well as changes in participation within age groups. However, looking at the prime-age group that is typically considered to be working age, participation in Ontario has lagged that of other provinces in Canada. While the prime-age participation rate in Ontario declined from its peak of 87% in 2003 to 86% in 2018, prime-age participation rates increased or stayed the same in most other provinces (all except Saskatchewan and Manitoba). For Canada as a whole, the rate increased slightly from 86% in 2003 to 87% in 2018.

For both Ontario and Canada, participation rates for prime-age males have been on a downward trend since 2003, with the decline more significant in Ontario. Female participation in Canada has increased since 2003, while decreasing slightly in Ontario. Prime-age male participation in Ontario decreased by 2.8 percentage points from 2003 to 2018, compared to 0.8 percentage points for Canada as a whole. Prime-age female participation in Ontario decreased 0.2 percentage points in the same period, compared to an increase of 2.1 percentage points in Canada in this period.

Labour force trends in Canada have closely resembled trends in the United States. According to the Bank of Canada²¹, while total labour force participation rates in both countries were similar in the early 2000's, the US experienced a more significant decrease than Canada following the 2008 recession. Population aging and lower youth participation were identified as key factors behind this trend in both countries. However, prime-age participation has declined significantly in the United States, while it has remained relatively stable in Canada since the recession. As of December 2019, the prime-age participation rate is still lower in the United States (at 83%)²² compared to Canada (at 87%).

Our research found that the prime-age participation rate in Ontario has been on a downward trend since 2003, while the rate for Canada as a whole has remained steady. Although Canada and the US had similar prime-age participation rates prior to the 2008-2009 recession, the rate in the US has remained lower since then. This is likely due to a range of structural differences (e.g. different levels of technology adoption) between the Canadian and US economies.

COVID-19 impacts

The COVID-19 pandemic continues to have a significant effect on employment across Canada. A report by the WPDB²³ on the labour market in the London ER noted that London ER's unemployment rate remained similar to the provincial and national level both pre- and post-COVID, suggesting that the effect of COVID on workers' ability to find work in the London ER has been similar to that in other parts of the province and country.

However, an analysis of labour force characteristics from Statistics Canada²⁴ suggests that participation in the London ER has been less affected by the COVID-19 pandemic than other economic regions in Ontario. Between 2019 and 2020, Ontario's participation rate fell by almost 2 percentage points, while the participation rate in London ER increased by almost 1 percentage point, with the number of individuals not in the labour force decreasing by 2,100 (the largest decrease in non-participants of all the economic regions in Ontario).

Though the overall participation rate in the London ER increased from 2019 to 2020, these effects are not distributed evenly across all profiles. Similar to the London ER, the number of individuals not in the labour force decreased in the London CMA between 2019 and 2020 for all ages. However, the number of prime-age individuals not in the labour force increased by 3,700 within the London CMA, or 0.2 percentage points. These decreases were larger for prime-age women than prime-age men. Though the decrease in participation was smaller compared to other CMAs for prime-age

¹⁹ Ontario's Panel on Growth and Prosperity. Strength in Numbers—Targeting labour force participation to improve prosperity in Ontario, 2017.

²⁰ Statistics Canada. Labour force characteristics by sex and detailed age group, annual (x1000).

²¹ Bank of Canada. Labour Force Participation: A Comparison of the United States and Canada, 2017.

²² Bureau of Labor Statistics. Labor Force Statistics from the Current Population Survey.

²³ Elgin Middlesex Oxford Workforce Planning and Development Board. Annual Review of the London Economic Region Labour Market (2019-2020), 2020.

²⁴ Statistics Canada. Labour force characteristics by province, territory and economic region, annual.

individuals, participation gains were concentrated in the 15-24 and 55-64 age groups, with participation continuing to fall for the prime-age group.

Analyzing the change in employment from 2019 to 2020, all economic regions in Ontario saw a decrease in employment. However, the decrease in employment in the London ER was the second-smallest among economic regions, with a decrease in the employment rate of 0.9 percentage points. Job creation for the London ER was largest in the industries of Educational services; Professional, scientific and technical services; Construction; Agriculture; and Finance, insurance, real estate, rental and leasing. Compared to the province as a whole, the London ER has a relatively low proportion of jobs in the industries that were the most affected by COVID-19. These industries include Accommodation and food services, and Retail trade, which made up almost half of the total employment decrease in Ontario between 2019 and 2020. One area where the London ER lost jobs during the pandemic was manufacturing, due to COVID-19's impact on the industry.

Given the findings on the relationship between participation and unemployment, it is possible that a sustained high level of unemployment as a result of the pandemic could have long-term adverse impacts on participation. The unemployment rate in London ER increased by 3 percentage points between 2019 and 2020 (compared to an increase of 4 percentage points for Ontario as a whole). A focus on making sure those who have become unemployed throughout the pandemic (especially in industries most affected) do not exit the labour market if the job market does not recover is an important consideration when thinking about supporting higher labour market participation post-COVID.

For most of the duration of the pandemic, the London-Middlesex Health Unit saw a lower number of COVID-19 cases per 100,000 residents compared to other regions such as Toronto, York, Hamilton and Ottawa,²⁵ which also likely protected jobs by allowing workplaces to continue to function with relatively less risk, which translated to more positive labour market outcomes. The industrial makeup of the region, and the relative density of the region as a whole is another potential contributor to the lower loss of jobs.

Though the COVID-19 pandemic has impacted labour market outcomes in the London ER relatively less than other economic regions in Ontario, the pandemic has and will likely continue to impact participation levels in the region. While the effect of a lower amount of available jobs in Retail trade, Accommodation and food services, and Manufacturing may continue to persist, the effects of the pandemic could result in many non-participants looking to retrain or switch industries. Employers may also be willing to offer more opportunities for remote work with flexible schedules given the evolution of the traditional concept of the workplace through the pandemic.

Key data gaps

Gaps in information on labour force participation of prime-age workers in the London ER somewhat limits the ability to conduct a complete analysis. For example, the regularly published Labour Force Survey does not provide data by economic region together with age breakdowns. The 2017 LEPC report used a custom tabulation ordered from Statistics Canada to analyze participation rates for London ER as a whole.

While labour force characteristics are published annually for the London ER, the most recent data for participation with age and sex breakdowns encompasses only the London CMA; both metrics are up to date for the year 2020. The analysis provided in the previous section above compared the findings in 2015 to the year 2019 instead of 2020 due to the effects of the COVID-19 pandemic on participation. As we are looking to identify structural issues behind participation in the region, the effects of COVID-19 are not included in this analysis.

The 2016 Census is the most recent data source that details participation in greater geographic detail, such as by census subdivision. Therefore, more up-to-date analysis on variations in participation rate within the London ER is unavailable.

Using CMA-level data to examine non-participation (as seen with Figures 1 and 2) is important to outline the most recent age and gender trends (given that this data is not publicly available for the London ER). Given that 76% of prime-age residents in the London ER reside in the London CMA (compared to 75% of all London ER residents living in the City of London) in 2016, trends within the CMA would broadly reflect those of the ER as a whole.

²⁵ Government of Ontario, [COVID-19 case numbers and spread](#).

The availability of labour force data by economic region and year, with breakdowns by age, gender, and other demographic details such as immigration status and whether a person is a visible minority, would allow for a more recent analysis on variations in non-participation trends across different profiles and regions in Ontario. This would also allow a more accurate assessment of those who would be available to participate if their barriers to participation were addressed. The data would support further enhancement on the analysis of participation rates between economic regions through the identification of variations by demographic detail.

A long-run study with temporal data could help assess some of the trends and lasting impacts of a sustained low participation rate. Long-term implications could include an increased gap in skills and job vacancies (especially within industries requiring in-demand skills), and lower levels of productivity. With an aging labour force, low prime-age participation leading to vacancies in these roles and lack of skilled labour would create inefficiencies in the transfer of skills and knowledge within higher-skilled industries. A lack of attractive opportunities could leave non-participants permanently discouraged and out of the labour market, as seen with a trend of decreased participation following long periods of unemployment. Discouragement and the lack of opportunity has the potential to contribute to population decline, as individuals and families may move out of the London ER to surrounding regions with more attractive labour market opportunities.

4. Literature review

Background

Previous studies have analyzed the low labour market participation in the London ER as it relates to economic, health and labour market circumstances. A study by the Local Employment Planning Council (LEPC) in 2017 and a follow-up study conducted by the LEPC and the Elgin Middlesex Oxford Workforce Planning and Development Board (WPDB) in 2019 analyzed the various profiles of non-participants in the London ER (those not working or looking for work), and connected with non-participants through a survey in order to develop recommendations and strategies. Other studies such as research from London Poverty Research Centre at King's and from economists Stephen R. G. Jones and W. Craig Riddell look at factors leading to non-participation such as poverty and low-income incidence, as well as a decreased attachment to the labour market. The figures presented below are public data or custom tabulations requested from Statistics Canada by the authors of the respective studies.

According to Statistics Canada, the labour force participation rate is measured by the total labour force (employed and unemployed) relative to the size of the population aged 15 years and older.²⁶ Non-participants are those that are neither working nor actively looking for work. This metric is often used to benchmark the engagement of a population in the workforce, which can be an indicator of economic growth potential and economic well-being, depending on what is driving the non-participation.

Previous studies conducted by the LEPC and Elgin Middlesex Oxford Workforce Planning and Development Board (WPDB) had identified an issue with the labour market participation in the London ER. Participation decreased from 88% to 84% between 2005-2015 for prime-age workers (aged 25 to 54), who account for 76% of the population in the Region. The decline for the London ER was much more significant than other economic regions in Ontario, demonstrating the second-largest decline in participation rate (second to Windsor-Sarnia).

Many reasons behind this decline were proposed and investigated in the literature analyzing London ER's relatively low labour market participation. Some of the most common reasons identified included:

- **Personal or family responsibilities:** This included parents who stay at home to take care of children, or caregivers who look after a family member.
- **Health or disability barriers:** This encompassed people with mental health issues, fatigue and stress.
- **Lack of education, experience or credentials:** This was especially relevant for new graduates and younger workers without experience or in-demand skills.
- **Lack of resources:** Limited access to transportation, a computer and/or phone to apply to jobs effectively has an effect on whether a person chooses to participate in labour market activities. The Employment Sector Council of London-Middlesex's Job Developers Network (JDN) conducted a survey in 2015 which indicated that two-thirds of job-seekers missed out on a job opportunity because it was not on a bus route.²⁷
- **Discouragement from the workforce:** Sustained unemployment or a lack of attractive opportunities (including the lack of jobs that pay enough, the lack of jobs that require their skill set, or the lack of jobs with their preferred schedule) in the labour market could discourage individuals from searching for work.
- **Costs to work:** The gap between income and personal/economic costs (e.g. transportation, clothing, supplies, etc.) was too large.
- **Discrimination in the workplace:** This was identified as a barrier that is particularly significant for Indigenous people, people who have disabilities, and immigrants.
- **Lack of network/connections:** This affected newcomers to the country in particular.

²⁶ Statistics Canada. Dictionary, Census of Population, 2016 - Population rate, 2017.

²⁷ Employment Sector Council London-Middlesex's Job Developers Network (JDN). Research Brief: Accessibility of London Transit Services, 2015.

In the 2017 LEPC report, focus groups with employers and employment service providers were held to identify issues with engaging the workforce. Barriers to find work and to keep work included:

- **Application process:** Challenges with technology, clarity of job postings, and applicants discouraged from not hearing back were all issues with applying for individuals.
- **Lack of jobs/quality of jobs available:** A mismatch existed between what workers need and what was provided for them (e.g. No benefits, poor pay or compensation, lack of training, etc.).
- **Qualifications/education/experience:** Foreign education and certifications were often not accepted. Those without higher education often had limited opportunities and were discouraged by qualifications needed.
- **Bias and prejudice:** Bias around age, sex, gender, race, physical appearance, disability, and Indigenous heritage were barriers to job-seekers.
- **Transportation:** Cost or accessibility issues to transportation were a barrier for many.
- **Personal challenges:** This included confidence, self-esteem, a lack of direction, a criminal record, language barriers, etc.
- **Lack of connections:** Immigrants often lost their network when they moved to Canada and were disconnected from employers.
- **Family/personal responsibilities:** Caregiving for children/elderly parents often was prioritized over finding employment.
- **Work-limiting conditions (health/disability/illness):** Physically- or mentally limiting conditions often kept people from the workforce.
- **Work environment/culture:** Poor leadership and workers feeling undervalued were not encouraging scenarios for workers to maintain employment.

While it is likely that a combination of these factors play into the decreasing participation rate in the London ER, certain factors could play a bigger part in explaining the decrease. While applicant-facing factors such as perceived discrimination and a lack of connections are not specific to just the London ER, structural changes such as a higher incidence of poverty (as identified in the London Poverty Research Centre at King's College report) and the changing industry landscape (e.g. effects of the recession on youth and prime-age outcomes, etc.) could be contributing to lower participation in the London ER. These structural elements affect factors such as costs to work, a lack of resources, health/disability barriers, transportation, and a lack of education, experience and credentials.

There is evidence that job attractiveness may be a larger factor than the simple availability of jobs in the London ER. From our analysis of data from Statistics Canada, the ratio of vacant jobs to the number of people in the labour force in the London ER has been increasing since 2015, suggesting that availability of open jobs was increasing. The proportion of available jobs to the labour force increased from 1.8% in 2015 to 2.6% in 2019, which was similar to the Ontario average of 2.55% in 2019. Meanwhile, the participation rate in London ER was decreasing during this period. Although the number of open jobs in London ER was growing during this period, non-participation was continuing to grow as well, signalling that individuals were opting to not participate rather than fill the open jobs. This suggests the reason for non-participation is more likely to be related to the match between jobs and potential workers, such as a skills mismatch for the labour force to jobs that are available, or the lack of jobs that are suitable to candidates' personal requirements (e.g. flexible hours, wages, etc.), rather than the lack of jobs available in the region.

Demographics

According to the 2017²⁸ and 2019²⁹ reports by the LEPC and WPDB on non-participation in the London ER, there were 42,200 non-participants who were in prime-age (aged 25 to 54) in the London ER. The groups with higher rates of non-participation included women, visible minorities and Indigenous communities, immigrants, those with a high school education or less, and those aged 45-54.

²⁸ Local Employment Planning Council. London Economic Region Labour Market Participation, 2017.

²⁹ Elgin Middlesex Oxford Workforce Planning and Development Board & Local Employment Planning Council. Labour Force Participation in London Economic Region—Follow-up study, 2019.

Gender

According to the 2017 study by LEPC, women accounted for 52% of the prime-age population in the London ER in 2015, but accounted for 72% of non-participants in the region. 22% of prime-age women were non-participating, while 9% of prime-age men were non-participating.

Underrepresented groups

According to the 2019 study by LEPC and WPDB, labour force participation rates are lower among visible minority, Indigenous and Francophone groups. Francophones experienced the lowest participation rate as a whole, which is driven by low participation among Francophones aged 55+. Francophones between aged 15 and 55 and those with postsecondary education had higher participation rates compared to non-Francophones in the same groups. For all minority groups, participation was lower for women than for men. Indigenous and visible minority groups had the lowest participation rates for prime-age workers. Notably, the immigrant population had lower participation in the London ER across all levels of education. This is likely due to a skills mismatch, and non-Canadian educational credentials being undervalued.

Immigrants

The study identified that immigrants, and particularly immigrant women, had a lower participation rate than Canadian-born residents. 8,400 non-participants surveyed were permanent residents, with 7,800 listed as unwilling or unable to work. In addition, 7,800 of the non-participating permanent residents were women. The participation rate for this group was five percentage points lower than that of Canadian-born individuals. Immigrant women tended to have lower participation rates, especially women who had children and/or lower educational attainment, or arrived from countries with lower female labour force participation. However, participation for immigrants aged 55-64 is the same as the overall population in the London ER, which may suggest that those who arrive in Canada earlier in their career are able to integrate into the labour force over time.

Education

Those with lower levels of education have lower levels of labour market participation. 79% of those with only a high school diploma participated in the labour market in 2015, compared to 60% of those with some high school education. This is lower than the participation rates for those with some post-secondary education (80% participating), a post-secondary certificate or diploma (88% participating), and a university degree (92% participating).

Non-prime-age participation

The 2019 study by the LEPC and the WPDB focused on trends in non-participation among youth and mature demographics. The study found the drop in labour force participation for youth was the result of higher educational attainment (due in part to employers seeking higher educated and skilled workers). Indeed, the proportion of those holding a university degree, a professional certification or a college degree significantly increased during the period studied. For the mature cohort (55-64 years old), women increased their labour force participation in this period, as did seniors (aged 65+). Women with post-secondary education saw a significant increase in participation across all age groups, while women 55+ from all educational backgrounds saw an increase in participation. Conversely, men across age and education groups experienced a decrease in labour force participation, with a notable exception for those over 65+ with a college or university degree, and an apprenticeship/trades or high school certificate.

Indigenous population

Indigenous people face many unique barriers to labour force participation and employment, which often coexist with many other socio-economic challenges. According to the 2017 LEPC report, up to 2,500 prime-age non-participants in the London ER were Indigenous and lived off-reserve in 2015. According to 2016 Census data, Indigenous residents over 15 years old in the London CMA have a participation rate of close to 60%, compared to 64% for non-Indigenous residents in the London CMA.³⁰ In Canada, the participation rate of those who were prime-age and Indigenous was around 9 percentage points lower than the general population as of 2019, a larger gap than in the London ER.³¹

In 2016, 57% of Indigenous residents had a high school education or less as their highest level of education, compared to 45% of non-Indigenous residents. Furthermore, Indigenous residents in the London CMA had lower representation in

³⁰ Statistics Canada, [Aboriginal Population Profile, 2016 Census](#).

³¹ Statistics Canada, [Labour force characteristics by region and detailed Indigenous group](#).

post-secondary attainment across certain programs including business, engineering, math, and sciences, compared to non-Indigenous residents. Programs such as health, public administration, humanities and trades (e.g. construction and transportation) had similar or greater Indigenous representation (compared to non-Indigenous). This translated to a greater representation in Sales and service and Trades occupations and in the Manufacturing, Accommodation and Food services, and Health care and Social Assistance industries among the Indigenous population compared to non-Indigenous residents in the London CMA.

According to the 2016 Census, employed Indigenous residents in the London CMA were less likely to commute to work by driving a personal vehicle (car, truck or van), with 68% commuting to work through this mode compared to over 78% for employed non-Indigenous residents. Over 21% were dependent on public transit, walking or bicycling to arrive at work, with 13% reporting that they took public transit to work (compared to 7% for employed non-Indigenous residents). Furthermore, 21% of Indigenous residents in the London CMA were characterized as low-income (based on the low-income cutoff, after tax) compared to 10% of non-Indigenous residents.

Studies by Statistics Canada found that in 2017, Indigenous people were underrepresented in the Canadian labour market (especially First Nations³²), leading to broader economic and societal implications^{33,34,35}, and that this gap is often larger for women than men. Indigenous women are less likely to be employed compared to Indigenous men, and those that work are more likely to be employed part-time, often due to caring for family members. Among First Nations people, prime-age women also had a lower employment rate across all levels of education compared to men; this gap was especially large for those without a certificate, degree or diploma (50% employment rate for men, compared to 24% for women). While labour market barriers vary between Indigenous populations, skill limitations (in writing, reading, math and computers) were identified across many groups as limiting labour market outcomes. Higher rates of disability among Indigenous people in Canada (and in Ontario, by at least 12 percentage points comparing First Nations and Métis groups to the non-Indigenous population in 2017) further impact labour market outcomes.³⁶ Opportunities identified to support labour market outcomes for these groups include providing more attractive job opportunities and opportunities to pursue education, resume writing support and skills training, as well as support for child care assistance for women.

A disparity in wages between Indigenous and non-Indigenous workers has existed over the past decade in Canada and Ontario, with a gap close to \$3 an hour in 2019 (this was closer to \$2 an hour for prime-age groups), or close to a 10% difference. This is largely driven by disparities in education, which is a consequence of Indigenous workers more commonly working in occupations requiring lower educational attainment.³⁷

Food insecurity / scarcity³⁸ and homelessness (28-34% of the shelter population is Indigenous³⁹) are risk factors that are much more prevalent in Indigenous populations compared to non-Indigenous populations, as well as other socioeconomic risks. Improving socioeconomic outcomes in conjunction with access to education and training are important considerations to addressing inequalities within labour market outcomes for this group.

Reasons for non-participation

Personal or family responsibilities

While dual-earner families with children have increased since the early 2000's in Canada, women are still more likely to stay at home to take care of children than men, which can lead to them not participating in the labour market. According to Statistics Canada⁴⁰, fathers were the single earner in 80% of Canadian households with at least one child under 16 in 2014. In all single-earner families, two-thirds of mothers were not in the labour force, with almost 90% of mothers out of the labour force who are stay-at-home mothers (with the other 10% unable to work or in school).

Lack of education, experience or credentials

³² First Nations people are a subset of the Indigenous population (distinct from Métis and Inuit Indigenous people).

³³ Statistics Canada, *Employment of First Nations men and women living off reserve*, 2019.

³⁴ Statistics Canada, *Labour Market Experiences of Métis: Key findings from the 2017 Aboriginal Peoples Survey*, 2018.

³⁵ Statistics Canada, *Labour Market Experiences of Inuit: Key findings from the 2017 Aboriginal Peoples Survey*, 2018.

³⁶ Statistics Canada, *Indigenous people with disabilities in Canada: First Nations people living off reserve, Métis and Inuit aged 15 years and older*, 2019.

³⁷ OECD, *Indigenous labour market outcomes in Canada*, 2018.

³⁸ PROOF, *Indigenous peoples and food security*.

³⁹ Advocacy Centre for Tenants Ontario, *Fact Sheet | Homelessness in Canada and Ontario*.

⁴⁰ Statistics Canada, *Employment patterns of families with children*, 2014.

Past studies have hypothesized that the polarization of the skill profile of jobs available in the London ER contributes to higher non-participation in the London ER. According to the 2019 LEPC and WPDB report, research suggests that the number of middle-skill-level jobs is decreasing, while low- and high-skilled jobs are on the rise in Canada. Middle-skilled jobs are identified as jobs that require some formal education beyond high school, but do not require a university or college degree. This polarization forces workers to increase their education or skills and training in order to migrate to high-skilled jobs, or accept jobs that they may be overqualified for. The onset of automation and technologies involving big data, machine learning and AI is suggested as a key driver of this polarization, with those who are underemployed or unable to upgrade their credentials, skills and education becoming increasingly discouraged from participating in the labour market.

Poverty, low income and health conditions

A report by the London Poverty Research Centre at King's College⁴¹ indicated that the increase in income inequality and poverty could be a driver of the relatively low participation rate in the London ER. Poverty and low income are seen as barriers toward participation in the labour market, as the costs of searching for a job, working, transportation, and pursuing education are less affordable for those in poverty. Furthermore, an increase in social assistance collection in the London ER could indicate worsening health conditions (contributing to poverty and low-income incidence, and vice versa).

People who collect social assistance such as Ontario Works (OW) or Ontario Disability Support Program (ODSP) often are in poor health or have a disability, or have trouble with living expenses. An estimated 8% of people (or 41,000 people) were on social assistance in the London CMA in 2014, which was higher than the 6% provincial average in 2014. Social assistance use grew 36% between 2003-2014 in the London CMA. Younger women aged 15-39, children under 10, and men over 40 are more likely to seek Ontario Works (OW) benefits and social assistance in general, with claimants of Ontario Disability Support Program (ODSP) more prevalent for the older population (45+). Furthermore, claimants of ODSP grew 64% from 2003-2014.

Social assistance income has decreased since the 1990s by almost 20% (equivalent to \$5,000 for a single parent with one child). OW provided 40% of support that a full-time worker in a minimum wage job would earn in 2016, while ODSP provided 60%. Household income in London had been decreasing as well, with the median income across families/singles \$3,300 greater than the Canadian median in 2000, but \$330 below the Canadian median in 2014. The after-tax median for the London CMA was lower than the Ontario average for all family types except single individuals. In 2019, the real after-tax household income in London was \$6,700 below the Canadian median⁴².

According to our analysis of the 2016 Census, the median employment income of \$32,706 in the London ER is slightly lower than the Ontario median of \$33,959 (by around \$1,200, or almost 4%).⁴³ Furthermore, the weighted median employment income across all family types was lower by 5% in London CMA compared to Ontario in 2019, with the 10-year average wage growth slower in the London CMA.⁴⁴ Slower wage growth likely contributes to poverty and low-income incidence in London ER, and could play a determining factor for why participation is lower in the London ER compared to other Ontario regions. Furthermore, the low-income measure, a metric that measures incidence of low income households,⁴⁵ in the London CMA is the third highest of all CMAs in Canada in 2015 at 17% (compared to 14% in Canada).⁴⁶ The growth in low income measure prevalence between 2005 and 2015 was highest in the London CMA out of all CMAs in Canada, increasing by 3.7% during this period (compared to 0.2% for Canada). Slow wage growth, combined with rising costs of living contribute to low-income incidence, which has impacted the London region relatively more than other parts of the province and country.

⁴¹ London Poverty Research Centre at King's. [An Overview of Recent Demographic and Economic Trends Impacting Low Income and Social Assistance Use in London and Neighbouring CMAs in Southwest Ontario, 2017.](#)

⁴² Canadian Mortgage and Housing Corporation. [Real Median Household Income \(After-Tax\), by Tenure, 2006-2019.](#)

⁴³ Statistics Canada, [Data Tables, 2016 Census.](#)

⁴⁴ Statistics Canada. [Distribution of total income by census family type and age of older partner, parent or individual.](#)

⁴⁵ According to Statistics Canada, "The Low-income measure, after tax, refers to a fixed percentage (50%) of median adjusted after-tax income of private households. The household after-tax income is adjusted by an equivalence scale to take economies of scale into account. This adjustment for different household sizes reflects the fact that a household's needs increase, but at a decreasing rate, as the number of members increases."

⁴⁶ Statistics Canada. [Population in private households for income status, number of persons in low income, prevalence of low income based on the low-income concept - Low-income measure, after-tax \(LIM-AT\), by age groups \(total - age groups\), Canada and census metropolitan areas, 2016 Census](#)

Discouragement from the workforce

According to Statistics Canada, discouraged workers are “persons who reported wanting to work at a job or business during the reference week and were available, but who did not look for work because they believed no suitable work was available”.⁴⁷ Discouraged non-participants are considered to have marginal attachment to the labour market, as opposed to those with no attachment who are not willing to or unable to participate under any circumstances. The level of attachment is defined by whether an individual wants work; those with marginal attachment to the labour market are willing and able to work, while those with weak to no attachment are not willing or able to work.

Research indicates that those with no attachment to the labour market face more challenges in re-entering, as attachment is determined by how much a person desires to find work. A paper by Stephen R. G. Jones and W. Craig Riddell⁴⁸ identified two groups of workers who are not in the labour force: those who are non-attached and those who are marginally attached. The transition rates into employment were higher for those with attachment to the labour market. The segmentation of these two groups were dependent on whether they wanted work, with those marginally attached more likely to passively search. Those in the marginally attached group also have shorter periods out of the labour market than those who are non-attached.

As discouraged workers are marginally attached, this subset of non-participants are more likely to search for work and are more likely to be available for work and re-entry to the labour market.

Willingness and ability to work

Although a variety of reasons may contribute to an individual’s non-participation in the labour market, individuals vary in terms of their ability to work, or interest in participating in labour market activities. According to the 2015 LEPC study, a large subsection of non-participants in the London ER were identified as unwilling or unable to work, as opposed to those who may be open to working. 93% of non-participants (or 38,200 people) were identified as unwilling or unable to work, which is higher than Ontario’s rate of 89%. Of those unwilling or unable to work, 73% were women, and 60% were individuals between 25-44 years old. Among 45-54-year-olds, illness was the top reason why they were not looking for work. Among immigrants, the top reason for not participating for those aged 25-44 was school (which includes school for new immigrants to learn English), while immigrants aged 45-54 cited personal/family responsibilities. We note that these statistics refer to interest in working under current conditions, which is in contrast to the estimates presented in this report of non-participants that may be available to participate if their barriers to participation were addressed.

Economic and labour market trends affecting participation

Temporary and short-term employment

The 2019 study by LEPC and WPDB cited research⁴⁹ that temporary and short-term employment contributed to lower participation rates. Since 1998, temporary workers have exceeded the number of permanent employees in Canada. “Entry-exit-respite” patterns are often observed from people engaged in temporary employment, where workers fluctuate between participation and non-participation in the labour market, using short breaks in between engagement. This is spurred by wealth effects (e.g. some people with partners who have high incomes do not have to work as consistently), as well as seasonal employment. Seasonal jobs tend to display an “in-and-out” employment pattern, where the labour force was highest during the summer months/middle of the year, and lowest towards the winter.

Long-term impacts of the financial crisis

Economic resilience is lower in regions with a greater concentration in relatively few industries, which may lead to long-term challenges for the labour force. Because many local economies within the London ER had relatively high concentrations in manufacturing, increased unemployment in this industry during the recession from 2008-2009 contributed to a lower participation rate in the years following. In 2008, manufacturing was the third-largest industry in the London ER, with 13% of employment in the sector. Between 2008 and 2010, there was a net decrease of almost 10,000 manufacturing jobs, or almost 20% of employment in the industry in the London ER. Post-recession, the decrease in participation in the London ER was larger for men than women, which was due in part to the significant loss of manufacturing jobs. Findings in the report also suggest employer preferences changed after the recession, with economic

⁴⁷ Statistics Canada. [Guide to the Labour Force Survey](#), 2020.

⁴⁸ Stephen R. G. Jones and W. Craig Riddell. [Unemployment, Marginal Attachment, and Labor Force Participation in Canada and the United States](#), 2019.

⁴⁹ John Coglianesi. [The Rise of In-and-Outs: Declining Labor Force Participation of Prime Age Men](#), 2018.

uncertainties increasing employers' preference for more educated workers. This was driven by greater availability of unemployed workers of all educational backgrounds post-recession. A preference for educated workers continued post-recession, which sent a signal to the market that higher education levels increase a worker's chance of getting a job. In addition, though the mature cohort was able to leverage work experience to maintain employment during the recession in 2008-2009, economic uncertainty may also have caused many workers in this cohort to delay retirement, decreasing job opportunities for younger workers. In turn, the lack of opportunities for youth encouraged higher educational attainment and a shift to a lower participation rate among this group.

Impacts of automation

Changes in technology have affected the labour market in manufacturing and mid-skill jobs. A changing landscape for these jobs may increase discouragement for workers who have been laid-off amid changing industry focuses. "Routine" operations in sales, office, administration, production, construction, transportation, etc. are also affected by technological changes. Workers in these occupations experience pressure to undertake education or training that allows them to migrate toward high-skill jobs, or accept lower-skill jobs. In addition, job postings for jobs that require no formal education (covering both mid- and low-skilled jobs) decreased over this period.

Automation appears to have been a driver of trends in manufacturing employment in London and Ontario. In 2003, manufacturing employment was at its highest, comprising 20% of total employment in the London ER. This was greater than the Ontario average of 18% in 2003. However, over the last decade, manufacturing employment continued to decline, as manufacturing employment in London from 2010 to 2019 averaged 14% of total employment. On the other hand, we note that other ERs with a dominant share of manufacturing employment in 2003 saw a larger adverse impact in the sector than London ER, but did not observe the same decrease in participation as the London ER. Regions that had larger shares of manufacturing employment than London, such as Hamilton-Niagara Peninsula, Windsor-Sarnia, and Kitchener-Waterloo-Barrie, experienced a larger decline in manufacturing employment share from 2003 to 2019, when compared to London ER, while experiencing lower decreases in participation. This suggests that the decline in employment for industries with increased automation is not the only factor in explaining the relatively larger decrease in participation in London ER. It may be useful for the London ER to seek a better understanding of the drivers behind the different outcomes between London and those regions.

Homelessness and housing

According to the City of London's 2020 *Housing Stability Action Plan*⁵⁰, the population growth in the City of London in recent years has not been supported with an increase in affordable housing units. Close to a tenth of homeowners in the City spend over 30% of their income on shelter every month, and close to half of renters spend over 30% of their income on shelter every month. Furthermore, home ownership has become less attainable for London residents; it is estimated that a household would need \$100,000 in income in order to obtain a mortgage for the average house in London. These factors put many lower-income individuals and families at risk for homelessness. It is estimated that 2,400 individuals and families access emergency shelter services every year in the City of London. The barriers that those who are homeless face in the labour market are expansive: the lack of a safe environment to prepare for interviews, not having an address to put on a resume, limited financial resources, as well as limited access to technology and tools to search and apply for jobs. Moreover, those who are homeless are also more likely to have health conditions, have lower levels of educational attainment, less vocational training, and thus are more likely to be discriminated against.⁵¹ Economic conditions such as the rising costs of living and low wage growth are factors that contribute to the homelessness and housing crisis in London, which subsequently impact the labour market outcomes for these individuals.

The City of London has one of the highest rates of homelessness of any CMA in Ontario, with an average of approximately 5 out of 1,000 residents accessing emergency shelter services in 2016.⁵² This rate is higher than those in regions such as Ottawa, Hamilton, Kingston, Waterloo and Peel.⁵³ According to *Counting Our Way Home*, a report chronicling the experiences that those who are homeless face, a lack of financial resources, addiction, and the lack of affordable housing are among their top challenges.⁵⁴ For these individuals, it is important to provide services to overcome trauma and other tailored interventions to healing before offering services to help develop occupational skills training,

⁵⁰ City of London, *Housing Stability For All: The Housing Stability Action Plan for the City of London 2019-2024*, 2020.

⁵¹ Homeless Hub, *About Homelessness*.

⁵² Homeless Hub, *Community Profiles, London*.

⁵³ This may even be understated for London, as not all who are homeless may seek to access emergency shelter.

⁵⁴ London Fuse. *Chronic Homelessness A Way Of Life For Many Londoners*.

career guidance, workplace behaviour training and other financial and family support to help homeless individuals obtain labour market opportunities.⁵⁵

Contributions of this study

This study builds on previous research on non-participation in the London ER, as described in Section 4. Although the main themes behind non-participation that were uncovered through our study are broadly similar to the findings in previous reports, our survey and analysis allowed for the quantification of London ER non-participants in various prime-age profiles who would be available to participate if their barriers were addressed, which was not evaluated in previous studies.

In addition, an updated analysis on labour force participation in London ER compared to other economic regions and Ontario, for as recent as 2019 (including an analysis of participation within the context of COVID-19 in 2020), validates that relatively low participation continues to affect the London ER. Continuing to keep track of participation rates in the London ER in the following years and how it responds to interventions and demographic changes is important to understand how to improve regional labour market outcomes.

⁵⁵ National Alliance to End Homelessness. *Overcoming Employment Barriers*, 2013.

5. Survey findings


Based on the survey conducted, we identify common barriers to labour market participation for prime-age and mature-age respondents, with a specific focus on eight prime-age profiles. The survey collected information on the reasons for non-participation (not working or looking for work), what factors need to be addressed in order to participate, when individuals last participated in labour market activities (searching for jobs or working), the nature of their employment when they last worked, as well as demographic and background information (education, social benefits collection, relationship status, etc.). For some questions, multiple responses could be provided. As a result, the graphs presented in this section may have responses that sum to over 100%.

In this section, industries in which respondents worked when they were last employed are grouped into Knowledge industries, Service industries, and Industries with trades occupations. This enables us to develop more specific trends in the type of work that respondents have performed. The full methodology behind this grouping is in Appendix B.

Each profile highlights unique barriers and circumstances behind their non-participation; profiles often overlap, which reinforces that non-participation is often complex and multi-faceted. Respondents often can be counted in multiple categories (e.g. a prime-age respondent who is an immigrant who also has a health condition); as a result, the number of respondents listed for the various profiles in Table 2 exceeds the total number of respondents in the survey. The findings developed from the survey were used as a basis for the considerations in the following section.

The following heat map visualizes the size of overlapping profiles, as a percentage of total prime-age respondents. Among the largest overlaps are women with postsecondary education, women with low income, and people with postsecondary education and low income. These overlaps highlight the importance of addressing overlapping barriers when seeking to encourage labour market participation.

Figure 8: Heat map of overlapping prime-age non-participant profiles



Availability to participate

We also assessed the share of non-participants that could be available to participate in the labour market with adequate support to mitigate or resolve the factors driving their non-participation. We estimated this share using responses in four areas of the survey responses: why the respondent was not participating, which factors need to change in order for them to participate, to what extent was their non-participation linked to COVID-19, and the free-form text answers that were provided at the end of the survey, where participants were invited to share additional information. To reflect some uncertainty inherent in this approach, we have estimated these shares as a range. For example, for those with health circumstances preventing them from participating, the lower bound assumes that all respondents who indicated that they would require improved health circumstances before entering the labour market would not be available to participate, whereas the upper bound assumes that some of these respondents would be available to participate based on their additional answers (e.g. if they indicated that they would be interested in working with certain accommodations). More details on the methodology used to determine who would be available to participate are presented in Appendix B.

Statistics Canada collects data on reasons for not looking for work among individuals who are not participating, including for those who did not want work or were not available. Citing these figures from Statistics Canada, the 2017 LEPC report states that 93% of prime-age non-participants in the London ER did not want to work or were unavailable to work in 2015. We note the contrast between this range and a previous study which estimated that 7% of non-participants in the London ER would be willing or able to work under the status quo (i.e. without barriers being mitigated or addressed). The methodology in this report assigns availability status on the basis of who could potentially be interested in labour market activities given the removal of barriers and/or circumstances mitigating participation. The breakdown of these figures by non-participant profiles is detailed in Table 2.

Table 2: Availability to participate if barriers were addressed, by non-participant profiles

	Responses in survey	% available to participate if barriers are addressed ⁵⁶	Non participants in London ER (2019) ⁵⁷	Potential participants in London ER ⁵⁸
Total survey (15 years or older)⁵⁹	447	7.2% - 69%	228,500	
Prime-age non-participant profiles				
Total prime-age (aged 25 to 54)	249	65% - 86% ⁶⁰	46,900	30,000 - 40,000
Women	145	65% - 88%	33,500	22,000 - 29,000
Immigrants	46	87% - 91%	9,300	8,000 - 8,500
Visible minority	31	71% - 87%		
With post-secondary education ⁶¹	179	72% - 87%	20,500	15,000 - 18,000
Without post-secondary education	70	47% - 81%	26,300	12,000 - 21,000
Health conditions	69	14% - 72%		
Low-income	99	63% - 90%		
Residents outside the City of London	46	67% - 87%		
Respondents aged 55-64	181	33% - 47%	30,100 ⁶²	12,000 - 14,000

⁵⁶ Rounded to nearest whole percentage—potential participants reflect numbers derived using more precise percentages.

⁵⁷ Extrapolated using data from the *Labour Force Survey* and figures from the Local Employment Planning Council report. London Economic Region Labour Market Participation, (2017), and rounded to the nearest hundred.

⁵⁸ Rounded to the nearest thousand.

⁵⁹ Estimate of potential participants not included due to small sample size of respondents aged 15-24 and 65+.

⁶⁰ The lower bound (7.3%) represents the availability to work number reported by Statistics Canada for the London Economic Region in 2015.

⁶¹ Includes all diplomas, certificates, and degrees beyond a high school education.

⁶² For London CMA only.

Profiles

Below we describe the barriers to participation for each profile identified. Actions to address these barriers are described in further detail in Section 6.


Prime-age respondents

Key findings: Prime-age respondents

Each profile of prime-age non-participants faces unique barriers, but a recurring issue across most groups is the lack of attractive jobs for them within the London ER. Other prevalent barriers include discouragement, child care responsibilities, perceived discrimination from employers, and the lack of access to transportation. Accordingly, the top factors that respondents say need to change in order for them to participate in the labour market would be improved opportunities for jobs that fit their requirements, and increased support for training, education, and searching for jobs.


The following sections expand on the various reasons for non-participation among different prime-age groups. Although each profile of prime-age individuals who are not participating have unique barriers to participation, a recurring issue across most groups is the lack of attractive jobs within the London ER, which includes a lack of jobs that pay enough, the lack of jobs that require their skill set, and the lack of jobs with their preferred schedule. Other prevalent barriers include discouragement, child care responsibilities, perceived discrimination, and the lack of access to transportation. With respect to a job's pay level, we note that it depends on many subjective factors such as their costs, child care needs, commute time, and access to transportation. We note that many survey respondents had relatively low income when they last worked: 55% of prime-age respondents who are not participating due to the lack of jobs that pay enough made less than \$40,000 when they were last employed.

Figure 9: Top reasons for non-participation among prime-age respondents




The top factors that need to change in order for prime-age respondents to participate in the labour market tend to be focused toward better opportunities for jobs that fit their requirements, and support for training, education, and searching for jobs, as seen with Figure 10.

Figure 10: Top factors that need to change in order for prime-age respondents to participate in the labour market




Prime-age respondents in the London ER are highly educated. According to the 2016 Census, the London ER had the third-highest rate of residents with a post-secondary education (behind Ottawa and Toronto), with 62% of London ER residents having a post-secondary college, university or apprenticeship certification. In the sample of non-participants, respondents who have a post-secondary degree are defined as those who graduated with a university, college, or CEGEP degree, certificate or diploma (below, at or above a bachelor’s level) or an apprenticeship/trades diploma or certificate. 72% of prime-age respondents have a post-secondary education, compared to 68% of the overall sample of respondents. However, when respondents last worked, they earned low wages and were concentrated in low-skill industries (e.g. retail). This suggests that non-participants may struggle to match their education and skills with available jobs.

Figure 11: Breakdown of educational background of prime-age respondents




When prime-age respondents were last employed, 29% worked in Knowledge industries, 24% worked in Service industries, while 18% worked in Industries with trades occupations. For prime-age respondents who indicate a lack of jobs that pay enough is a reason for non-participation, the top industries they were last employed in were Retail trade (17%), Manufacturing (14%), and Health care and social assistance (12%).

Figure 12: Top industries in which prime-age respondents last worked when last employed




While Sales and service occupations were the most common occupations prime-age respondents last worked in, employment in Knowledge industries for Business, finance and administration occupations and Management occupations were common as well. 60% of those who worked in Service industries worked in Sales and service occupations, while 27% of those who worked in Knowledge industries worked in Business, finance and administration occupations. 22% worked in Health occupations and 15% worked in Education, law and social, community and government services.

Figure 13: Top occupations in which prime-age respondents last worked when last employed



Despite being highly educated, prime-age respondents often earned less than the median income. 40% of prime-age respondents and 37% of the whole sample made less than \$30,000 when they were last employed. For prime-age respondents with a post-secondary education, 35% made less than \$30,000 when last employed (compared to 29% of mature-age respondents with a post-secondary education).

Figure 14: Employment income distribution among prime-age respondents when they were last employed



Almost half (47%) of prime-age respondents last searched for jobs six months prior to the time of survey response. We note that all respondents were not searching for a job at the time of the survey response in order to be classified as non-participating. The COVID-19 pandemic appears to have not impacted job searching among prime-age respondents, with 55% who indicate that the COVID-19 pandemic is one of the reasons for their non-participation having last searched for a job within the month prior to their survey response. For those who indicated that COVID-19 was not a reason for their non-participation, 31% have searched for a job within the month before the survey response. Furthermore, prime-age respondents who last worked in Service industries were more likely to have last searched for work within the month prior to their survey response, with 38% searching within the last month prior to their survey response compared to 31% of those who last worked in Knowledge industries and Industries with trades occupations. As a larger proportion of prime-age respondents in Service industries were affected by COVID-19 (37% cite COVID-19 as a reason for their non-participation, compared to 31% in all other industries), it suggests that the structural nature of non-participation among respondents, such as the lack of attractive jobs, takes a longer period of time to address and resolve, which results in less frequent job-searching and lower attachment to the labour market.

Respondents between the ages of 25 to 34 are the most likely to have last searched for jobs a month prior to their survey response despite a larger proportion of respondents not participating due to COVID-19. A higher availability to participate (73% - 94%) and a larger share of those who last worked in Service industries (31% compared to 21% of those aged 35-54) among those aged 25-34 likely contributes to higher rates of searching in the month prior to survey response.

Prime-age women

Key findings: Prime-age women

Child care responsibilities are a barrier to participation for 30% of women in the survey sample, and affect women much more significantly than men. However, most prime-age women with child care responsibilities also identify other barriers including the lack of jobs with their preferred schedule, the lack of jobs that pay enough, and the lack of transportation. Women also make less than men at each level of education, suggesting that they may have lower incentive to participate.

The lack of attractive jobs is a strong barrier to non-participation among prime-age women. The top reason for non-participation for prime-age women is a lack of jobs that pay enough (30% compared to 38% for prime-age men). Other labour market conditions that contribute to non-participation include a lack of jobs requiring their skill set (20% compared to 27% for prime-age men) and discouragement (24% compared to 21% for prime-age men).


Though labour market conditions are a strong driver of non-participation, prime-age women are often not participating due to child care responsibilities. 30% of prime-age women in our sample do not participate due to child care responsibilities.

81% of all prime-age respondents who do not participate due to child care are women, which is a greater share of women in the prime-age sample (58%).

More prime-age women than prime-age men do not participate due to a lack of jobs that fit their schedule (24% compared to 6%; this correlates with more women are more often non-participating due to child care responsibilities than men). Furthermore, 36% of prime-age women caring for children are also unable to find jobs available with their preferred schedule.

However, 65% of prime-age women who are non-participating due to child care also cited other reasons for not participating. Other than the lack of jobs with their preferred schedule, the lack of transportation, jobs that pay enough, and health and safety conditions in the workplace are also barriers to prime-age women who are non-participating. This suggests that other factors will need to be addressed to encourage their participation, mainly related to the match between their preferred work conditions (e.g. flexibility, locations) and available jobs.

Figure 15: Top reasons for non-participation among prime-age women



Non-participating women tend to be out of the labour force for more extended periods of time than men, creating barriers to re-entering the labour market. This tends to be linked to child care responsibilities, which is more often a barrier affecting women. 77% of all prime-age respondents who are non-participating due to childcare last worked more than a year ago. Overall, 67% of prime-age women have been out of work for over a year, compared to 57% of prime-age men. Furthermore, 43% of prime-age women last searched for a job in the six months prior to survey response, compared to 56% of prime-age men.

Figure 16: Length of time out of the workforce for prime-age women





Figure 17: Length of time since prime-age women last searched for work at the time of survey response




Compared to prime-age men, prime-age women tend to have worked in lower-paying industries when they were last employed, decreasing their incentive to work. Compared to prime-age men, prime-age women are much more likely to work in lower-paying industries when they were last employed, and were more likely than prime-age men to make less than the median income in the London ER.

Despite having similar education levels as prime-age men, prime-age women made less income than prime-age men at every level of education when last employed. While 72% of prime-age women have a post-secondary education (the same share as prime-age men), 48% of prime-age women with a post-secondary education earned less than the median income in London ER in 2016 when they last worked, compared to 19% of prime-age men. Similar trends arise for prime-age women without a post-secondary education. For those without a post-secondary education, 53% of prime-age women earned less than the median income in London ER when they last worked, compared to 46% of prime-age men. This suggests that women may be less incentivized to enter the labour market due to lower potential earnings. Actions to increase potential earnings or job quality (such as retraining) may address this issue.

Prime-age women with and without a post-secondary education often worked in lower-paying industries than prime-age men with the same educational credentials. Prime-age women with a post-secondary education often held jobs in Health care and social assistance, while prime-age men with a post-secondary education most often held Manufacturing jobs. Prime-age women without a post-secondary education most frequently worked in Retail trade, and Accommodation and food services, while prime-age men without a post-secondary education most frequently worked in higher-paying industries such as Manufacturing and Construction. As a result, 49% of prime-age women made less than \$30,000 when they last worked, compared to 27% of prime-age men.

Figure 18: Top industries prime-age women worked in when last employed



Interventions that would help increase participation for prime-age women could include providing affordable and accessible child care services and transportation, as well as more flexible employment opportunities (e.g. flexible

schedules, working from home, etc.). Better services for job search assistance and retraining programs could help align job-seekers to opportunities with higher pay and with their relevant skill set.


Prime-age immigrants

Key findings: Prime-age immigrants

For prime-age immigrants, discouragement is indicated as the top reason for their non-participation. Among prime-age immigrants who were discouraged, non-participation due to perceived discrimination from employers and the availability of jobs that require their skill set are highly correlated. For this group, the inability to find opportunities that are relevant to their skills and desired compensation despite high levels of post-secondary education drives non-participation. However, if these barriers were addressed, this group could have a relatively high availability to participate.


Prime-age immigrants are more often discouraged than their Canadian-born counterparts, due to not finding employment through previous job searches, and this is the top reason for their non-participation. A lack of attractive jobs such as jobs that pay enough and jobs with their preferred schedule also contribute to discouragement. 28% of prime-age immigrants are discouraged from participating, compared to 23% of prime-age non-immigrants. Furthermore, discrimination is a more frequently cited factor for non-participation among prime-age immigrants (24% compared to 16% of prime-age respondents who are not immigrants). Despite higher rates of discouragement, 87% - 91% of prime-age immigrants may be available to participate if barriers are addressed (compared to 60% - 84% of prime-age non-immigrants).

Figure 19: Top reasons for non-participation among prime-age immigrants



Among prime-age immigrants who were discouraged, non-participation due to perceived discrimination and the availability of jobs that require their skill set is highly correlated. Despite higher rates of post-secondary education and previous employment in Knowledge industries, prime-age immigrants did not earn more than prime-age non-immigrants (when they were last employed), providing some support to the claims for discrimination and barriers related to skills mismatch. 87% of prime-age immigrant respondents have a post-secondary education (compared to 68% in prime-age non-immigrants), with a greater proportion of prime-age immigrants with a university education (bachelor's or above) than prime-age respondents who are not immigrants (61% compared to 22%). The high levels of educational attainment among this group and the inability to find opportunities that are relevant to their skills and provide desired compensation seems to drive non-participation.

Figure 20: Employment income distribution of prime-age immigrants compared to prime-age non-immigrants



Interventions to support participation among prime-age immigrants could include better services to provide job search assistance to create a better match between skills and available jobs. A wider availability of retraining and education programs would support prime-age immigrants in attaining skills and education relevant to the jobs they would like to pursue. Flexibility in licensing for skills and abilities would reduce discrimination and create positive wage outcomes. In addition, a review of the frameworks in place to report and assess claims of discrimination from government entities, and greater transparency around equity practices and pay from employers, could help address the issue of discrimination.

The availability of employment counselling is crucial to support immigrants and their labour market outcomes. As many immigrants with foreign education credentials often return to school to obtain a Canadian degree due to their degree not being recognized, providing employment counselling on how to best leverage skills and foreign credentials in the context of the Canadian job market helps accelerate transition to the labour market without the need to return to school for another degree.

Prime-age visible minority non-participants^{63,64}

Key findings: Prime-age visible minorities

Over half of prime-age visible minorities in the sample are also immigrants, leading to similar barriers faced between the two groups. Among prime-age visible minorities, the top reason that they indicate for non-participation is discrimination from employers. The lack of attractive jobs also contributes to the non-participation in this group, as well as discouragement and a lack of technical skills that employers are looking for.

Over half of prime-age visible minority respondents in the sample are also immigrants (58%). As a result, some of the observations for non-participation among prime-age visible minorities are similar to those made for the prime-age immigrant group.


The primary barrier to participation for prime-age visible minority respondents is discrimination, with 29% indicating that employers discriminate against people like them; this is compared to 16% of prime-age non-visible minority respondents. A lack of attractive jobs is also a common barrier for this group. Prime-age visible minorities are also more likely to

⁶³ Due to a low sample size for prime-age Indigenous respondents, specific trends in non-participation could not be isolated for this group. A small sample size in prime-age visible minorities who are not immigrants restricts more in-depth analysis for this group.

⁶⁴ The term "visible minority" refers to Statistics Canada's existing operational definition as of 2021, which takes from the Employment Equity Act's definition of "persons, other than Aboriginal peoples, who are non-Caucasian in race or non-white in colour". The use of this term to refer to individuals who identify as part of this group is currently under review by the Government of Canada, and is subject to change.

indicate that they lack the technical skills that employers are looking for, with 16% stating that it is a barrier to participation (compared to 13% of prime-age respondents who are not visible minorities).

Figure 21: Top reasons for non-participation among prime-age visible minority respondents



Among our sample of prime-age visible minorities (both immigrants and non-immigrants), social benefit collection is lower than their counterparts who are not visible minorities. Prime-age visible minorities are less likely to collect social benefits such as Ontario Works (OW) and Employment Insurance (EI): 55% of prime-age visible minorities in our sample receive social benefits, compared to 64% of those in prime-age who are not visible minorities. However, a slightly higher share of prime-age visible minorities in our sample are collecting Ontario Disability Support Program (ODSP) benefits (19% compared to 18% among those who are not visible minorities), as a greater share of these respondents have a disability or physical health barrier affecting their participation (23% compared to 21% among those who are not visible minorities). Data for ODSP recipients in Ontario as a whole is not available in this level of detail, so we cannot ascertain that these trends hold outside of our sample.

Prime-age visible minorities are as likely to have last worked in Knowledge industries and Service industries as their counterparts who are not visible minorities. A greater share of prime-age visible minorities with a post-secondary education work in Service industries (29%) than their counterparts who were not visible minorities and have a post-secondary education (20%). This could suggest the existence of a combination of barriers such as discrimination among Knowledge industries, or greater skills mismatch among prime-age visible minorities.

Almost half (48%) of prime-age visible minorities in the sample last searched for a job within the last month prior to their survey response. This is compared to 33% among prime-age respondents who do not identify as a visible minority. This is similar to trends seen for prime-age immigrants.

Similar to prime-age immigrants, interventions to support greater participation for prime-age visible minorities could include a review of the frameworks to assess claims of discrimination from government entities, greater transparency around equity and pay from employers, licensing for skills and abilities, and a greater availability of job search assistance and retraining and education programs to match respondents to jobs that are relevant to their skills and requirements.

Prime-age non-participants with a post-secondary education

Key findings: Prime-age non-participants with a post-secondary education


Although a large share (72%) of prime-age respondents have a post-secondary education, a lack of attractive jobs is the main contributor to non-participation, with the lack of jobs that pay enough as the top reason for non-participation. The lack of jobs that pay enough is often correlated with a lack of jobs that require their skill set and discouragement. A considerable amount of prime-age respondents with a post-secondary education work in low- to mid-paying industries, with retail trade being the most frequent industry that respondents in this group last worked in. These factors suggest that among this group, poor match between their skills and available jobs is a driver of non-participation.

Respondents who have a post-secondary degree are defined as those that have graduated with a university, college, or CEGEP degree, certificate or diploma (below, at or above a bachelor’s level) or an apprenticeship/trades diploma or

certificate. Despite prime-age respondents frequently pursuing post-secondary education, a lack of attractive jobs largely contributes to non-participation. 72% of prime-age respondents have a post-secondary education, compared to 65% of respondents in the mature cohort.

Among these respondents, 40% cite the lack of jobs that pay enough as a reason for non-participation. The lack of jobs that pay enough is often correlated with a lack of jobs that require their skill set (45%), and discouragement (37%). These factors suggest that among this group, there is a poor match between their skills and available jobs.

Figure 22: Top reasons for non-participation among prime-age respondents with a post-secondary education



A considerable share of prime-age respondents with a post-secondary education work in low- to mid-paying industries. The top industries they work in include Health care and social assistance, Retail trade, Manufacturing, and Accommodation and food services. Though 49% of prime-age respondents who have a university education at a bachelor's level or above last worked in Knowledge industries, the most common industry this group was last employed in was Retail trade (17%). This tends to support the notion that the lack of attractive jobs to their skills and desired compensation leads non-participants in this group to work in industries with lower pay, leading to discouragement and labour market exits.

Table 3: Breakdown of industry groups that respondents were last employed in and median employment income for prime-age respondents with and without a post-secondary education⁶⁵

Industry group	% when last employed (all prime age respondents)	% when last employed (with a post secondary education)	% when last employed (without a post secondary education)	Weighted median employment income in London CMA in 2015 ⁶⁶
Total, all industries	100%	100%	100%	\$31,511
Knowledge industries	29%	36%	11%	\$47,766
Industries with trades occupations	18%	16%	23%	\$44,798
Service industries	24%	21%	31%	\$17,432

All respondents to the survey were not searching for a job at the time of the survey. However, prime-age respondents with a post-secondary education are more likely to have last searched for a job within the month prior to their survey response, and are less likely to have never searched for a job. 36% of respondents in this group last searched for a job within the month prior to their survey response, with 6% having never searched for jobs. This is compared to 15% of prime-age

⁶⁵ Respondents in the listed industry groups do not sum to 100% due to a share of respondents last working in Other industries, respondents who preferred not to report the industry they last worked in, and respondents who were never employed.

⁶⁶ Data tables, 2016 Census. Median employment income weighted according to the number of prime-age respondents in each industry group, rounded to the nearest dollar.

respondents without a post-secondary degree who last searched for a job within the month prior to survey response. In addition, 10% of prime-age respondents without a post-secondary degree have never looked for jobs.

Furthermore, prime-age respondents with a post-secondary education who are not participating due in part to the COVID-19 pandemic are more likely to have last searched for jobs within the month prior to survey response (62% compared to 34% of prime-age respondents with a post-secondary degree whose non-participation is not due to COVID-19). Given that jobs that allow working from home often require a post-secondary education, it is likely that those who are not participating or laid-off as a result of the pandemic have a greater ability to have searched for relevant work despite the pandemic's effect on the economy and the health circumstances of workplaces. Those who are not participating for reasons not due to COVID-19 are more likely to have not looked for jobs prior to the pandemic (43% last searched over a year ago from the time of survey response), and likely face structural issues resulting in long-term non-participation.

Despite this group's attainment of post-secondary education, they struggle to find jobs that are well-matched to their skills and therefore pay lower wages and are less attractive. This situation leads to lower incentives for these individuals to look for work. Interventions for this group could include retraining programs to help non-participants switch careers or develop new skills to make them more competitive in the labour market. Other factors that can support an improved match between education and available jobs are availability of labour market information in secondary schools, colleges, and universities to help students develop their career paths, and collaboration between educational institutions and employers, focusing on matching skills to available jobs and growing industries.


Prime-age non-participants without a post-secondary education

Key findings: Prime-age non-participants without a post-secondary education

Lack of transportation and poor health circumstances are the primary reasons for non-participation among prime-age respondents without a post-secondary education, while a lack of attractive jobs also contributes. A lack of technical skills that employers are looking for also affects this group more so than those with a post-secondary education. Not having a post-secondary education is often correlated with having low income and being in poor health, all factors that contribute to non-participation.

A lack of transportation and poor health conditions are the primary reasons for non-participation for prime-age respondents without a post-secondary education, while a lack of attractive jobs also contributes, as seen in Figure 18. A lack of technical skills that employers are looking for is a factor that affects non-participation in this group greater than those with a post-secondary education (21% compared to 9% of prime-age respondents with a post-secondary education).

Figure 23: Top reasons for non-participation among prime-age respondents without a post-secondary education



Prime-age respondents who do not have a post-secondary education often worked in Service industries (33%) and Industries with trades occupations (24%), which generally have lower barriers to entry in terms of educational requirements. The top industries these respondents last worked in were Retail trade (17%), Accommodation and Food services (14%), and Manufacturing (12.9%). Furthermore, a third of prime-age respondents without a post-secondary education worked in Sales and service occupations, with 16% working in Trades occupations.

The occurrence of not having a post-secondary education is often related with having low income and being in poor health. The lack of transportation is likely driven by lower income, as 51% of prime-age respondents who do not have a post-secondary education made less than the median income in London ER in 2015, compared to 35% of prime-age respondents with a post-secondary education. Furthermore, poor health conditions are often barriers to participation and education: 56% of prime-age respondents who have a health condition also have a post-secondary education, compared to 78% of prime-age respondents without a health condition. Given the intersection between being low income and non-participation due to a lack of skills for this group, this may suggest that subsidized training and upskilling programs would help develop higher labour market participation among these respondents.

This group faces intersecting barriers and would require various supports in order to enable participation. As prime-age respondents without a post-secondary education are more likely to have health conditions, better accommodations from employers to support those with health barriers would help support labour market outcomes. This could include providing jobs with flexible hours or opportunities to work remotely. Accessible and affordable transportation would also help this group in pursuing jobs in more remote regions, or to support those who may have accessibility issues due to a physical health condition or disability. Finally, better services for job search assistance and training/education programs could assist those without post-secondary education in finding jobs that are relevant to their abilities and requirements.

Prime-age non-participants with health conditions


Key findings: Prime-age non-participants with health conditions

Over two-thirds of prime-age respondents with at least one health condition state that they would require improved health circumstances to enter the labour market, which suggests that they would be unlikely to be able to enter the labour market even with other types of support. In order to participate, this group would also require greater availability of jobs that fit their qualifications and desired compensation (e.g. wages, benefits), and better access to transportation and training opportunities, among other factors.

The top reasons for non-participation among prime-age respondents with at least one health condition range from a lack of attractive jobs to a lack of transportation. Notably, a lack of transportation is a prominent barrier for prime-age respondents with a disability or physical health condition, as 23% of prime-age respondents with at least one of these health conditions indicate that it is a reason contributing to their non-participation (compared to 16% of prime-age respondents without a disability or physical health condition). Prime-age respondents with a health condition are also more likely to claim employers discriminating against people like them are a reason for their non-participation (25% compared to 14% of prime-age respondents without a health condition).


Prime-age respondents who are not participating due to a disability or physical health condition frequently indicate that their mental health is a barrier to participation. 58% of prime-age respondents who identify as having a physical health condition also cite mental health as a barrier to participation, while 51% of those who identify as having a disability cite mental health as a barrier. This may suggest that support to help enter the labour force for these respondents often would be required to extend beyond physical accommodations.

Figure 24: Top reasons for non-participation among prime-age respondents with at least one health condition



Health conditions are often barriers to education and consequently to labour market participation, leading to lower income levels. 48% of prime-age respondents with a health condition made less than \$30,000 when last employed (compared to 37% of prime-age respondents without a health condition). However, prime-age respondents with health conditions last worked in Service industries as frequently as Knowledge industries (29% of respondents for each). Prime-age respondents without health conditions were less likely to work in Service industries (23%).

Figure 25: Top industries prime-age respondents with health conditions worked in when last employed




As described in the profile of prime-age respondents without a post-secondary education, the occurrence of not having a post-secondary education is often correlated with health conditions. However, post-secondary attainment varies between different health conditions. Prime-age respondents who identify as having a physical health condition are less likely to have a post-secondary education (47%) compared to those who identify as having a disability (51%) or a mental health barrier (59%).

Many of the respondents in this group require improvement from their health conditions in order to consider labour market entry; this translates to a significantly lower number of those who would be available to participate given that many people with health barriers would not be able to work even with increased support from governments and employers. However, a significant portion have still indicated interest in entering the labour force, given additional support. Between 14% and 72% of prime-age respondents with at least one health condition could be available to participate if barriers were addressed, with lower rates of participation expected for those with a disability. Though over two-thirds of respondents in this group state that they would require improved health circumstances to enter the labour market, other changes need to be implemented in order to support their participation.

Regardless of whether or not respondents in this group require improved health circumstances, the availability of jobs that fit their qualifications and compensation expectations (e.g. wages, benefits), as well as better access to transportation and training opportunities, would help their transition into the labour market—among other factors. This reinforces that the pathway to participation for this group is not one-dimensional; even with improved health circumstances, support is required in other areas in order to create labour market opportunities among this group.

Figure 26: Factors that need to change in order for prime-age respondents with at least one health condition to participate



While two-thirds of prime-age respondents with health conditions are not able to work without improvement in their health circumstances, others could be available to participate if barriers were addressed. Interventions that can support this group include better accommodations from employers to support those with health barriers, which would help support labour market outcomes. This includes providing jobs with flexible hours or opportunities to work remotely, and extended health benefits. Another intervention to support participation among this group is availability of transportation that accommodates those who may have accessibility issues due to a physical health condition or disability. Finally, better services for job search assistance, and accessible retraining and education programs (e.g. AODA compliant online modules, would help non-participants in this group find jobs that are relevant to their skills, abilities and requirements.

Prime-age non-participants with low income

Key findings: Prime-age non-participants with low income

Among prime-age respondents who made less than \$30,000 when they were last employed, lack of access to transportation is the top barrier to participation. In addition, the lack of attractive jobs such as the lack of jobs that pay enough or require their skill set are commonly indicated as barriers to non-participation, as well as discouragement. Non-participation due to discouragement among these respondents is also highly correlated with the lack of jobs that pay enough.

Low income is defined as an individual earning less than \$30,000 in employment income when last employed, which is less than the median employment income of \$33,126⁶⁷ in the London ER in 2019. Among low-income respondents, the lack of access to transportation is the top barrier to participation, with 27% saying it is a reason for their non-participation. As those with low income are less likely to be able to afford a car, the lack of transportation can make jobs inaccessible if public transit is not a viable option.


The use of public transportation to commute to work was significantly lower in the London ER compared to Ontario as a whole. Based on the 2016 Census, almost 6% of employed London ER residents commuted to work using public transportation, compared to almost 15% for the average Ontarian. Employed London ER residents were more likely to drive to work compared to the average Ontarian (80% compared to 72%, a difference of over 8 percentage points). This could be due to availability of routes and schedules, time required for commutes, or cost. The implications of the need to

⁶⁷ Derived from calculation indexing 2015 median employment income in London ER to growth in median employment income in Ontario from 2015 to 2019.

have a vehicle in order to reach places of employment that are more distant or at a location where public transit does not reach would create significant issues in labour market participation and employment opportunities for those who cannot afford to purchase or own a vehicle.

In addition to the lack of attractive jobs, discouragement is more prevalent among prime-age low-income respondents as a reason for non-participation. 26% of these respondents are discouraged from participating; this is compared to 22% among prime-age respondents who made over \$30,000 when last employed. Discouragement is often highly correlated with responses indicating the lack of jobs that pay enough (54%).

Figure 27: Top reasons for non-participation among prime-age respondents with low income



Compared to those without a low income, prime-age respondents with low income are less likely to have a post-secondary education and work in Service industries. 64% of prime-age low-income individuals have a post-secondary education, compared to 85% of prime-age respondents who made over \$30,000 when last employed. 42% of these respondents worked in Service industries when last employed, with the top industries being Retail trade (25%), and Accommodation and food services (17%). One-fifth held jobs in Knowledge industries such as Health and social assistance, and Educational services.

16% of prime-age respondents with low income indicated that they lack the technical skills that employers are looking for (compared to 9% of those who made over \$30,000 when last employed), suggesting that these individuals do not have the necessary skills for jobs that they find attractive in terms of pay and work environment. A skills mismatch is further perpetuated due to lower rates of post-secondary education, which may be related to barriers faced due to having low income.

Prime-age respondents with low income are more likely to collect social benefits: 65% of prime-age respondents in low-income are collecting social benefits (compared to 58% of prime-age respondents making over \$30,000 when last employed). Among the top social benefits collected, 21% collect Ontario Works (OW) benefits (compared to 6% of prime-age respondents making over \$30,000 when last employed), 18% collect Ontario Disability Support Program (ODSP) benefits (compared to 10% of prime-age respondents making over \$30,000 when last employed), and 9% collect Employment Insurance (EI) benefits (compared to 16% of prime-age respondents making over \$30,000 when last employed). The effect of clawbacks on social benefits such as OW and ODSP can discourage labour market participation by lowering the financial incentive to work.

Prime-age respondents with low income are more likely to have a health condition, and these conditions are likely to be mutually reinforcing. One-third of prime-age respondents with low income have at least one health condition that limits their participation, compared to 17% of prime-age respondents making over \$30,000 when last employed. 18% have a disability, and 19% have a physical health condition. Furthermore, a high correlation between low-income and health conditions contributes to lower participation, and a greater need for the collection of social benefits.

Interventions to support prime-age respondents with low-income when they were last employed include better services for job search assistance, and free or low-cost training and education programs. This would provide respondents in this group an affordable way to develop the skills required to pursue opportunities in careers that are relevant to requirements.

Employers should also consider providing apprenticeship and co-operative programs to help non-participants gain experience and become more competitive in the labour market for higher-paying industries.

Prime-age non-participants outside of the City of London

Key findings: Prime-age non-participants outside the City of London


Among the top reasons for non-participation among prime-age respondents who reside outside the City of London are the lack of attractive jobs and child care responsibilities. Notably, prime-age residents living outside the City of London are more likely to not participate due to having sufficient household income. On the other hand, those in the City of London were more likely to cite lack of transportation as a barrier, compared to those outside the city. This is likely due to higher reliance on public transit as their main form of commuting. While prime-age residents outside the City of London have less post-secondary education, they did not make less than those living in the City of London, with similar opportunities working in mid-to-high-skilled industries to those living in the City.

Our analysis showed that drivers of non-participation differ between those in the City of London⁶⁸ and in other areas of the London ER. Prime-age women who resided outside the City of London are more likely to not participate due to child care responsibilities. 48% indicated that child care responsibilities are a reason for their non-participation, compared to 24% of prime-age women living in the City of London. As a result, these respondents were more likely to find a lack of jobs that fit their preferred schedule (26% compared to 16% of those living in the City of London). Furthermore, the sample size of respondents within each individual county outside the City of London is not statistically sufficient to be able to interpret specific trends in non-participation; therefore, we have focused on comparing those who live within the City of London with those outside the City of London.

The lack of transportation was a larger barrier to participation for prime-age respondents living in the City of London than those living outside the City. 19% of prime-age respondents living in the City of London indicated transportation is a barrier to participation, compared to 11% of prime-age respondents living outside of the City of London. According to the 2016 Census, 9% of those living in the City used public transit as their primary form of transportation, compared to 6% of residents living in the Elgin, Middlesex and Oxford counties. 75% of those living within the City used a car, truck or van as their primary form of commuting, compared to 80% of those living outside the City. Given that residents within the City of London rely more on public transit than those living outside the City and were less likely to travel by car primarily, transit is a greater issue for non-participants within the City.

Non-participants living outside the City of London are also more likely to not participate due to household income being sufficient. 15% of prime-age respondents living outside the City of London state this as a reason for their non-participation, compared to 6% of prime-age respondents living in the City of London.

Figure 28: Top reasons for non-participation among prime-age respondents living outside the City of London



⁶⁸ Defined according to municipal boundaries.

Prime-age respondents outside the City of London are also more likely to have last worked in Knowledge and Industries with trades occupations, and less likely to have last worked in Service industries. However, these respondents were similarly more likely to make less than \$30,000 in 2016 (39% compared to 40% of prime-age respondents within the City of London). Furthermore, prime-age respondents outside the City of London were less likely to have a post-secondary education (65% compared to 73% of prime-age respondents living in the City of London). This indicates that while prime-age respondents outside the City of London have less post-secondary education on average, they did not make less than those living in the City of London, with similar opportunities working in mid-to-high-skilled industries to those living in the City of London. As many of the top reasons for non-participation are related to the lack of attractive jobs, this may indicate opportunities to non-participants outside the City of London are limited.

Lack of transportation is a larger barrier for those in the City of London, with 19% citing it as a barrier, compared to those in other parts of the London ER (11%). Consideration paid to interventions around transportation should include an analysis of the infrastructure within the City of London, and could include an assessment on public transportation systems and transportation supports such as bussing services from employers.


Mature-age (aged 55 and over) non-participants

Key findings: Mature-age (55+) non-participants

Although many mature-age respondents are retired, there is interest in returning to the labour market under the right conditions. Up to 15.5% of retirees in the mature-age cohort would be available to participate if there were attractive jobs available that pay enough, fit their schedule, or require their skill set. 92% of retired respondents who potentially would be available to participate have a post-secondary education, suggesting that those with specialized skills and knowledge are more likely to be attached to the labour market.

Many mature-age respondents are not available to participate in the labour market due to being retired. 45% of the mature-age cohort is retired, with 96% of retired respondents in the mature-age cohort (which is a greater share than the 40% of the overall sample who are in the mature cohort). Among those in this age group who are not retired, factors that contribute to non-participation include disabilities, discouragement, and a lack of attractive jobs.

Figure 29: Top reasons for non-participation among mature-age respondents



Though many mature-age respondents are retired, there is interest in returning to the labour market under the right conditions. Up to 16% of retirees in the mature-age cohort could be available to participate if barriers were addressed, with the lack of well-paying jobs (33%), jobs that fit their schedule such as part-time/flexible positions (25%), and jobs requiring their skill set (25%) cited as the main reasons for non-participation. Up to 92% of retired respondents who potentially would be available to participate have a post-secondary education, suggesting that those with specialized skills and knowledge are more likely to be attached to the labour market.

While many mature-age non-participants are not interested in participating because they are retired, interventions to support those who are interested in working could include providing opportunities with flexible schedules and hours, as well as better services to help connect job-seekers to employment opportunities that are relevant to their skill set and requirements.


Changes in industry opportunities

Key findings: Changes in industry opportunities

Industry composition appears to be shifting in the London ER. Non-participants aged 45 and over are more likely to have last worked in Industries with trades occupations, while those aged 25-44 are more likely to have last worked in service occupations. The 25-44 age group is relatively more likely to have pursued Apprenticeship or a trades certificate or diploma, while having had relatively less success gaining employment in Industries with trades occupations. This suggests that the education and training pursued by the 25-44 cohort is not well aligned to opportunities in the industries they are pursuing, and/or there is a lack of jobs in those industries.

A divide between industries that younger and older respondents last worked in signifies a shift in industry opportunities. While many respondents aged 25-44 more commonly worked in Service industries when last employed, respondents aged 45 and over are more likely to have worked in Industries with trades occupations. Both groups are equally as likely to have worked in Knowledge industries when last employed.

Figure 30: Industry groups in which respondents were last employed, by age group



Prime-age respondents most frequently worked in Knowledge industries when last employed, and the majority of respondents who last worked in Service industries were in the prime-age demographic. 75% of all respondents who last worked in Service industries are in the prime-age cohort (with over half between the ages of 25 to 44), which is greater than the share of prime-age respondents in the sample (56%).

Older respondents were the most likely group to have been last employed in Industries with trades occupations. Those aged 45+ represented 67% and 68% of those that worked in Industries with trades occupations and Manufacturing, respectively, while representing 61% of the sample overall.

Despite a greater representation of respondents aged 45+ last working in Industries with trades occupations, a larger share of respondents under 44 years of age have an Apprenticeship or trades certificate or diploma. 10% of respondents under 44 years old have an Apprenticeship or trades certificate or diploma, compared to 7% of respondents aged 45

years or older in our sample. As respondents between the ages of 25 to 44 are more likely to not participate due to lacking technical skills that employers are looking for (12% compared to 7% of respondents who are 45 years or older), it is likely that they are less competitive due to the lack of experience in developing skills in the workforce despite having attained a certificate or diploma in trades. However, it is possible that younger respondents did not acquire trades certificates in trades occupations with higher job demand. For these individuals, retraining may help these individuals switch to careers in industries with greater employment opportunities. As seen in Table 4, this gap between respondents aged 25-44 and respondents 45+ who do not participate due to lack of technical skills is larger for those who last worked in Industries with trades occupations compared to Service and Knowledge industries.

Table 4: Gap between younger and older respondents who do not participate due to a lack of technical skills, by industry group respondents were last employed in⁶⁹

Industry group	Percentage who do not participate due to lack of technical skills that employers are looking for ⁷⁰		Difference between younger and older respondents
	Respondents aged 25 44	Respondents aged 45+	
Industries with trades occupations	13.6%	9.3%	4.3%
Service industries	17.1%	13.9%	3.2%
Knowledge industries	6.4%	4.9%	1.5%

The importance of opportunities in Industries with trades occupations is significant, as jobs in these industries have historically been available to those with and without a post-secondary education but offered higher wages than other industries that do not require a post-secondary education (e.g. Service industries). For all respondents that worked in Industries with trades occupations when last employed, 70% have a post-secondary education, and 67% earned more than the median income in London ER in 2019. For all respondents that worked in Service industries when last employed, 78% have a post-secondary education, but only 21% earned more than the median income in London ER in 2019. Furthermore, the weighted median annual employment income⁷¹ for those working in Industries with trades occupations in the London CMA was over 2.5 times as much as Service industries (\$44,798 compared to \$17,432).

An OECD study⁷² on job polarization in Canada with specific analysis on the London CMA finds that demand for mid-skill workers, such as tradespeople, has been on the rise in London since 2011, and data from Statistics Canada⁷³ has shown that employment in trades within Ontario has shown similar patterns. However, an increased demand for workers in trades has not allocated opportunities evenly. In Ontario between 2000-2009, 14% of workers in Industries with trades occupations were aged 55+, which has since risen to 21% between 2010-2019 (an increase of 8 percentage points). By comparison, the share of 55+ workers in all industries increased 6 percentage points over the same time period. As the mature-age cohort is able to leverage their experience to remain competitive in the labour market, this may explain why despite greater educational attainment in trades among those 25-44 years old, trades employment is more common among those who are aged 45 and older.

A loss of manufacturing opportunities in the years following the 2008-2009 recession may have contributed to prime-age non-participation, as it is possible that the initial shock to manufacturing employment has continued to have long-run effects on participation. Since 2015, manufacturing employment showed strong growth, but has yet to return to pre-recession levels. Whether this will have a positive effect on participation remains to be seen. With the COVID-19 pandemic decreasing opportunities for most industries and increasing trends of automation, there could be an adverse impact on any gains within manufacturing in London ER within the past five years.

⁶⁹ Figures rounded to one decimal place to show more precise differences between industry groups and age groups.

⁷⁰ Figures are rounded to the nearest whole.

⁷¹ Weighted according to the size of respondents in each industry, according to median employment income statistics from the 2016 Census.

⁷² OECD. *Job polarisation and changing skills needs at the local level in Canada*, 2020.

⁷³ Statistics Canada. *Labour force characteristics by industry, annual (x 1,000)*.

6. Considerations for addressing low labour market participation

As noted throughout this report, increasing the labour market participation rate is an important tool to promote economic growth, and in many cases individual well-being. It is particularly important in the context of the aging population trends in Ontario and Canada. In this section we propose options that may address the main barriers for non-participation (not working or looking for work) identified in our study. In developing the considerations we focused on the opportunities and gaps specific to the London ER with respect to types of jobs available, the inclusivity of programs available, the amount of existing collaboration between the community and industry, government and academia. The interventions in this section are ordered from top to bottom by the number of non-participants that would be supported by the interventions.

Mismatch between skills and available jobs

Impact in the London ER

For prime-age non-participants in the London ER, the top drivers of non-participation are related to a mismatch between individuals' skills and the jobs that they would like to have. The top reasons for not participating cited are the lack of availability of jobs that pay enough (34%), discouragement due to not finding a job previously (24%) and unavailability of jobs requiring their skill set (23%). In sum, non-participating individuals are not able to find jobs that they are qualified for that are sufficiently attractive to consider working. This mismatch persists despite the fact that a relatively high share of respondents (72%) have post-secondary education. Elements of mismatch affect almost all of the profiles described in this report, making it one of the top issues driving non-participation.

Factors that prime-age non-participants would like to see change in order to participate reflect the impact of this mismatch: 41% would like to see a greater availability of jobs that they are qualified for, 38% would like higher wages and/or benefits in the jobs they are qualified for, and 26% cite access to training or educational opportunities.

Evidence on interventions

Our survey evidence shows that many prime-age non-participants are not able to match with jobs that are attractive to them in terms of pay and schedule, and therefore become discouraged and choose to not participate. Interventions that can increase the number of jobs for which non-participants could qualify for and the pay of those jobs should be considered.

Active labour market measures, including retraining and job search assistance, have been widely studied and shown to be effective. For example, Denmark dedicates a significant amount of spending on active labour market programs, which is credited as one reason why the prime-age employment rate in Denmark is high relative to peer countries.⁷⁴ A meta-analysis of over 200 active labour market programs found that they generally have economically and statistically significant benefits, but only two to three years after the program takes place.⁷⁵ The most beneficial programs focus on human capital accumulation, through classroom or on-the-job training. The meta-study also found that there are larger impacts for women and participants who enter from long-term unemployment. This is relevant in the London ER, as the majority of non-participants have been out of the labour market for over one year.

Individuals who may benefit most from retraining are often switching occupations. This is likely to be the case among non-participants in the London ER undergoing retraining, because many of them worked in lower-paying occupations when last employed. A study of workers undergoing retraining in the US found that when controlling for whether

⁷⁴ The Economist, Flexicurity: How the Danes do it, April 10, 2021.

⁷⁵ Card et al. What works? A Meta-Analysis of Recent Active Labour Market Program Evaluations, 2015

individuals were switching occupations or staying in one occupation, training would increase employees' wages by around 10%, both for government-sponsored and employer-sponsored training.⁷⁶

With rising automation risk in manual and routine jobs expected in the near- and long-term, there is a need for industry and academia to collaborate in order to ensure the pipeline from school to the workplace is robust. The identification of skills demand and growing industries would reduce gaps in skilled labour and mismatch between job-seekers and available jobs. According to a study by the Canadian Education and Research Institute for Counselling (CERIC)⁷⁷, career education in high schools effectively changed the focus of students to pursue their early career aspirations, encouraged academic engagement, and increased career clarity. This is most effective for disadvantaged students from low-income backgrounds and from families where the parents did not have a post-secondary education.

Finally, increases in wages have been shown to increase labour force participation. In particular, stronger economic growth leads to higher wages as employers compete for workers, and employers may be more willing to make accommodations and broaden their criteria for hiring.⁷⁸

Considerations in the London ER

Evidence from the survey and from international examples suggest that a focus on retraining and job search assistance can make a meaningful difference to labour market participation in the London ER. These policies are designed to increase the number of jobs in the London ER for which individuals are qualified, and the pay of potential jobs. The large share of non-participants with post-secondary education suggests that in the longer term, better alignment of post-secondary education to employment opportunities can address these challenges preventatively, a recommendation made in a recent study on skill mismatch by the Conference Board of Canada.⁷⁹

In the context of the London ER, the following actions should be considered:

Governments

- Increase funding for Employment Ontario programs and community-specific employment agencies and programs that focus on training and job search support, particularly in areas of identifying retraining opportunities and matching job-seekers with open roles.
- Increase the focus on training programs, specifically aligned to the London ER and its labour market demand / opportunities
- Work to increase awareness of available training and job search services by promoting them through other government services that may connect with non-participants.
- Increase funding for retraining programs catered towards career transitions. Engage industry to ensure that training and credentials developed are relevant for in-demand positions. Additional research will be required to identify areas where the skills and experience of non-participants can match with in-demand roles in the London ER.
- In line with the above, create apprenticeship positions in high-demand trades in London ER and work to connect non-participants with apprenticeship opportunities.
- Provide funding for employer-run training and onboarding programs serving those in need of retraining or making a career change.
- Through existing employment services, assist employers in marketing available jobs in the London ER (e.g. videos of workers sharing their story working in or transitioning from a certain industry).
- To address the skill mismatch for immigrants specifically, review processes for entering licensed occupations after being licensed in other countries.

⁷⁶ Kambourov et al, Occupational mobility and the returns to training, forthcoming.

⁷⁷ Canadian Education and Research Institute for Counselling. [The role of career education on students' education choices and post-secondary outcomes](#), 2020.

⁷⁸ The Hamilton Project. [Labor Force Nonparticipation: Trends, Causes, and Policy Solutions](#). 2019.

⁷⁹ Conference Board of Canada, [Aligning Skill Development to Labour Market Need](#), 2016

- For federal and provincial governments, use fiscal and monetary tools to move the economy towards full employment and generate wage growth while balancing targets for inflation. Examples include monetary policy tools such as interest rates, and fiscal policy tools such as stimulus spending, infrastructure investment etc.
- For federal and provincial governments, consider enhancing the Canada workers benefit, a subsidy provided to low-income workers, which would increase the incentive for low-income earners to work. This effort should be combined with the above approaches to retrain individuals and help match them with jobs, as well as greater educational outreach to ensure low-income workers are aware of these incentives.
- When evaluating programs, focus on long-term outcomes to ensure that benefits are adequately captured.
- Fund and design programs for skills and employment training specific to Indigenous labour market gaps with input from the Indigenous community in the London ER. For example, there is an underrepresentation of Indigenous people in STEM post-secondary programs; a pipeline from boosting enrolment by showcasing STEM programs in secondary schools, support for job searching post-graduation, and career development and mentorship for Indigenous people in STEM would boost labour market outcomes for the community.

Educational institutions

- Promote cooperation with employers to increase the relevance of education for available jobs. In particular, program design for secondary and post-secondary education should consider the skill requirements of in-demand roles in the region and skills that are anticipated to grow in the future.
- Increase opportunities for labour market experience during education such as co-op placements and internships.
- With the support of employers, government and other community organizations, create better online infrastructure for post-secondary students to interact with employers who are seeking co-op students to increase matching.
- Expand labour market information access and career education in elementary, secondary and post-secondary institutions. This could include the addition of an online career information portal, holding career fairs and bringing in speakers from different industrial backgrounds, etc.
- Increase mentoring and guidance services available to students, incorporating relevant labour market information in order to help them identify relevant career paths.
- Provide financial support (eg. grants, scholarships) to equity-seeking groups such as Indigenous people and women in programs with high demand from high-skill industries (eg. STEM).

Employers

- Expand co-operative opportunities, apprenticeship placements, and retraining programs offered for individuals that may be transitioning between industries. These placements are relevant in both Knowledge and Industries with trades occupations.
- Consider the issue of access to transportation described below, and make transportation support and/or support for online training (including availability of devices) available for these programs.
- Collaborate with educational institutions to communicate which skills and credentials are in demand, and to provide opportunities for co-op and internship placements.
- Consider offering more competitive benefits such as work from home opportunities and child care support
- Participate in the development of employment programs in partnership with community organizations and employment agencies

Community organizations, employment agencies and economic development agencies

- Collaboration between community organizations / agencies with employers, government and educational institutions in order to help align those using services for economic and employment support towards finding and obtaining more attractive labour market opportunities
- Increasing visibility of career counselling services
- Promoting training opportunities based on employer and community feedback

- Highlighting recruitment activities from employers, and what working in the company and role may entail (this could extend to marketing recruitment to workers in other geographic regions to attract new talent)
- Hosting information sessions to showcase opportunities from employers in different industries in London ER, and the skills required in each
- Connecting foreign trained professionals to educational institutions and alumni to identify opportunities to return to school in order to upskill / switch careers

Health barriers

Impact in the London ER

28% of survey respondents cited health conditions as a reason for not participating, which encompasses physical health, mental health, and disability. For this group, primary additional reasons for not participating are a lack of attractive jobs (i.e. a lack of jobs that pay enough, the lack of jobs that require their skill set, or the lack of jobs with their preferred schedule), and lack of transportation. This group was less likely to have post-secondary education and more likely to be low income: when they last worked, almost half of these individuals made less than the median income in the London ER.

Evidence on interventions

A report by the London Poverty Research Centre at King's College indicated that an increase in social assistance collection in the London ER could indicate worsening health conditions (contributing to poverty and low-income incidence, and vice versa). People who collect social assistance such as Ontario Works (OW) or Ontario Disability Support Program (ODSP) often are in poor health or have a disability, or have trouble with living expenses. An estimated 8% of people (or 41,000 people) were on social assistance in the London CMA in 2014, which was higher than the 6% provincial average in 2014. It was also observed that social assistance use grew 36% between 2003-2014.

Evidence on the impact of health on labour force participation has been documented globally. A study for the New Zealand Treasury⁸⁰ in 2010 shows that individuals with poor health have a reduced chance of participating in the labour force. The study estimates that an improvement in health could increase the number of labour market participants by 0.3% to 2.1%. While poor health circumstances are often difficult to amend using only policy interventions, addressing other barriers to participation while keeping in mind how interventions may require different supports for those with health conditions would help them find opportunities relevant to their needs and abilities.

Considerations in the London ER

Employers can provide employment with accommodations for those with health conditions in order to enable those who are interested in working, but have health barriers, to participate in the workforce. This could include a wider availability of work-from-home options, part-time work or jobs with flexible hours, extended health benefits, addressing physical barriers in the workplace, or other accommodations as required.

Governments can provide greater support to connect job-seekers to employment services and opportunities that may be relevant for them. This could include providing specialized training and upskilling programs, identification of jobs that are relevant to their needs and abilities, and resources to prepare for those jobs. Consideration should be paid to the types of accommodation that individuals with health conditions would require (e.g. learning modules offered online should be AODA compliant).

As COVID-19 worsened pre-existing health conditions (e.g. mental health worsened due to isolation and economic impacts, physical health was impacted as gyms closed and work-from-home / stay-at-home orders limited physical exercise), providing access to better mental health services and general counselling for healthier living would accelerate recovery and the removal of barriers affecting labour and economic outcomes.

Expanding resources and programs in health and wellness centres to address both physical and mental health issues specific to marginalized groups such as Indigenous populations and those who are homeless would be necessary in order to improve labour market outcomes. Given that negative physical health, addiction and trauma are prevalent barriers to

⁸⁰ Heather Holt and the New Zealand Treasury. [Health and Labour Force Participation](#), 2010.

positive socio-economic outcomes, with different context behind these barriers between groups, it is important to have the necessary resources to address a variety of health concerns that would impact the ability to participate or work.

Childcare

Impact in the London ER

As noted in the report, 29% of women and 11% of men in our survey reported that child care responsibilities was one of the reasons that they were not participating. Prime-age women outside the City of London are much more likely than those in the city of London to be not participating due to child care responsibilities (48% vs 24%). It is important to note that access to child care is not the only barrier for these individuals: the majority of them cite other reasons for not participating including lack of jobs with their preferred schedule, and lack of access to transportation.

Evidence on interventions

Research confirms that home responsibilities, particularly child care, drive gender gaps in labour market outcomes. In particular, having young children impacts occupational choice, and reduces hours worked and hourly wages.⁸¹ Breaks in work due to child care responsibilities can also have lasting effects on women's labour market outcomes for decades after taking a break from the labour market for child care. Therefore, both child care responsibilities while children are young and lower long-term potential earnings are likely factors in women's lower labour market participation. It is not clear that any factors specific to the London ER are affecting non-participation related to child care.

There is strong evidence from Canada and elsewhere that access to affordable child care increases labour force participation, particularly for women. A study on the introduction of low-cost daycare in Quebec found a large and statistically significant increase in the labour supply of Quebec mothers with preschool-age children. Participation of those women was 69%, compared to an estimated 61% without the policy. The study noted that economic growth was strong at the time, which supported increased participation.⁸² Government-funded childcare in Japan has also been shown to be effective at increasing the labour force participation of women.⁸³

Considerations for the London ER

In its 2021 budget, the federal government committed to establish a Canada-wide early learning and child care system, including a target of bringing costs down to \$10 per day within five years.⁸⁴ In announcing this policy, the federal government specifically cited the expected benefits for women's labour force participation.

The federal action on this issue is likely to largely address the need for child care and encourage participation to the extent possible. We note that in Ontario, child care is subsidized for those with low incomes, so this policy would be expected to have a smaller effect on low-income non-participants. Additionally, some individuals may also prefer to care for children rather than to work, regardless of access to child care. One consideration for local governments in the London ER is that our survey finds that women in the London ER outside of the City of London are significantly more likely than those in the City of London to not participate due to child care responsibilities. To the extent that this is driven by fewer available child care facilities in those regions, local governments should work with the provincial government (which administers child care programming) to ensure that adequate facilities are available.

In addition, employers providing flexible opportunities for parents would help accommodate their personal schedules. Given that our survey finds that non-participation due to child care responsibilities is highly correlated with a lack of jobs that fit their schedule, the increased ability to work from home and flexible working hours would support parents who are balancing child care duties throughout the day (also, see flexibility recommendations below).

The first Indigenous child care centre in London ER is looking to open in Summer 2021⁸⁵; establishing and funding more Indigenous-run child care centres across the London ER would benefit the labour market outcomes of Indigenous women.

⁸¹ Erosa et al, Hours, Occupations, and Gender Differences in Labor Market Outcomes, forthcoming.

⁸² Lefebvre and Merrigan, 2008.

⁸³ <https://www.brookings.edu/opinions/removing-barriers-to-womens-labor-force-participation/>

⁸⁴ <https://www.canada.ca/en/department-finance/news/2021/04/budget-2021-a-canada-wide-early-learning-and-child-care-plan.html>

⁸⁵ CBC, London's first-ever Indigenous child care centre gears up for summer opening, 2021.

Flexibility

Impact in the London ER

The attractiveness of a job to non-participants depends on more than skill requirements and wages: elements of flexibility (e.g. part-time vs full-time, seasonal vs year-round) can be an important factor. Overall, 18% of prime-age respondents identified lack of available jobs with their preferred schedule as a barrier to participation. Within this group, flexibility is more likely to be an issue for immigrants and women, with 26% and 24% citing it as a barrier, respectively. Both of these groups also face child care responsibilities, which may be related to their desire for flexibility. Some mature-age respondents were also interested in flexible employment opportunities, with 25% of respondents aged 55 and older identified flexibility as a barrier.

Evidence on interventions

Research supports the idea that flexible scheduling, for example, availability of part-time work, encourages labour market participation, particularly for women. An often-cited success case is Holland, where part-time work is much more common than in other countries. This arrangement supported a significant increase in female labour market participation in the late 1980s, and has become a workplace norm for both men and women.⁸⁶

Research by labour economist Claudia Goldin focuses on the importance of flexibility in work arrangements for addressing the gender wage gap, which can increase incentives for women to work. For example, some types of workers prefer predictable hours rather than being on call. Availability of part-time work is also significant for women, who are more likely than men to work part-time at some point in their careers. Currently, there is a wage penalty for part-time work in many occupations.⁸⁷

Many surveys conducted state that employees are more productive when working remotely,^{88,89} which helps with flexibility of work hours, boosts employee retention, reduces absenteeism and improves satisfaction overall. Promoting flexibility among employers as a cost-efficient benefit which generates positive outcomes for both workers and employers.

Considerations in the London ER

When hiring, employers should consider providing part-time or other flexible options such as working from home where roles enable it. Also where possible, hourly pay for part-time or otherwise flexible jobs should be similar to the full-time equivalent for those roles, with possibility for growth, benefits, and advancement. Governments should also consider adopting these approaches in their own hiring, and should promote the practices to employers. The 2019 study by the LEPC and WPDB on non-participation in the London ER also identified flexibility as an issue, and recommends that governments promote and incentivize creation of alternatives to full-time roles.

Where employers face barriers to offering these arrangements, governments should consider funding or subsidizing technology infrastructure in order to help them provide remote work opportunities for employees.

In addition to addressing longer-term issues, the availability of flexible employment such as work-from-home and part-time options would support participation against the backdrop of recovery from COVID-19. Another part of providing flexible work is predictable schedules, which employers should provide where feasible. For those that have safety concerns about returning to the office, remote work opportunities may make it easier for non-participants to consider returning to work.

Access to transportation

Impact in the London ER

Lack of transportation is the top barrier to participation for prime-age respondents without a postsecondary education and those with low income. Lack of transportation is a larger barrier for those in the City of London, with 19% citing it as a

⁸⁶ The Economist, The Economist explains: Why so many Dutch people work part time, May 11, 2015.

⁸⁷ Claudia Goldin, [Hours Flexibility and the Gender Gap in Pay](#), 2015

⁸⁸ TINYpulse, What Leaders Need to Know About Remote Workers.

⁸⁹ Hubble, Do Flexible Work Hours Improve Employee Productivity?

barrier, compared to those in other parts of the London ER (11%). Although public transportation is available in the City of London, routes and schedules may not meet individuals' needs.

Evidence on interventions

Economic theory suggests that lack of transportation options can contribute to unemployment and non-participation through two main channels. First, by adding to commuting costs and time, it increases individuals' "reservation wage," which is the lowest level of income they would accept in order to work. It also increases the search costs for jobs, making it less likely that individuals will find jobs that meet their reservation wage.

Empirical evidence supports this theory: a study from Sweden finds that accessibility of transportation (taking into account all modes of transportation and their cost) has a statistically significant positive impact on labour force participation and employment. Interestingly, they find that the impact is higher for those with lower levels of education, likely due to the fact that they have more trouble finding jobs that meet their reservation wage. This mirrors the findings in our survey of the London ER, where many non-participants cite a lack of jobs that pay enough.

A study of transit accessibility in the Greater Toronto and Hamilton Area (GTHA) found that improvements in transit are associated with higher household income and lower unemployment in low- and medium-income areas.⁹⁰ Although the study did not assess impacts on participation, access to jobs with higher income could increase participation, as lack of jobs that pay enough is the top reason for not participating cited by prime-age respondents to our survey. In interpreting these results, it should be noted that population density is higher in the GTHA compared to the London ER, which affects the ability of public transportation systems to serve the population.

A US study from the Department of Housing and Urban Development evaluated the impact of access to automobiles and public transportation on employment outcomes for individuals receiving subsidized housing. It found that access to automobiles was associated with better labour market outcomes and enabled job acquisition, retention, and earnings better than public transit. In the study, access to an automobile was the most important determinant of employment status. The impact of public transit depended on the quality of the transportation: moving to a neighbourhood with better transit accessibility was associated with higher employment and earnings. The study recommends providing automobile access as part of housing subsidy programs, and in dense urban areas, improving public transit.

Considerations in the London ER

Access to transportation appears to be a significant barrier to labour market participation in the London ER; however, it is not clear that public transportation can be a complete solution. The London ER may lack the population density to sustain public transportation systems that fully meet the needs of non-participants, particularly outside of the City of London. That said, when municipalities assess future changes to their public transportation systems, potential impacts on labour market participation should be included. Municipalities should also examine the costs and benefits of providing automobile access as part of subsidized housing, including potential impacts on labour market participation.

Employers should consider how they can accommodate individuals who lack access to transportation, such as by facilitating carpooling arrangements, or setting up bussing services. The 2017 study by the LEPC and WPDB on non-participation in the London ER noted successful examples of employers providing support for transportation, such as bussing services or having supervisors give rides. The government could provide further support for this by incentivizing employers to buy into these programs through tax credits. Where roles allow, employers should also enable work-from-home arrangements, which reduce the need for transportation to get to work.

Discrimination

Impact in the London ER

Discrimination appears to be a significant driver of non-participation among certain profiles: it is the top reason cited by visible minorities and Indigenous respondents (28% of these groups). Discrimination is likely related to other factors faced by these groups such as lack of jobs that pay enough (25%) or require their skill set, and discouragement due to not finding a job through previous searches (22%). Immigrants and those with a health condition also cite discrimination as a

⁹⁰ Robbin Deboosere, Geneviève Boisjoly and Ahmed El-Geneidy. [Understanding the relationship between changes in accessibility to jobs, income and unemployment in Toronto](#), 2019.

reason for not being in the labour force (25% and 24% of prime-age non-participants in these groups, respectively). Immigrants have higher levels of education than non-immigrants in the sample, but did not make more when they last worked, suggesting that discrimination may be a factor. While it can be challenging to address and corroborate incidents of discrimination to identify appropriate actions, the ongoing perception of discrimination itself has a significant impact on labour market participation, which signifies the need for interventions in order to boost participation.

We note that immigrants are one of the profiles with the highest potential to participate if barriers are addressed; therefore, addressing issues relevant to them should be a priority. In Ontario and Canada overall, immigration has been an important tool to maintain economic growth and counteract population ageing.

Evidence on interventions

There is well-established evidence that discrimination affects employment outcomes in the Canadian labour market. A common approach is field experiments using fictitious resumes to test the impact of the race and background of prospective employees. A meta-study of 97 such experiments found that there was significant hiring discrimination against nonwhite applicants in all countries studied, including Canada, leading to lower callback rates for those applicants.⁹¹

Flexibility in occupational and professional licensing is effective in reducing discrimination and closing wage gaps for discriminated groups. A study published through the National Bureau of Economic Research⁹² finds that occupational licensing is a strong labour market signal to employers, and has positive effects on wage outcomes for workers who could be affected by discrimination on the basis of race or gender.

Considerations in the London ER

The majority of employees in Ontario are covered by the Ontario Human Rights Code, and legal matters related to discrimination are dealt with at both the provincial and federal level. It is beyond the scope of this study to identify potential changes to those frameworks, but the examination of existing frameworks around reporting and investigating incidents of discrimination could be considered. Regional and municipal governments in the London ER may highlight to the provincial government the fact that discrimination appears to be discouraging labour market participation in the London ER.

Employers should consider communicating openly with potential employees about their actions to address discrimination in the workplace, and being transparent about wages and opportunities.

Frameworks around providing licenses for the skills and abilities of workers would help reduce discrimination among immigrants and other minority groups. Licensing skills in addition to occupational and professional certifications offers flexibility around the types of jobs an individual is qualified to perform. For example, an immigrant who worked as an engineer in their home country could obtain licensing for operating machinery, which offers flexibility in finding employment in other roles such as technicians, inspectors, and controllers. This also helps reduce racial and gender bias, as licensing sends a strong signal to reinforce the skills of workers.

A review of hiring practices by employers, aimed at making hiring panels more representative of applicants and interviewees could be considered. Although it is outside the scope of our research to identify a specific framework, the municipal government could consider developing a system to review and provide oversight to hiring practices and outcomes in the region.

Development of positive workplace culture (with the support of the government as a mediator, and with input from the community) could keep employers accountable to mitigate discriminatory practices and attitudes in the workplace.

Areas for further research

This study increases the knowledge of London's prime-age non-participants by providing more detail on the number of people belonging to each profile, and the specific barriers facing each profile. In order to better design options to support these groups, it would be valuable to gather data on non-participants' skills profile and competencies. This would allow

⁹¹ Quillian et al, *Do Some Countries Discriminate More than Others? Evidence from 97 Field Experiments of Racial Discrimination in Hiring*, 2019

⁹² Peter Q. Blair & Bobby W. Chung. *A Model of Occupational Licensing and Statistical Discrimination*, 2020.

identification of pathways for retraining that could connect them with existing jobs. This data would include their field of study within their educational background, and the option to select from a list of skills that they possess.

It is important to consider the implications of COVID-19 on the participation rate in London ER in the near future, especially in the context of economic recovery. As 31% of prime-age respondents indicate that COVID-19 played a role in their non-participation, recognizing areas where support is needed to return to work, and how COVID-19 enhanced structural issues within the labour market (including participation) would help inform targeted interventions supporting participation. In the short term, supporting and enforcing employer compliance with relevant health guidelines can help individuals feel safe to return to the workplace. Analyzing changing trends within the workplace such as working from home and encouraging employers to provide flexible opportunities could support stronger recovery from the pandemic.

Appendices

Appendix A: Limitations

Receipt of new data or facts: PwC reserves the right at its discretion to withdraw or revise this report should we receive additional data or be made aware of facts existing at the date of the report that were not known to us when we prepared this report. The findings are as of May 2021 and PwC is under no obligation to advise any person of any change or matter brought to its attention after such a date that would affect our findings.

Reliance on third party data/information: We relied upon the completeness, accuracy and fair presentation of all the information, data, advice, opinion or representations obtained from third parties and public sources, which is detailed under the Scope of our Work section (collectively, the “Information”). We have not conducted any audit or review of the Information, nor have we sought external verification of the Information. We accept no responsibility or liability for any losses occasioned by any party as a result of our reliance on the financial and non-financial information that was provided to us or found in the public domain.

Data limitations: PwC has relied on the information provided by the City of London and its partners. PwC has relied upon the completeness, accuracy, and fair presentation of all information and data obtained from the City of London and its partners and the various sources set out in our report, which were not audited or otherwise verified. The findings in this report are conditional upon such completeness, accuracy, and fair presentation, which have not been verified independently by PwC. Accordingly, we provide no opinion, attestation or other form of assurance with respect to the results of this study.

Use limitations: This report has been prepared solely for the use and benefit of, and pursuant to a client relationship exclusively with the City of London. We understand that the City of London may share our report with third parties. The City of London can release this report to third parties only in its entirety and any commentary or interpretation in relation to this report that the City of London intends to release to the public either requires PwC’s written consent or has to be clearly identified as the City of London’s own interpretation of the report or the City of London is required to add a link to the full report. PwC accepts no duty of care, obligation or liability, if any, suffered by the City of London or any third party as a result of an interpretation made by the City of London of this report.

Further, no other person or entity shall place any reliance upon the accuracy or completeness of the statements made herein. In no event shall PwC have any liability for damages, costs or losses suffered by reason of any reliance upon the contents of this report by any person other than the City of London.

It is understood that this report is only one of the sources that will inform the City of London in devising policies that will address non-participation. Ultimately it is the City of London’s sole responsibility for any future policy decisions and their success.

This report and related analysis must be considered as a whole: Selecting only portions of the analysis or the factors considered by us, without considering all factors and analysis together, could create a misleading view of our findings. The preparation of our analysis is a complex process and is not necessarily appropriate for partial analysis or summary description. Any attempt to do so could lead to undue emphasis on any particular factor or analysis.

We note that significant deviations from the above listed major assumptions may result in a significant change to our analysis.

Appendix B: Methodologies

Methodology for those available to participate in the labour market

Using the criteria below, it can be determined that 30,000 - 40,000 prime-age individuals (or 65% - 86%) would be available to participate in labour market activities (working or looking for work) in the London ER if barriers were addressed. This departs from the figure in the 2017 LEPC report using Statistics Canada data, which estimates the number of those available to work without addressing the barriers to non-participation.

Criteria considered to determine whether a respondent would be available to participate included:

- Circumstances related to non-participation / Social benefits collection
 - Retired respondents, those in school, and those who have a disability, physical or mental health condition are not expected to be available for participation.
 - In some cases, those with a disability/health condition have indicated that they are interested in working and there are other circumstances that lead them to not participate—as OW and ODSP recipients are still able to participate in some labour market activities, these respondents would be available to participate for the lower-bound estimate in the range of availability to participate.
- What factors need to change in order to participate?
 - Those who responded “I would not want to work or look for work under any circumstances” are not expected to be available to participate.
 - Similar to those who are unable to participate due to disability/health conditions, if a respondent requires improved health circumstances as well, it indicates that they would not be available to participate unless their health has recovered (unless indicated otherwise).
- Is non-participation COVID-19 related?
 - If non-participation is mainly due to the pandemic, it is expected that the respondent would be available to participate once the pandemic has subsided/labour market conditions start to recover.
- Comments from respondents (text box answers)
 - Reading their input provides a more in-depth understanding of their non-participation and interest in the labour market, in order to individually determine whether they would be available to participate.

The lower-bound estimates that all respondents who indicated that they would require improved health circumstances before entering the labour market would not be available to participate, whereas the upper-bound estimates that some of these respondents would be available to participate.

Methodology for industry groupings

To conduct analysis on industry trends for respondents when they were last employed, we have grouped industries into three larger sets of industries to better understand broader trends. The three groups we refer to in our findings are Knowledge, Service, and Industries with trades occupations.

Knowledge industries: Included in this grouping are those who were last employed in Finance and insurance, Health care and social assistance, Management of companies and enterprises, Professional, scientific and technical services, Educational Services, Information and Cultural industries, Real estate and rental and leasing, and Public administration.

Service industries: Included in this grouping are those who were last employed in Accommodation and food services, and Retail trade.

Industries with trade occupations: Included in this grouping are those who were last employed in Agriculture, forestry, fishing and hunting, Construction, Manufacturing, Transportation and warehousing, and Utilities. This group includes any industry where the majority of workers in the sample of respondents worked in a trades occupation as defined by Statistics Canada under the National Occupational Classification⁹³ (under NOC 7 - Trades, transport and equipment operators and related occupations, NOC 8 - Natural resources, agriculture and related production occupations, and NOC 9 - Occupations in manufacturing and utilities). In our sample, 73% of respondents in these industries who worked in these industries performed work in a trades occupation.

Other industries that were not included in any of these groupings include Administrative and support, Waste management and remediation services, Arts, entertainment and recreation, and Wholesale trade.

Extrapolation of size of profiles available to participate to 2019 estimates

Using 2019 data from Statistics Canada on the total number of London ER residents who are not in the labour force, we are able to estimate the number of non-participants in prime-age, and the number of prime-age women, immigrants and those with and without a post-secondary degree who are not participating using proportions calculated from 2016 data.

The proportion of these profiles as a percentage of prime-age non-participants in the London ER were calculated using 2016 data from the 2017 LEPC report. This includes figures on the number of total prime-age non-participants and within profiles such as women, immigrants, and those with and without a post-secondary degree in the London ER. The proportion of prime-age non-participants is derived from the total number of non-participants in London ER in 2016 (as provided by Statistics Canada).

⁹³ Statistics Canada, [National Occupational Classification](#), 2017.

Appendix C: Survey targets

Demographic targets

The sample of respondents collected roughly aligns with the survey's target distribution as it relates to the location, age, and gender of respondents. Based on the profiles of respondents, we estimated the number of non-participants that could potentially be available to enter the labour market in the London ER if barriers to participation were addressed.

Region

The survey sample has a higher share of those that live in the City of London, compared to the overall population. 79% of survey respondents reside in the City of London, compared to the 61% of non-participants in the London ER who lived in the City of London in 2016. Other regions in London ER (Elgin, Middlesex and Oxford counties, and the City of St. Thomas) have a lower representation in the sample than their share of non-participants in 2016.

Table 5: Distribution of survey respondents by region

Region	Number of respondents	Percentage of respondents	Percentage of London ER residents (aged 15+), 2016	Percentage of total non participants, 2016
City of London	352	79%	59%	61%
Elgin County	14	3%	7%	7%
Middlesex County	25	6%	11%	9%
Oxford County	32	3%	17%	16%
City of St. Thomas	24	5%	6%	6%

Gender

The share of female survey respondents is similar to the share of female non-participants in the London ER (according to the 2016 Census). 59% of all respondents are female, similar to 57% of female individuals not in the labour force in 2016. 38% of respondents are male, and 1% of respondents are non-binary.

Table 6: Distribution of survey respondents by gender⁹⁴

Gender	Number of respondents	Percentage of respondents	Percentage of London ER residents (aged 15+), 2016	Percentage of total non participants, 2016
Female	262	59%	52%	57%
Male	170	38%	48%	43%
Non-binary	4	1%		
Prefer not to say	11	2%		

⁹⁴ Census data in 2016 was only available for male and female residents in the London ER.

Age

Based on the scope of work for this study, the proposed target for the share of prime-age respondents was 75% of the sample. The final sample has 249 prime-age respondents (56% of the sample), with 146 of respondents between 55 and 64 years old (almost a third of the sample).

Table 7: Distribution of survey respondents by age

Age	Number of respondents	Percentage of respondents	Percentage of London ER residents (aged 15+), 2016	Percentage of total non participants, 2016 ⁹⁵
Prime-age (25-54 years old)	249	56%	39%	21% ⁹⁶
Mature-age (55+ years old)	181	41%	31%	
Youth (15-24 years old)	12	3%	13%	

⁹⁵ Data for mature-age and youth individuals not participating in 2016 is not publicly available.

⁹⁶ Calculation based on the figure provided in the LEPC report, [London Economic Region Labour Market Participation \(2017\)](#) and Labour force survey data from Statistics Canada.

This publication has been prepared for general guidance on matters of interest only, and does not constitute professional advice. You should not act upon the information contained in this publication without obtaining specific professional advice. No representation or warranty (express or implied) is given as to the accuracy or completeness of the information contained in this publication, and, to the extent permitted by law, PricewaterhouseCoopers LLP, its members, employees and agents do not accept or assume any liability, responsibility or duty of care for any consequences of you or anyone else acting, or refraining to act, in reliance on the information contained in this publication or for any decision based on it.

© 2021 PricewaterhouseCoopers LLP, an Ontario limited liability partnership. All rights reserved. In this document, "PwC" refers to the Canadian member firm, and may sometimes refer to the PwC network. Each member firm is a separate legal entity. Please see www.pwc.com/structure for further details.

- Communicating actions to address discrimination in the workplace
- Be transparent about wages and opportunities

2.3. Lunch and Learn

PwC presented their report through a virtual Lunch & Learn event held on August 9, 2021, from 12:00pm-1:00pm. Brief comments on PwC research findings and recommendations were provided by the following speakers:

- Workforce Planning and Development Board – Deb Mountenay
- Fanshawe College – Darlene O’Neill
- LMLIP / Employment Sector Council – Jennifer Hollis
- Employment Sector Council – Carol Stewart

Approximately 80 persons were in attendance and the audience were representative of:

- Employment Sector Council members and Employment Sector agencies
- Economic Development offices (Elgin, Oxford, Middlesex, London)
- Regional Workforce Development offices
- Municipal Council members (Elgin, Oxford, Middlesex, London)
- London Community Recovery Network (mix of employers, community training and employment agencies)
- Mayor’s Jobs Now Taskforce Members
- Civic Administration

The presentation from the Lunch & Learn session was recorded. Both the Lunch & Learn session as well as the PwC report will be publically shared on the City of London website – See <https://london.ca/living-london/community-services/ontario-works>

2.4. Next Steps / Implications

Labour market participation is a complex and multi-dimensional issue and doesn’t have an easy fix, nor a simple solution. PwC’s research findings will help inform current and future strategic planning in a multitude of areas. The PwC report will be shared with community stakeholders from across the London Economic Region to support strategic planning that municipalities, economic and workforce development organizations, education and training institutions, community agencies and businesses are undertaking. Advisory Committee members have begun referring to the report and its use in its development and updating of strategic planning.

For the City of London, the PwC report will be shared with strategic leads of various working tables to inform work currently in progress with the goal to identify further opportunities to address barriers and facilitate and encourage labour market engagement. The finds can be applied to internal practices of the City of London as well as to community based strategies. Examples include, but not limited to: the London Community Recovery Network, Mobility Master Plan and Transportation Management Association, London’s Newcomer Strategy, London Strengthening Neighbourhoods Strategy, London & Middlesex Local Immigration Partnership, and the Community Diversity Inclusion Strategy.

3.0 Financial Impact / Considerations

This project was 100% funded by the Ministry of Labour, Training and Skills Development through the City’s Ontario Transfer Payment Agreement - Ontario Labour Market Partnerships with the Ministry effective March 9, 2020, and amended March 2, 2021, to extend the expiry date to October 29, 2021. The total funding provided by the Ministry for this program is \$123,669, which includes an allocation to fund the work awarded to PwC in the amount of \$115,101 plus applicable taxes, resulting in no financial impact to the City’s budget.

As per the agreement with the Ministry, the City’s contribution to this project is in the form of “in-kind contributions” provided from existing City resources. These contributions

Report to Community and Protective Services Committee

To: Chair and Members, Community and Protective Services Committee Meeting
From: Kevin Dickins, Deputy City Manager, Social and Health Development
Subject: Homeless Prevention COVID-19 Response Extension (Single Source Procurement SS21-29, Council Approved June 22, 2021)
Date: August 31, 2021

Recommendation

That, on the recommendation of the Deputy City Manager, Social and Health Development, that the following actions Be Taken, as per the Corporation of the City of London Procurement Policy Section 14.5 a. ii, requiring Committee and City Council approval for single source procurements greater than \$50,000;

- (a) Extensions to existing Purchase of Service Agreements **BE APPROVED** as set out in the Housing Stability Services COVID-19 Response Allocations, attached as Schedule 1 to this report. A combined total funding amount up to \$3,055,000 (excluding taxes) in 2021-2022 to provide COVID-19 Response Housing and Support Services;
- (b) that Civic Administration **BE AUTHORIZED** to undertake all administrative acts which are necessary in relation to this matter;
- (c) that the approval given herein **BE CONDITIONAL** upon the Corporation of the City of London entering into and/or amending Purchase of Service Agreements with Agencies outlined in the attached Schedule 1 of this report.

Executive Summary

Housing Stability Services is seeking single source approval to extend existing Purchase of Service Agreements with homeless serving agencies to support the continuation of COVID-19 related programming at local hotels.

As part of the continuation and ultimate wind-down of temporary shelter in local hotels, Housing Stability Services is seeking approval to reinforce housing and emergency shelter support through the following actions:

- Hotel extension, as required, from October 1, 2021 up to March 31, 2022, for provision of Isolation Space, Monitoring Space and Social Distance Space.
- Continuation of services and supports, as required, providing basic needs and housing support for those supported in Isolation Space, Monitoring Space and Social Distance Space.
- Continuation of 24/7 staffing support, as required, at COVID-19 Isolation Space, Monitoring Space, and Social Distance Space during hotel wind-down.

Programs and allocations are included in attached Schedule 1 of this report. Funding for Housing Stability Services programs outlined in the attached as Schedule 1 will be provided through COVID Reaching Home and other COVID-19 relief funding.

Linkage to the Corporate Strategic Plan

2019-2023 Strategic Plan for the City of London

The City of London identifies 'Strengthening Our Community' and 'Building a Sustainable City' as strategic areas of focus.

Londoners have access to the supports they need to be successful.

Londoners have access to the services and supports that promote well-being, health, and safety in their neighbourhoods and across the city.

Housing Stability for All: The Housing Stability Action Plan for the City of London (2019-2024)

London's Homeless Prevention and Housing Plan, Housing Stability for All: The Housing Stability Action Plan for the City of London (Housing Stability for All Plan), is the approved guiding document for homeless prevention and housing in the City of London and was developed in consultation with Londoners.

Council and staff continue to recognize the importance of actions to support the Core Area, and in the development of its 2019-2023 - Strategic Plan for the City of London. Specifically, the efforts described in this report address the following Areas of Focus, including:

- Strengthening Our Community
- Building a Sustainable City
- Safe City for Women and Girls
- Leading in Public Service

Links to Community Recovery

The City of London is committed to working in partnership with the community to identify solutions that will drive a strong, deep and inclusive community recovery for London as we move out of and beyond the global COVID-19 pandemic. This report, and the items within, are linked to supporting Londoners experiencing homelessness during the COVID-19 pandemic to attain and retain permanent housing. This work supports recovery efforts through a coordinated COVID-19 Response that will support the transition of homeless individuals and families who have been provided with temporary shelter in Isolation and Monitoring Spaces and Social Distance Spaces into permanent housing.

Analysis

1.0 Background Information

1.1 Previous Reports Related to this Matter

- Homeless Prevention COVID-19 Response (SSRF Phase 3) – Single Source Procurement - #SS21-29 (June 22, 2021)
- City of London Additional Short-Term Supports for Unsheltered Individuals (CPSC: June 1, 2021)
- Update – City of London 2020-21 Winter Response Program for Unsheltered Individuals (CPSC: April 20, 2021)
- Homeless Prevention COVID-19 Response Extension, April to June, 2021 (CPSC: March 30, 2021)
- Homeless Prevention COVID-19 Response and Funding Overview (CPSC: April 28, 2020)
- Canada's COVID-19 Economic Response Plan Funding Agreement (CPSC: April 28, 2020)
- Homeless Prevention COVID-19 Response (CPSC: October 6, 2020)
- Municipal Council Approval of the Housing Stability Plan 2019 to 2024 as Required Under The Housing Services Act, 2011 (CPSC: December 3, 2019)

2.0 Discussion and Considerations

2.1 Purpose

Housing Stability Services is coordinating a COVID-19 Response that will support the continuation and transition of homeless individuals and families who have been provided with temporary shelter in Isolation and Monitoring Spaces and Social Distance Spaces (at local hotels) into permanent housing.

The COVID-19 Response will also include the extension and ultimate wind-down of temporary Social Distance, Monitoring, and Isolation Space from October 1, 2021 up to March 31, 2022. These spaces are currently being provided through local hotels and may be wound down earlier than March 2022, in consultation with the Middlesex-London Health Unit. The Housing Stability Services Team is continuing to work closely with the Middlesex-London Health Unit to assess local COVID-19 case numbers and risk to individuals and families experiencing homelessness in London and those in congregate living settings. It is anticipated that as the vaccine roll-out progresses, the need for these spaces will decline.

The City of London has been allocated additional funding specifically for COVID-19 related supports through the Federal Reaching Home program and Ontario Social Services Relief Fund Phase 4. This funding is intended to support vulnerable individuals and families during the COVID-19 pandemic.

Single source approval for the Homeless Prevention COVID-19 Response, including for the use of local motels and hotels as temporary housing and staffing support, for the period of July 1, 2021 to September 30, 2021 was provided by City Council in June, 2021.

2.2 Background

City of London, Homeless Prevention COVID-19 Response

The City of London Housing Stability Services team is working with community collaborators to prevent the spread of COVID-19, in accordance with guidance provided by the Canadian Alliance to End Homelessness and through the Reaching Home Directives provided by Employment and Social Development Canada.

City of London Housing Stability Services team has taken the following actions to increase social distancing and reduce the risk of outbreak within emergency shelters by providing safe spaces for individuals and families to self-isolate. Since March 2020, the following spaces have been set-up at various locations throughout London through the use of local motels and hotels.

1. Isolation Space for COVID-19 positive individuals.
2. Testing and Monitoring Space for individuals who have screened positive for COVID-19, and individuals deemed close contact to a positive COVID-19 case who are required to isolate.
3. Physical Distancing Space in local motels and hotels for vulnerable participants including those that are high-risk and over fifty-five years of age, those that have a cardiac or respiratory disease, those who are immunocompromised, and families. Physical distancing space is also being provided for women fleeing violence, as well as Indigenous culturally appropriate space.

The City of London Housing Stability Services team has worked closely with community agencies to coordinate staffing at each site, as well as provide food, cleaning and laundry, and safe transportation.

The aim of the Housing Stability Services team is to reduce the use of hotel and motel rooms in a wind down phase between October 1, 2021 and March 31, 2022, by continuing to actively engage individuals and families, to ensure they are paper and document ready to secure permanent housing, and are supported to secure and retain housing.

2.3 Procurement Process

During the initial onset of COVID-19, hotel and motel rooms, along with the staffing support for isolation spaces were procured under section 14.2, Procurement in Emergencies, of the City of London Procurement of Goods and Services Policy. Based on that experience and the anticipation that these services will be required at least until the end of March 2022, Civic Administration is recommending that these procurements be made under section 14.4 Single Source of the Procurement of Goods and Services Policy item d) as following:

“There is a need for compatibility with goods and/or services previously acquired or the required goods and/or services will be additional to similar goods and/or services being supplied under an existing contract (i.e. contract extension or renewal).”

3.0 Financial Impact/Considerations

3.1 Funding

The program allocations outlined in the attached as Schedule 1 of this report total \$3,055,000 and will be fully funded through additional COVID-19 specific Reaching Home funding and other provincial COVID-19 relief funding.

This Homeless Prevention COVID-19 Response has been 100% funded by the Government of Canada COVID-19 Economic Response Plan Funding Agreement and Government of Ontario Social Services Relief Fund since March, 2020.

On August 16, 2021, the Province of Ontario announced a phase 4 of the Social Services Relief Funding (SSRF). Through phase 4, London will receive an additional \$6,256,400 for 2021-2022. Civic Administration is working to complete a required investment and comprehensive wind down plan for the temporary COVID-19 relief measures. The Province has asked for submission of these plans by September 15, 2021. Civic Administration will report back at a future committee meeting with pertinent developments related to the COVID-19 response and SSRF funding. Investments from this allocation will continue to support London’s COVID-19 initiatives and the eventual wind down of interim measures.

Prepared by:	Laura Cornish, Manager, Housing Stability Services, Social and Health Development
Submitted by:	Craig Cooper, Director, Housing Stability Services, Social and Health Development
Recommended by:	Kevin Dickins, Deputy City Manager, Social and Health Development

Schedule 1

**Housing Stability Services
 COVID-19 Response Extension October 1, 2021 – March 31, 2022
 COVID-19 Hotel Response**

Program/ Service	Agency	Cost Estimate	Time-period & Description
Hotel Rooms	Various locations	\$1,300,000	Wind-down of hotel rooms.
Services and Supports	Various providers	\$250,000	Services to provide basic needs and operational requirements to continue to support vulnerable individuals and families receiving temporary emergency shelter at local hotels. Includes cleaning & laundry, transportation, comfort stations, damages, security, pest control, etc.
Food - Isolation, Monitoring, and Social Distance Space	The Salvation Army and Mission Services of London	\$225,000	Meals for individuals and families currently supported at Isolation, Monitoring, and Social Distance Spaces.
COVID-19 Isolation and Monitoring Space Staffing	Impact London	\$735,000	Support staff at Isolation Space and Monitoring Space.
Violence Against Women (VAW) Social Distance Space Staffing	Canadian Mental Health Association	\$80,000	Support staff at VAW specific Social Distance Space.
Social Distance Space for Families	Mission Services of London	\$265,000	Support staff at Social Distance Space.
Rapid Rehousing, Rent Stability and Housing Identification Program	St. Leonard's Community Services	\$200,000	Rapid rehousing support through extension of Rapid Rehousing, Rent Stability and Housing Identification Program.
Total		\$3,055,000	

Report to Community and Protective Services Committee

To: Chair and Members
Community and Protective Services Committee

From: Cheryl Smith, Deputy City Manager, Neighbourhood and
Community-Wide Services

Subject: Community Safety and Well-Being Plan

Date: August 31, 2021

Recommendation

That, on the recommendation of the Deputy City Manager, Neighbourhood and Community-Wide Services, the following actions be taken with respect to the City of London Community Safety and Well-Being Plan:

- a) the Community Safety and Well-Being Plan attached as Appendix A **BE ADOPTED** in accordance with the Police Services Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. P.15, Section 143 (1);
- b) the above-noted Plan **BE SUBMITTED** to the Ontario Ministry of the Solicitor General; and,
- c) the remainder of the report titled “Community Safety and Well-being Plan” dated August 31, 2021, **BE RECEIVED** for information.

Executive Summary

This report presents London’s Community Safety and Well-Being (CSWB) Plan, developed in response to a provincial legislative requirement that all Ontario municipalities develop and adopt Community Safety and Well-Being Plans. This report provides an overview of the development process, key components of the CSWB Plan, and next steps.

Linkage to the Corporate Strategic Plan

The Community Safety and Well-Being Plan is aligned with the following strategic areas of focus in the City of London Strategic Plan 2019 – 2023:

- Strengthening our Community, under the outcome Londoners have access to the services and supports that promote well-being, health, and safety in their neighbourhoods and across the city; and,
- Creating a Safe London for Women and Girls, under the outcome London has enhanced the potential for women and girls to live safe lives.

Analysis

1.0 Background Information

1.1 Previous Reports Related to this Matter

- N/A

2.0 Discussion and Considerations

2.1 Background and Purpose

The purpose of the CSWB Plan is to support a collective approach to community safety and well-being where everyone feels safe, has a sense of belonging, and can meet their needs for education, health care, food, housing, income, and social and cultural expression. To meet Provincial requirements the CSWB Plan must:

- identify risk factors in the municipality, including, without limitation, systemic discrimination and other social factors that contribute to crime, victimization, addiction, drug overdose and suicide, and any other prescribed risk factors;
- identify which risk factors the municipality will treat as a priority to reduce;

- identify strategies to reduce the prioritized risk factors, including providing new services, changing existing services, improving the integration of existing services or coordinating existing services in a different way; and,
- set out measurable outcomes that the strategies are intended to produce.

The City of London was designated to lead the development of London's CSWB Plan under the guidance of an Advisory Committee which brought together perspectives from various sectors that influence safety and well-being in London. The role of the CSWB Advisory Committee is to provide strategic advice and direction on the development and implementation of the CSWB Plan. This report acknowledges the substantial time and effort contributed by past and present members. Below is a list of the current members of the CSWB Advisory Committee:

- Cheryl Smith – City of London
- Chris Churney – London Police Services
- Dave O'Brien – City of London
- Dennis Wright – Thames Valley District School Board
- Jesse Helmer – London Police Services Board
- Kevin Dickins – City of London
- Lynn Logan – Western University
- Mary Lou Albanese – Middlesex London Health Unit
- Rebecca McKee – Ontario Health (West)
- Stephanie Circelli – London District Catholic School Board
- Susan Schiedel – Children's Aid Society
- Tara Thomas – City of London
- William Berg – London Policy Services

The purpose of this report is to outline the process taken to develop the proposed CSWB Plan, highlight key components of the CSWB Plan, and discuss next steps.

2.2 Process to Develop the CSWB Plan

When determining how to approach the development of the CSWB Plan, the CSWB Advisory Committee established the following planning principles:

- align with current work and avoid duplication;
- be responsive and listen to the community;
- work differently together;
- address complex issues; and,
- not a static plan.

These principles were established to respect the work that is already taking place to make London a safer and healthier city and to focus on ways to work differently together. Flexibility was recognized as key to being responsive to the changing needs of the community, while at the same time identifying proven strategies, outcomes, and metrics to address complex community safety and well-being issues.

The planning principles guided the development of the CSWB Plan through four phases:

- Phase 1- Identify the Risk Factors;
- Phase 2- Engage the Community;
- Phase 3- Analyze the Data; and,
- Phase 4- Develop the CSWB Plan.

Phase 1 – Identify Risk Factors

From July 26, 2019 to August 26, 2019, stakeholder organizations participated in an online survey to identify and prioritize risk factors related to community safety and well-being in London. Participants shared information about approaches, services, and programs that exist to address top priorities, as well as gaps in these areas. Information collected through this process was used to design the community engagement process.

Phase 2 – Engage the Community

Two community engagement processes were undertaken to identify and confirm what safety and well-being issues were most important to Londoners. From January 13, 2020 to February 14, 2020, respondents engaged through open houses, pop-up events, online surveys, and community conversations. In total, 1,975 respondents shared their thoughts about what a safe and healthy city means to them. When asked what requires the most attention to improve safety and well-being in London, the top five priorities identified by respondents were:

- Mental health;
- Housing;
- Substance use;
- Crime and victimization; and,
- Employment.

Between March 8, 2021 and March 19, 2021, a second round of community consultation was held to confirm and validate what was heard through the first engagement process. A survey was conducted that could be completed online or by phone. This was the only engagement method used due to provincial COVID-19 restrictions. In total, 95 respondents confirmed the five priorities identified in the first round of engagement and identified two additional priorities:

- A Safe London for Women and Girls; and,
- Anti-Racism and Anti-Oppression.

The survey was promoted through City of London communication channels and circulated to stakeholders including the Community Safety and Crime Prevention (CSCP) Advisory Committee. On April 22, 2021, an update on the CSWB Plan development and engagement process was shared with the Community Safety and Crime Prevention Advisory Committee and feedback was received.

Phase 3 – Analyze the Data

A gap analysis was conducted to compare what was heard through the CSWB Plan engagement and what was currently being accomplished in London through existing community plans, strategies, and initiatives. The gap analysis identified that London has a number of robust, active plans addressing the priorities identified through the community engagement process. The results of the gap analysis led to consideration of how to build on what was already happening in the community.

Phase 4 – Develop the CSWB Plan

The final phase was the development of the CSWB Plan. This was completed collaboratively by the CSWB Advisory Committee with input from plan holders.

2.3 Community Safety and Well-Being Plan Highlights

The CSWB Plan, attached as Appendix A, acknowledges the feedback from the community and leverages rather than duplicates what is already happening in London. The key components that make up the CSWB Plan include:

- Vision;
- Guiding Principles;
- Integrated System Priorities;
- Issue-Based Priorities; and,
- Emerging Issue Priorities.

Each of these components is discussed below.

Vision:

“London is a healthy, safe, equitable city for all.”

Guiding Principles

The principles that will guide the implementation of the CSWB Plan, inform how decisions are made, and influence actions include:

- Equity, Diversity, Inclusion;
- Evidence-Informed;
- Collaboration;
- Outcome-Driven; and,
- Continuous Improvement.

Integrated System Priorities focus on how existing plans work together to create a coordinated system of aligned efforts that increase the overall community impact. To function as intended, integrated systems require the following:

- Knowledge Mobilization;
- Coordinated Planning;
- Collective Action;
- Evaluation; and,
- Leadership.

Issue-Based Priorities focus on the top risks that were identified by the community as most important to create a safe and well community; these include:

Priority 1: Healthy and Resilient People Risks:

Risks:

- Anti-racism and Anti-oppression
- Mental Health
- Substance Use

Priority 2: Safe and Vibrant Neighbourhoods

Risks:

- A Safe London for women and girls
- Crime
- Housing

Priority 3: Thriving and Inclusive Economy

Risks:

- Employment

These three priorities represent how the CSWB Plan will approach the issue-based risks identified by the community. For each risk, examples of existing community plans have been identified as contributing to this work. However, there are many other current and future plans that may connect to the CSWB Plan as it continues to evolve.

Emerging Issue Priorities

The emerging issues model outlines how new and evolving issues will be identified and addressed through the CSWB Plan. The process includes:

- Issue Identification;
- Issue Assessment;
- Issue Referral;
- Action Planning;
- Action Mobilization; and,
- Assess Impact.

For the purposes of the CSWB Plan, an emerging issue is a newly identified or prioritized risk factor that has a significant impact on community safety and well-being. Identification of emerging issues is a collective effort that includes the CSWB Advisory Committee, plan holders, researchers, practitioners, individuals with lived/living experience, and community stakeholders.

At present, one emerging issue has been identified in the CSWB Plan, Islamophobia in London. Following an incomprehensible act of violence against members of the Muslim community on June 6, 2021, the existence of Islamophobia was acknowledged by Municipal Council and the London community through an Emergent Motion. The Community Diversity and Inclusion Strategy and the Muslim Community have been identified to collaboratively find ways to end Islamophobia in London and to remember and honour the victims of the Islamophobia attack. Please see pg. 23 in Appendix A [attached](#) for more details.

These Integrated Systems, Issue Based, and Emerging Issue priorities work together to address community safety and well-being issues in an integrated manner, grounded in the ideas and opinions of the community, subject matter experts, and other stakeholders. The CSWB Plan will help to make sure that London is prepared to address the changing needs of the community in an innovative and collaborative way.

3.0 Financial Impact/Considerations

There are no financial impacts or considerations associated with this report. The development and implementation of the CSWB Plan is budgeted within the existing operating budget.

4.0 Next Steps

Pending Council's adoption, the CSWB Plan will be submitted to the Ontario Ministry of the Solicitor General and posted to the City of London website.

The next step is to develop an implementation approach for the CSWB Plan. It is anticipated that this work will continue to be guided by the CSWB Advisory Committee in partnership with plan holders and other key stakeholders.

The CSWB Advisory Committee has started discussing the Committee's role and membership to make sure it is well-positioned to deliver on the CSWB Plan, and ever-changing community needs. While the current CSWB Advisory Committee membership meets requirements under the Police Services Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. P.15, the Legislation provides for the addition of other prescribed persons. The CSWB Advisory Committee is committed to reviewing its membership based on the CSWB Plan's guiding principle of equity, diversity, and inclusion; and to best align to current and future issue-based priorities.

Conclusion

The CSWB Plan provides a mechanism for working together differently to improve the safety and well-being of Londoners. By acknowledging the work already underway in London, encouraging community partners to work differently together, and addressing emerging issues, the CSWB Plan provides a strategic framework for integrated planning, outcome measurement, and strategic alignment. The CSWB Plan provides principles to support operationalization and allows for flexibility to respond to changing needs.

Prepared by: Alexis Kampman, Specialist II Municipal Policy

Submitted by: Kristen Pawelec, Director, Community Development and Grants

Recommended by: Cheryl Smith, Deputy City Manager, Neighbourhood and Community-Wide Services

c. Community Safety and Well-Being Advisory Committee

August 2021

Appendix A

London's Community Safety and Well-Being Plan



Working together to meet the needs of all Londoners.

Accessibility

The City of London is committed to accessibility and the principles of independence, dignity, integration, and equality of opportunity, as described in the *Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act (AODA)*. To request this report in an alternate format or if you require additional assistance with reviewing the data presented in this report, please email cswb@london.ca.

Table of Contents

A Message From the Community Safety and Well-Being Advisory Committee	3
Section 1.0 Introduction	4
1.1 Background and Context	4
1.2 Purpose of the CSWB Plan.....	4
1.3 How the CSWB Plan Was Developed.....	4
Section 2.0 What Is a Safe and Healthy Community?	6
Section 3.0 What Are London’s Community Safety and Well-Being Risks?	8
3.1 Issue-Based Risks	8
3.2 System Level Risks	9
3.3 Emerging Risks.....	9
Section 4.0 A New Framework for Community Safety and Well-Being	10
4.1 Vision.....	10
4.2 Guiding Principles.....	10
4.3 The CSWB Strategic Framework.....	10
Section 5.0 Integrated System Priorities	12
5.1 Integrated System Priorities Overview	12
5.2 Leadership	13
5.3 Knowledge Mobilization	13
5.4 Coordinated Planning	13
5.5 Collective Action	13
5.6 Evaluation	14
Section 6.0 Issue-Based Priorities	15
6.1 Issue-Based Priorities Overview	15
6.2 Healthy and Resilient People	16
6.3 Safe and Vibrant Neighbourhoods.....	18
6.4 Thriving and Inclusive Economy.....	20
Section 7.0 Emerging Issues Priorities	21
7.1 The Emerging Issues Model.....	21
7.2 Emerging Issue: Islamophobia in London.....	23
Section 8.0 CSWB Plan Implementation	24
Appendix A: Key Strategies and Outcomes	25
Healthy and Resilient People Community Plans	25
Safe and Vibrant Neighbourhoods Community Plans.....	32
Thriving and Inclusive Economy Community Plans	43
Appendix B: Community Plan Contact Information	46

A Message From the Community Safety and Well-Being Advisory Committee

London has a community of committed people and organizations working to make London a healthier and safer city through community actions, initiatives, and plans. We need to recognize, raise awareness of, and celebrate this work. These efforts are having a profound impact on our community.

While our community has made great advances in community safety and well-being, there is still more work that needs to be done. Twenty-six agencies and more than 2,000 individuals shared their vision, insights, and ideas for community safety and well-being in London. We are grateful for their contributions. Their voices, experiences, and stories set the context for this critical work and serve as the foundation for the development of the Community Safety and Well-Being (CSWB) Plan.

To build healthy, safe, and equitable communities, we must prioritize the risks identified by our community: anti-racism and anti-oppression, a safe London for women and girls, crime, employment, housing, mental health, and substance use. These are the significant issues of our time. These priorities reflect the growing understanding that social, economic, and environmental factors determine safety and well-being outcomes.

Where we live, work, play, and go to school shape our well-being. We know that not everyone in London has the same opportunity. Black, Indigenous, and other racialized people, low-income individuals, individuals with disabilities, seniors, and many others often experience inequities in safety and well-being outcomes. We must focus on equity to ensure that all people have the opportunity for safety and well-being. This requires us to address the root causes such as the social, economic, and physical conditions around us.

The CSWB Plan is a starting point. It will evolve over time so that we can continue to address the needs of our community. By working together, we can do more and achieve more than by working alone. The CSWB Plan will guide our collective actions now and into the future to ensure that *London is a healthy, safe, equitable city for all.*

The Community Safety and Well-Being Advisory Committee

Section 1.0

Introduction

1.1 Background and Context

The Government of Ontario required all municipalities to prepare and adopt a Community Safety and Well-Being Plan by July 1, 2021. The City of London was designated to lead a collaborative planning process with the Community Safety and Well-Being Advisory Committee (CSWB Advisory Committee).

1.2 Purpose of the CSWB Plan

The purpose of the CSWB Plan is to work collectively towards a community where everyone is safe, has a sense of belonging, and can meet their needs for education, health care, food, housing, income, and social and cultural expression. The CSWB Plan also ensures London is better prepared for the ever-changing community needs and demands.

1.3 How the CSWB Plan Was Developed

The development of the CSWB Plan was a collaborative process led by the CSWB Advisory Committee. The CSWB Advisory Committee brings various sectors' perspectives together to provide strategic advice and direction to the municipality on the development and implementation of the CSWB Plan. Members included:

- Children's Aid Society of London and Middlesex
- City of London – Council
- City of London – Emergency Management
- City of London – Social and Health Development
- City of London – Neighbourhood and Community-Wide Services
- City of London – Strategic Communications and Government Relations
- Middlesex-London Health Unit
- London District Catholic School Board
- London Police Service
- London Police Services Board
- Ontario Health (West)
- Thames Valley District School Board
- Western University

Four key phases resulted in the development of the CSWB Plan, including:

Phase 1

Identify Risk Factors – Twenty-six stakeholder organizations participated in an online survey from July 26, 2019 to August 26, 2019 to identify and prioritize risk factors related to community safety and well-being in London. The results were used to design the community engagement data collection tools.

Phase 2

Engage the Community – Between January 13, 2020 and February 14, 2020, 1,975 individuals shared their insights about community safety and well-being through an open house, pop-up events, online surveys, and community conversations. To confirm and validate the engagement results, the community participated in an online survey from March 8, 2021 to March 19, 2021. In total, 95 responses were received.

Phase 3

Analyze the Data – The insights and ideas shared through the engagement process were reviewed and analyzed to determine the community safety and well-being priorities for London. A gap analysis was undertaken, where each recommendation provided by the community was compared to strategies and actions in current community plans.

Phase 4

Develop the CSWB Plan – The CSWB Advisory Committee collaboratively developed the CSWB Plan through a series of rigorous strategy sessions. Community stakeholders reviewed the CSWB Plan and provided feedback. The feedback provided was incorporated to finalize the CSWB Plan.

Section 2.0

What Is a Safe and Healthy Community?

In a healthy, equitable community, everyone feels safe, receives quality education, and lives in stable, affordable housing in neighbourhoods that make it easy to be healthy and active every day. These neighbourhoods offer a clean environment, access to healthy and affordable foods, and parks and public spaces to walk, bike, and use transit. Residents of diverse backgrounds are engaged, socially connected, and feel a sense of belonging.

According to the 1,975 respondents who participated in the initial community engagement process, a safe and healthy community means:



- 1. Good mental health (62%)**
Access to mental health and substance use prevention and treatment where the right care is provided at the right time and in the right place.



- 2. Affordable and accessible housing (58%)**
Sufficient, clean, safe, diversified, stable housing for all incomes and age levels.



- 3. Safe neighbourhoods (47%)**
Lack of criminal activity such as robbery, theft, sexual assault, and threatening behaviour, as well as positive perception of safety.




- 4. Good physical health (47%)**
Access to health care services and treatment that addresses and improves physical health.



5. **Stable employment opportunities** (43%)

Diverse local small businesses, economic opportunities with a living wage, fair labour practices, job skills training, and community support of new and current businesses.



6. **Strong communities** (43%)

People-centred design with housing, businesses, services, schools, jobs, recreation, and transit in close proximity. Culturally and linguistically supportive services, affordable childcare, and accessible libraries and recreation facilities.



7. **Access to education** (42%)

Strong educational, career development, and skill enhancement programs for infants, children, youth, and adults.



8. **Social supports and connections** (34%)

Safe and socially cohesive communities, local leadership that is representative of community demographics, empowered residents who are involved in decision-making, and social and civic engagement.



9. **Strong road safety and mobility** (33%)

Affordable and accessible transportation options for all ages. Easy-to-use, fast, well-connected, and efficient transit located near jobs, housing, and retail, and quality bike and pedestrian infrastructure.

Section 3.0

What Are London's Community Safety and Well-Being Risks?

The Government of Ontario has defined risk factors as negative characteristics and/or conditions present in individuals, families, communities, or society that may increase social disorder, crime or fear of crime, or the likelihood of harm or victimization to persons or property in a community.

Community safety and well-being risk factors were identified through the community engagement process. Once identified, they set the foundation from which the priorities included in this plan were developed.

3.1 Issue-Based Risks

Through the initial community consultation process in January 2020, respondents were asked to identify the top five risks that required attention to improve safety and well-being in London. The results included: mental health (69%, n=878); housing (63%, n=807); substance use (61%, n=778); crime (49%, n=620); and employment (48%, n=610).

Through the second community consultation process in March 2021, respondents confirmed each of these as the top five community safety and well-being risks to be addressed in London. Further, respondents identified two additional community safety and well-being priorities to be included in the CSWB Plan, including anti-racism and anti-oppression and a safe London for women and girls.

In alignment with the recommendations from the community consultation process, the CSWB Plan will focus on seven issue-based risks:

- Anti-racism and anti-oppression
- A safe London for women and girls
- Crime
- Employment
- Housing
- Mental health
- Substance use

3.2 System Level Risks

The gap analysis process demonstrated that there is a lot happening in our community. London has robust, active community plans in most of these priority areas, and new community plans are actively being developed. What the community identified as current needs are being addressed through existing plans. There is an opportunity to connect existing community plans to the CSWB Plan to create meaningful, long-lasting change.

The community shared that complex community safety and well-being issues were often being addressed in isolation and that individuals and organizations needed to work together in new ways. Not only was action required towards the specific issues, but also how the overall community safety and well-being system operated. This included mechanisms for evaluating and reporting on results of actions taken, collaborative planning efforts, and collective action.

3.3 Emerging Risks

While the community consultation process identified current risks, recent local and global events have highlighted emerging and evolving risks. In 2020, the COVID-19 pandemic, inequality and exclusion, and economic challenges emerged as critical community safety and well-being issues. The CSWB Plan must go beyond what is in front of us today. This is just a starting point. As part of the CSWB Plan implementation process, there will be continuous research and engagement to proactively identify emerging risks.

Section 4.0

A New Framework for Community Safety and Well-Being

4.1 Vision

London is a healthy, safe, equitable city for all.

4.2 Guiding Principles

The following principles will guide the implementation of the CSWB Plan; they will inform how we make decisions, influence our actions, and shape how we work together.


- **Equity, Diversity, Inclusion:** We will embed an intersectional, anti-racism, and anti-oppression framework into all that we do.
- **Evidence-Informed:** We will use evidence to inform our decisions. Evidence will include voices of individuals with lived/living experience, experience of practitioners, and qualitative and quantitative research.
- **Collaboration:** We will leverage the expertise of our community and work collectively across sectors.
- **Outcome-Driven:** We will commit to taking concrete action to achieve our vision.
- **Continuous Improvement:** We will consistently evaluate our actions and use the results to improve our efforts.

4.3 The CSWB Strategic Framework

In London, there are many individuals, groups, and organizations working diligently to address community safety and well-being. There are a variety of community plans that have bold visions and concrete actions to enhance community safety and well-being in London. With that context, our driving force question then was, “How does the CSWB Plan add value to what is currently being done in London?”

The CSWB Strategic Framework acknowledges the feedback from the community and leverages, rather than duplicates, what is happening in London. It creates an ecosystem that brings community together to create innovative solutions to intersectional community safety and well-being challenges. It holds the community accountable together and moves us towards system integration.

Figure 1. The Community Safety and Well-Being Ecosystem



Sections 5.0 – 7.0 define each of the priority areas further and provide additional information about how these priorities will be implemented.

Section 5.0


Integrated System Priorities

5.1 Integrated System Priorities Overview

Integrated System is a process priority that will support and enable the work in all other priorities. Issues that impact the safety and well-being of communities are often complex and require collective and combined action from multiple partners.

This priority is about working together to create a more streamlined and integrated system to identify issues, seek input from the community, design and implement solutions, and measure and report on progress and achievements. This work will be led by the CSWB Advisory Committee.

Figure 2.
Components of an Integrated System



An integrated system requires knowledge mobilization, coordinated planning, collective action, evaluation, and leadership. While there is still more work to be done in terms of how this model is operationalized, each of the components are described in more detail in subsections 5.2 – 5.6.

5.2 Leadership

Through *leadership*, awareness of issues will be raised and support for solutions will be developed. Working with local, provincial, and federal governments and partners to lead change, norms and expectations will be challenged across communities and systems. Advocating for policy, resources, and funding for prioritized risks and emerging issues will occur. In doing this work, a community-wide understanding of initiatives, results, and gaps will be built.

5.3 Knowledge Mobilization

Through *knowledge mobilization*, evidence will be used to inform system-wide decision-making and action. The voices of individuals with lived/living experience, researchers, and practitioners will be heard to identify community gaps and needs and build a shared understanding of current, evolving, and emerging risk and protective factors. Opportunities for shared learning, exchange of ideas, and development of solutions will be provided. Evidence will be used to identify policy gaps and inform policy and practice development.

5.4 Coordinated Planning

Through *coordinated planning*, a system-wide approach will be implemented to support the development of comprehensive action plans. Collaborative community engagement processes will be facilitated to inform planning, integrate and align current plans to streamline and maximize impact, and identify and define innovative, cross-sectoral solutions. In this way, community plans will be designed that address complex, interconnected community issues.

5.5 Collective Action

Through *collective action*, people, organizations, and systems will be brought together to take concrete action towards common goals. Opportunities to share staff, space, and funding will be explored to maximize resources. Through collaboration, common systems, processes, and practices will be implemented and stakeholders will be mobilized to take action on community plans, strategies, and initiatives. In-the-moment solutions will be piloted to address emerging and evolving needs, using a collective approach to provide the required infrastructure for action.

5.6 Evaluation

Through *evaluation*, the effectiveness of efforts will be assessed, and evidence will be used to scale or course correct. The effects and impacts of initiatives, strategies, and community plans will be measured to inform changes in real time based on what is and isn't working and determine change in our communities. Evaluation efforts will demonstrate transparency and accountability for action.

Section 6.0

Issue-Based Priorities

6.1 Issue-Based Priorities Overview

Through the community engagement process, seven community safety and well-being risks were identified, as described in Section 3.0. These included: anti-racism and anti-oppression, a safe London for women and girls, crime, employment, housing, mental health, and substance use. These seven risks have been distilled into three issue-based priorities: safe and vibrant neighbourhoods, healthy and resilient people, and thriving and inclusive economy.

Each of the priorities are described in detail in sections 6.2 – 6.4. Community plans have been identified that are supporting this work. However, these are not the only community plans that address community safety and well-being. The inclusion of these community plans demonstrates the great work that is already happening. There are many other current and future plans that will be included to strengthen this work. Further, addressing issue-based priorities is not only happening through community plans. There are many individuals, groups, and organizations involved in addressing issue-based priorities in London through individual, community, and organization led initiatives. Through the Integrated System Priorities, people and plans will continue to be connected to this work across and beyond these priorities. The role of individuals, groups, organizations, and community plans in the CSWB ecosystem will be explored further through implementation.

The CSWB Plan is a living plan and will continue to evolve over time. It is expected that the three priority areas will remain constant. However, as risks are addressed through effective solutions, efforts will be redirected towards emerging community safety and well-being risks. Appendix A includes the specific strategic directions, expected results, and strategies from each of the community plans described in sections 6.2 – 6.4.

Figure 3. Issue-Based Priorities



6.2 Healthy and Resilient People

What We Heard

Mental health was ranked as a top priority by 69% of respondents. Respondents identified a need for improved access to mental health services, as well as an increase in the number of mental health services. Ensuring services are available in a timely manner, decreasing barriers to accessing services, and improving the affordability of mental health supports were also noted. Increased mental health education and awareness about mental health were additional recommendations.

Substance use was rated as a priority by 61% of respondents. Similar to mental health, respondents recommended increased access to services, increased substance use supports and services, and increased ease of access to substance use supports. Further, more awareness and education about substance use and supports, focusing on prevention, applying an integrated approach to address substance use, using a harm reduction approach, and using evidence-based solutions were suggested by respondents.

Respondents reported **anti-racism and anti-oppression** as an issue that needs to be addressed in London. Respondents expressed concern about ableism, xenophobia, sexism, homophobia, transphobia, Islamophobia, and anti-Semitism in London. Specifically, respondents noted that “there is a long way to go” in how Black, Indigenous, and Asian people, Muslims, individuals with disabilities, individuals experiencing homelessness, 2SLGBTQ+ community members, and other equity seeking groups are treated. Inequalities in income, education, leadership opportunities, and career opportunities were of specific concern. “London must do better” was a common message within this theme.

Community Plans Supporting This Work

The community plans below highlight some of the efforts and initiatives being undertaken in London. There are many individuals, organizations, and networks committed to mental health, substance use, and anti-racism and anti-oppression work.

The London & Middlesex Mental Health and Addictions Strategic Direction Council is a collaborative network of mental health and addictions system leaders in London-Middlesex that evolved from the Community Mental Health and Addiction Strategy for London. The strategy consisted of five strategic directions, including: Expand Communication, Enhance Access, Foster Collaboration, Grow Awareness, and Build Capacity. [Visit the Community Mental Health and Addiction Strategy to learn more.](#) The Strategic Direction Council is leading change in this space with an initial focus on expanding communication and fostering collaboration. Moving forward, the role of the Strategic Direction Council in the CSWB ecosystem will be further explored.

The Middlesex-London Community Drug and Alcohol Strategy’s (CDAS) vision is a caring, inclusive, and safe community that works collaboratively to reduce and eliminate the harms associated with drugs and alcohol. The CDAS has four pillars: Prevention, Treatment, Harm Reduction, and Enforcement. For each pillar, there are a series of recommendations and corresponding actions. [Access the CDAS for more information.](#)

London's Community Diversity and Inclusion Strategy 2017 (CDIS) envisions London as a diverse and inclusive community that honours, welcomes, and accepts all people; where people have the power to eliminate systemic oppressions. There are five priorities included in the plan: 1) Take concrete steps towards healing and reconciliation; 2) Have zero tolerance for oppression, discrimination, and ignorance; 3) Connect and engage Londoners; 4) Remove accessibility barriers to services, information, and spaces; and 5) Remove barriers to employment. In 2020, a sixth priority was added to the CDIS, Addressing anti-Black racism. [Each priority has a set of correlating strategies that can be found in the full plan.](#)

6.3 Safe and Vibrant Neighbourhoods

What We Heard

A total of 63% of respondents reported that **housing** was a community safety and well-being issue that needed to be addressed. Exploring options, providing incentives, and implementing policies were recommendations provided by the community in relation to the need for affordable housing. Supporting the best and highest use of properties and supporting new housing developments were also suggested to increase the amount of housing available in London. Respondents noted that individuals experiencing homelessness needed shelter, supports, and increased coordination of services.

Crime was reported by 49% of respondents as an issue that needed to be addressed. Crime reduction and prevention were reported as critical areas of focus. This included addressing underlying issues related to crime, providing education to promote safety, and increasing awareness of how to report safety concerns and how to stay safe. Respondents also recommended improved coordination and communication between police and community services, as well as between police and residents. Increasing opportunities to connect with neighbours and ensuring services and programs can be accessed in neighbourhoods were also raised as much-needed strategies. Built environment recommendations included ensuring spaces in neighbourhoods are safe, clean, and well-maintained.

A safe London for women and girls was noted as a priority by respondents. Specific concerns included human trafficking, gender-based violence, lack of proper lighting on streets, the negative impact of COVID-19 on violence against women, and the need for more services and supports for women who have been abused, sexually exploited, sexually assaulted, and/or sex trafficked.

Community Plans Supporting This Work

The community plans below outline actions being undertaken to address housing, crime, and a safe London for women and girls. In addition to these plans, there is more work being done in London. Individuals, groups, and networks are also leading initiatives to address each of these issues.

Housing Stability For All: The Housing Stability Action Plan for the City of London 2019-2024 (Housing Stability Plan) has strategies and initiatives that align with the recommendations provided by the community, and that also align with many other community plans. The Housing Stability Plan has four strategic areas of focus: Respond to the Homelessness Crisis, Create More Housing Stock, Provide Housing Supports, and Transform the Service System. Each strategic area of focus has a goal, result, initiatives, actions, and key measures. [Please see the Housing Stability Plan to learn more.](#)

The London Police Service 2019-2023 Business Plan has two strategic priorities focused on crime and victimization. The first strategic priority is community safety and the second is community well-being. Each strategic priority has an outcome, area of focus, objectives, and highlights of planned activities. [The full Business Plan can be viewed on the London Police Service website.](#)

The London Strengthening Neighbourhoods Strategy 2017-2020 serves as a guide towards stronger neighbourhoods across the city. The Strategy recognizes that neighbourhoods are about people and places, and how they come together to make great places to live, work, and play. Strong neighbourhoods are vibrant, connected, and engaged – they form the backbone of our diverse, inclusive, and welcoming community. [The full London Strengthening Neighbourhoods Strategy can be requested through the City of London's website.](#)

To create a healthy and resilient Core Area, the City of London developed the Core Area Action Plan. The Core Area Action Plan outlines short-, medium-, and long-term initiatives to address such issues as homelessness and health, safety and security, creating a positive business environment, and attracting more people to the Core Area. [To view the full Core Area Action Plan, visit the City of London's website.](#)

The 2019-2023 Strategic Plan for the City of London has a strategic area of focus called *Strengthening Our Community* that includes expected results and strategies related to crime. Further, *Creating a Safe London for Women and Girls* is also a strategic area of focus. [Please visit the City of London website to read the full strategic plan.](#)

The Safe Cities London Action Plan has a vision of London as a safe city where women, girls, nonbinary and trans individuals, and survivors access public spaces and freely participate in public life without fear or experience of sexual violence. Within the Safe Cities London Action Plan, there are three areas of focus: Social Norms, Policy and Practice, and Collaboration. Each of the areas of focus have corresponding outcomes, expected results, strategies, and initial actions. [The full plan can be accessed through Anova's website](#). The work to create a safe London for women and girls is facilitated by a host of individuals, organizations, and networks in London.

6.4 Thriving and Inclusive Economy

What We Heard

The fifth highest ranked issue by respondents (48%) was **employment**. Respondents shared that income disparity, income inequity, lack of financial supports, and lack of stable employment were concerns. Solutions such as paying a living wage, improving job opportunities, and looking at guaranteed basic income were proposed.

Community Plans Supporting This Work

The community plans identified have strategies that address employment. However, this is not the only work being done in London towards employment. There are many individuals, organizations, and networks taking action in this area.

The recommendations from respondents are in alignment with the actions being undertaken through the 2019-2023 Strategic Plan for the City of London strategic area of focus *Growing Our Economy*. [To read the corresponding strategies, go to the City of London's website](#).

The London Community Recovery Network (LCRN) brings together leaders from the private sector, non-profit, and institutional organizations to undertake community conversations about London's recovery. In Phase 1 of their work, LCRN identified short-term ideas for action. One theme in particular, *Business and Employment*, aligns directly with this priority area. Additional strategies identified by LCRN include: Explore, Support, and Buy Local; Core Area & Infrastructure; Housing, Health, and Social Supports; and Supporting Arts, Culture, Tourism, and Hospitality Industries. These actions are detailed in [Laying the Foundation: Ideas for Action to Power London's Community Recovery from COVID-19](#). In Phase 2, building on the work undertaken in Phase 1, LCRN is creating a three-year Community Recovery Framework that sets out a common vision and shared measures for community recovery for London.

Emerging Issues Priorities


7.1 The Emerging Issues Model

An emerging issue is an issue that is not yet generally recognized or identified, but could have a significant impact on community safety and well-being. An emerging issue may not yet have received adequate attention, which could result in negative effects in the future if it is not addressed.

The Emerging Issues Model outlines how new and evolving issues will be identified and addressed through the CSWB Plan. The implementation of the Emerging Issues Model demonstrates that the CSWB Plan is not a one-time planning exercise, but rather an evidence-based, nimble system of issue identification and resolution. The model recognizes there is a need for ongoing community engagement to identify emerging issues.

Identifying emerging issues is a collective effort, done in collaboration between the CSWB Advisory Committee, community plan holders, researchers, practitioners, individuals with lived/living experience, and community stakeholders. Early efforts will be focused on determining how this work will be done.

Figure 4. The Emerging Issues Model



- 1 Issue Identification:** Research will be conducted and/or reviewed to identify evidence of emerging issues. Evidence will include data from individuals with lived/living experience, practitioners, and qualitative and quantitative research.
- 2 Issue Assessment:** Data will be analyzed and results will be reviewed to determine whether the issue needs to be addressed through the CSWB ecosystem or another entity. Emerging issues that are not related to community safety and well-being will be referred to an appropriate group so that they can be addressed.
- 3 Action Planning:** If an issue is related to community safety and well-being, it will be referred to a group that, due to their expertise, is positioned to address the issue through their community plan. Ideally, this group becomes part of the CSWB ecosystem model. Where a community plan does not exist, a new community plan or initiative will be developed to address the emerging issue.
- 4 Action Mobilization:** Implementation of actions will occur through community efforts. Skills, expertise, and resources of existing groups will be leveraged. Action-taking will be done collectively and collaboratively.
- 5 Impact Assessment:** Performance will be monitored, outcomes will be assessed, and actions will be refined to ensure efforts result in the desired impact.

7.2 Emerging Issue: Islamophobia in London

Islamophobia has been identified as an emerging issue in London. Below is an assessment using the Emerging Issues Model.

- 1 Issue Identification:** On June 6, 2021, the Islamophobia Attack at Hyde Park and South Carriage Road was an incomprehensible and despicable act of violence against members of our community. This was a traumatic event for members of the Muslim community and a devastating loss of life. Acts of violence and hate-based violence have no place in our community. This attack highlighted the issue of Islamophobia in London.
- 2 Issue Assessment:** On June 9, 2021, through an Emergent Motion, Municipal Council and the London community acknowledged that Islamophobia exists in London, denounced Islamophobia, and committed to end Islamophobia and hate. The Community Diversity and Inclusion Strategy (CDIS) and the local Muslim community were identified to lead this critical and urgent work.
- 3 Action Planning:** Initiatives and strategies to end Islamophobia, ways in which the contributions of the London Muslim community can be highlighted and honoured, and means by which to remember and honour the victims of the Islamophobia Attack will be identified collaboratively by the CDIS and the local Muslim community.
- 4 Action Mobilization:** The CDIS, the local Muslim community, and stakeholders will work together to implement the planned initiatives and identify funding sources to assist with the implementation of these initiatives.
- 5 Impact Assessment:** Outcomes will be reported to Municipal Council, the local Muslim community, and the public. Results will be used to refine initiatives and inform next steps.

Section 8.0

CSWB Plan Implementation

The CSWB Plan outlines a new way of implementing the important work of community safety and well-being in London. It acknowledges and leverages the great work already being done on issue-based priorities through community plans. It provides a framework to work differently together through system integration priorities. It offers a model to identify and address emerging issues quickly and effectively.

There is much work to be done, and the development of the CSWB Plan is only the starting point. The priorities identified in the CSWB Plan cannot be addressed in isolation. Bold, committed, and courageous action across sectors and stakeholder groups will be required. Tangible, proactive steps will be taken to be inclusive of individuals, groups, and organizations that are reflective of the London community.

Complementary to the CSWB Plan, the Connectivity Table is a multi-sectoral risk intervention model that is being implemented across the province. London's Connectivity Table has been in operation for two years, and it has addressed a number of challenging circumstances related to community safety and well-being. Statistics gathered through the Connectivity Table will inform this work moving forward.

Part of the implementation of the CSWB Plan will be determining how to best operationalize this work. Clear roles, responsibilities, processes, practices, and concrete action plans will need to be designed. An anti-racism and anti-oppression lens will be used throughout implementation as policies, strategies, and actions are considered. Monitoring and assessment of progress and impact will also be a crucial component of implementation. Other risks, such as road safety, may also be considered through implementation planning.

The priorities to be addressed through the CSWB Plan are significant, and the work that needs to be done will not be easy. We know that our community is committed to taking action, moving forward, making a difference, and creating the change needed for London to become a healthy, safe, equitable city for all.

Appendix A:

Key Strategies and Outcomes

The Government of Ontario requires that CSWB Plans include outcomes and strategies for issue-based priorities. In alignment with this requirement, the information below provides strategic directions, expected results, and strategies for the community plans described in Section 6.0 of this document. Strategic directions, expected results, and strategies have been included in full for the community plans where the majority of content relates to the issue-based priority. Due to the volume and breadth of content in some of the community plans, only strategic directions, expected results, and strategies that correspond to the issue-based priority have been included.

The community plans identified are not the only community plans that address community safety and well-being. The inclusion of these community plans demonstrates the great work that is already happening. There are many other current and future plans that will be included to strengthen this work.

Healthy and Resilient People Community Plans

Community Mental Health and Addiction Strategy for London

Strategic Direction: Expand Communication

Expected Results:

1. Improved experiences of residents.
2. Smoother transitions throughout system.

Strategies:

1. Communicate Mental Health and Addiction (MH&A) services across providers, agencies, and the public.
2. Open and build communication channels.
3. Develop Indigenous-specific MH&A strategy.

Strategic Direction: **Enhance Access**

Expected Results:

1. Faster access to services.
2. Improved system equity.

Strategies:

1. Increase access to care outside traditional business hours.
 2. Define Circle of Care.
 3. Increase access to housing with essential supports to foster recovery.
 4. Develop inclusivity, diversity, and equity framework.
-

Strategic Direction: **Foster Collaboration**

Expected Results:

1. Efficiency through better integrated services.
2. Better system value.

Strategies:

1. Create governance structure to align MH&A services.
 2. Focus and align existing collaborative forums, tables, and initiatives.
 3. Identify and address service gaps in MH&A services.
-

Strategic Direction: **Grow Awareness**

Expected Results:

1. Improved access to information.
2. Reduced stigma.

Strategies:

1. Develop London Asset Map of MH&A services across all funders.
2. Reinforce and coordinate a central, single door for information about local assets.
3. Strengthen MH&A awareness, prevention, and health promotion education.

Strategic Direction: **Build Capacity**

Expected Results:

Improved health and wellness outcomes for residents.

Strategies:

1. Complete comprehensive capacity study of all MH&A services.
2. Develop standardized guidelines informed by leading practice.
3. Develop central intake and referral service for MH&A.

Middlesex-London Community Drug and Alcohol Strategy

Strategic Direction: **Overarching**

Strategies:

1. Advocate for policies and programs that address poverty, homelessness, housing and other social determinants of health including Indigenous determinants of health.
2. Ensure programs and services in Middlesex-London are person focused.
3. Encourage participation of people with lived experience during development and implementation of programs, services, and campaigns.
4. Work to reduce stigma related to substance use and addictions.
5. Increase response to public space challenges related to drugs and alcohol.

Strategic Direction: **Prevention**

Strategies:

1. Provide accurate substance related information and prevention messaging to the community about facts, protective factors, and impact of substance use.
2. Advocate for and implement targeted strategies and programs to reduce known substance use risk factors and increase protective factors that help to prevent problematic substance use.
3. Ensure supportive built environments and social environments in our communities.

Strategic Direction: **Treatment**

Strategies:

1. Enhance community awareness of services within Middlesex and London.
 2. Reduce system barriers and create greater access to treatment and recovery services.
 3. Enhance coordination of treatment service and improve linkages and collaboration among the continuum of services.
 4. Develop a coordinated service response specific to Crystal Methamphetamine (drug induced psychosis).
-

Strategic Direction: **Harm Reduction**

Strategies:

1. Work collaboratively to address the opioid crises within Middlesex-London.
2. Ensure people who are using drugs have access to accurate and timely information.
3. Expand harm reduction services.
4. Develop a comprehensive community needle syringe recovery strategy.
5. Monitor substance use trends in Middlesex-London.
6. Advocate for policy and legal change within the correctional system that supports both harm reduction and treatment.
7. Advocate for evidence-based reform of current drug laws and policy.

Strategic Direction: **Enforcement**

Strategies:

1. Improve collaboration between police, health and social services.
2. Support education and training for those working within the justice system about substance use, harm reduction, and treatment.
3. Advocate for recovery-focused solutions for people involved with the criminal justice system (e.g., drug court).
4. Enhance the community's understanding of the "right" responder to contact in situations where addiction crisis is apparent and increase community knowledge about reporting incidences.

London's Community Diversity and Inclusion Strategy 2017

Strategic Direction: Take concrete steps towards healing and reconciliation

Strategies:

1. Establish an Indigenous relations office within the City.
 2. Work with local Indigenous peoples to establish a *Truth and Reconciliation Commission – Calls to Action* (TRC) accountability and implementation body and plan.
 3. Create a community pledge to encourage everyone to take action towards the recommendations of the *Truth and Reconciliation Commission – Calls to Action* (TRC).
 4. Develop an audit and evaluation process to measure the progress towards the *Truth and Reconciliation Commission – Calls to Action* (TRC) recommendations.
 5. Ensure Indigenous peoples lead the change process within our community.
 6. Work with local Indigenous peoples to develop a unified Indigenous health strategy, including consideration of Indigenous social determinants of health.
 7. Forge partnership agreements between the City and three neighbouring communities (Chippewas of the Thames First Nation, Munsee Delaware Nation, and Oneida Nation of the Thames).
 8. Provide opportunities for on-reserve economic development through strategic and innovative partnerships with the City and the private sector.
-

Strategic Direction: Have zero tolerance for oppression, discrimination, and ignorance

Strategies:

1. Address one's own privilege and bias by learning, sharing, and recognizing the lived experiences, cultures and histories of Londoners.
2. Acknowledge and combat the existence of anti-Black racism, Islamophobia, sexism, racism, anti-Semitism, ageism, xenophobia, homophobia, transphobia, gender-based and other forms of discrimination in our community.
3. Recognize a common language around oppression and discrimination.
4. Know the *Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms* and the *Ontario Human Rights Code*.
5. Require educators, social service and health practitioners to complete training on Indigenous cultures.
6. Encourage everyone to undertake de-colonization, anti-racism, anti-oppression, cultural, safety, accessibility, and diversity training in order to understand those around them.

7. Build cultural awareness among children and youth through schools, community groups, parent councils, and other community engagement activities.
 8. Ensure that children starting at primary level receive anti-oppression education including learning how to recognize their own privilege and bias and how to build relationships with those around them.
 9. Make community training on sexual harassment, sexual assault, safety, trans health and HIV more readily accessible.
 10. Promote a culture within the London Police Service where all groups are safe and protected, and not targeted based on any of the enumerated terms in the *Ontario Human Rights Code*.
 11. Ensure the London Police Service invests in and provides ongoing training to police officers and employees to better understand and protect the communities they serve.
 12. Encourage local media and community figures to promote inclusive messages and to address barriers and oppressions within London.
 13. Implement a social media campaign modelled after #MakeltAwkward.
 14. Encourage local businesses and organizations to share knowledge, resources, and information to address oppression, discrimination and ignorance.
-

Strategic Direction: Connect and engage Londoners

Strategies:

1. Promote events and opportunities for Londoners to collaborate, share, and access information.
2. Encourage and facilitate dialogue between all levels of government and organizations around common goals of inclusion, particularly groups that stand to gain by supporting one another.
3. Recognize and celebrate Londoners, organizations and businesses that promote and undertake diversity, inclusion, and anti-oppression activities.
4. Establish long-range plans to grow diversity activities, including grants and recognition programs.
5. Increase participation of Londoners from non-dominant groups on the City of London Advisory Committees, Boards and Commissions.
6. Ensure the City of London and other organizations understand and model best practices for inclusive engagement.

Strategic Direction: Remove accessibility barriers to services, information, and spaces

Strategies:

1. Create awareness about the accessibility services available in the community, and encourage organizations to better promote the accessibility supports they offer.
 2. Promote the local welcome and assessment centres for newcomers.
 3. Ensure that all current and future transportation options are reviewed by, and easily available and accessible to, seniors, persons with disabilities, and newcomers.
 4. Include persons with disabilities in policy development, consultations, and implementation processes in order to address different accessibility perspectives.
 5. Promote and encourage developers to implement the City of London's *Facility Accessibility Design Standards* (FADS), and other progressive accessibility standards.
 6. Encourage the development of an assistive technology information resource to assist Londoners in learning more about different types of technologies.
 7. Encourage businesses and organizations to have non-gender specific washrooms.
 8. Ensure the safety of the community by developing comprehensive and adaptable emergency and safety procedures, and conduct regular safety audits throughout the community.
 9. Provide accommodation for religious and cultural practices.
 10. Establish awards for architects and/or other professionals if they build or innovate an inclusive design.
-

Strategic Direction: Remove barriers to employment

Strategies:

1. Implement metrics and regular opportunities to measure diversity and inclusion within the community, ensuring the workforce and local leadership are reflective of the community.
2. Know the *Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act* and *Integrated Accessibility Standards Regulation* (under AODA).
3. Identify and remove barriers in the recruitment process, including; identifying accommodations in job advertisements, and ensuring transparent hiring and evaluation practices.
4. Promote equity within policy, practices and strategies in businesses, non-profit, public and labour organizations.
5. Ensure that all health and safety standards in the workplace are inclusive.

6. Support the professional development of individuals who are underrepresented in the workforce and leadership.
 7. Promote and encourage mentorship, co-op, apprenticeship and internship programs happening within the City and the community.
 8. Advocate to local businesses and organizations to recognize the sanctioned knowledge of Indigenous Elders and Healers, and to recognize foreign credentials and work experience.
 9. Support employers and community members in learning how to assist newcomers with their integration.
-

Strategic Direction: Addressing anti-Black racism *(Strategies under development)*

Safe and Vibrant Neighbourhoods Community Plans

Housing Stability For All: The Housing Stability Action Plan for the City of London 2019-2024

Strategic Direction: Respond to the homelessness crisis

Expected Results:

Reduce the number of individuals and families at risk of and experiencing homelessness.

Strategies:

1. Work collaboratively across systems to address the immediate needs of individuals and families at risk of or experiencing homelessness.
2. Create an outreach system and rapid response to support individuals and families experiencing unsheltered homelessness.
3. Provide the right level of support at the right time to decrease the use of emergency services.
4. Prevent individuals and families from entering homelessness.
5. House and rehouse individuals and families experiencing homelessness rapidly.

Strategic Direction: Create more housing stock

Expected Results:

Increase affordable, quality, and mixed housing options.

Strategies:

1. Retain existing and create new affordable housing stock.
 2. Revitalize and modernize community housing.
 3. Increase supportive and specialized housing options.
 4. Attract new and engage current partners towards affordable housing solutions.
-

Strategic Direction: Provide housing supports

Expected Results:

Increase the number of individuals and families who secure housing and stay housed.

Strategies:

1. Help individuals and families access housing stability services and solutions that best meet their needs.
 2. Implement coordinated access to mental health and addictions services and supports.
 3. Support movement of choice within a range of housing options and services based on the needs and interests of individuals and families.
 4. Strengthen and enhance the delivery of housing stability services.
 5. Assist individuals and families to move towards community integration and belonging.
-

Strategic Direction: Transform the service system

Expected Results:

Increase in the ability of the housing stability system to address community needs.

Strategies:

1. Redesign and implement a new housing system to better help individuals and families avoid homelessness and achieve housing stability.
2. Use data to drive decision-making to respond in real-time to the housing stability needs of individuals and families.
3. Be a local and national leader in housing stability.

London Police Service 2019-2023 Business Plan

Strategic Direction: Crime prevention

Expected Results:

Reduced crime and victimization/revictimization.

Strategies:

1. To promote crime prevention strategies and educate the public on potential threats to safety and security.
 2. To engage in actions that encourage participation of business owners, neighbours, citizens, and social service partners in increasing their own and others' safety and security.
-

Strategic Direction: Equity, diversity, and inclusiveness

Expected Results:

Increased sense of belonging.

Strategies:

1. To increase awareness and understanding of the unique circumstances of members of diverse communities.
-

Strategic Direction: Community mobilization/risk intervention

Expected Results:

Reduced rates of revictimization.

Strategies:

1. To work strategically and collaboratively with social service providers and community partners on early intervention and prevention of identified risks.

Strategic Direction: **Response to victims, the vulnerable, and racialized persons and groups**

Expected Results:

1. Appropriate response to victims, the vulnerable and racialized persons and groups.
2. Enhanced public trust and confidence in police.
3. Increased satisfaction with police services.

Strategies:

1. To implement best practices for police engagement with persons in mental health and addictions crisis.
2. To provide victims of crime and/or traumatic circumstances with immediate on-site support and referrals to available programs and services.
3. To enhance transparency and improve consultation with the community.

2019-2023 Strategic Plan for the City of London

Strategic Direction: **Strengthening Our Community**

Expected Results:

Increase neighbourhood safety.

Strategies:

1. Develop and implement a Community Safety and Well-Being Plan.
2. Reduce crime through increased visibility of community patrols and partnership with other agencies to address multi-jurisdictional criminal activity.
3. Reduce victimization/revictimization through public education, promotion and encouragement of public engagement in crime prevention strategies.

Strategic Direction: **Creating a Safe London for Women and Girls**

Expected Results:

Decrease male violence against women and girls who are subjected to abuse, assault and non-state torture in their intimate relationships; sex trafficking; sexual assault; and workplace harassment.

Strategies:

1. Apply a three pillared framework (legislation, public awareness, and funded services) in policy and by-law development.
2. Ensure women and girls with lived experience, including but not exclusive to Indigenous and newcomer women and girls, are included in the development of policies, by-laws, and programs that affect them.
3. Develop policies, by-laws and programs that make the safety of women and girls a priority, including policies and procedures that ensure workplace harassment is addressed appropriately with sanctions against harassers and supports for victims.
4. Implement mandatory comprehensive training on male violence against women and girls in their intimate relationships; sex trafficking, workplace and sexual harassment; non-state torture; and sexual violence for all City employees and encourage all of London's agencies, boards and commissions to also implement the training.
5. Increase the number of women in senior management positions and other positions of power.
6. Work with the London Transit Commission to enhance the safety of women and girls on public transit, for example longer hours of bus service and free service to low-income women.
7. Work together with City of London Housing Services, Housing Development Corporation, London Middlesex Community Housing to build more accessible and safer housing options for women and girls.
8. Maintain or increase the number of shelter beds available to abused women and their children, and to homeless women and girls. Full implementation of Housing First policy to be contingent on availability of immediate access to safe, affordable housing.
9. Work with landlords and developers to end discrimination and bias against abused, sex trafficked and/or sexually assaulted women and girls attempting to access affordable housing.
10. Recognize London as a sex trafficking hub and take action to work collaboratively towards solutions.
11. Investigate signing the Global Every Woman Treaty and encourage AMO, FCM, other provincial associations, the governments of each province and the federal government to do the same.
12. Include male violence against women and girls in discussions and decisions made at the Town and Gown Committee.

13. Support community-based initiatives and organizations committed to ending male violence against women including but not limited to Anova (UN Safe Cities); Atlohsa Family Healing Services; the London Abused Women’s Centre/ Youth Opportunities Unlimited/Salvation Army Correctional and Justice Services (Phoenix and Choices programs); and London Police Service (DV Unit and HT Unit).
14. Commit to applying a trauma and violence-informed lens to strategic plan for the City of London, ensuring that an intersectional approach is applied to address violence against women and girls in our community.

Core Area Action Plan

Strategic Direction: Short-Term Actions

Strategies:

1. Strengthen delivery of Coordinated Informed Response Program.
2. Implement Housing Stability Week pilot project.
3. Implement early-morning Coordinated Informed Response Program.
4. Implement breakfast Coordinated Informed Response Program.
5. Establish Headlease Program.
6. Double foot patrol officers in Core Area for a discrete period of time.
7. Create new Spotlight Program.
8. Enhance Service London Portal to allow for complaints, concerns, and enquiries on Core Area issues.
9. Install kindness meters to directly support Core Area social service agencies.
10. Stage police command vehicle in strategic locations.
11. Issue request for proposals on Queens Avenue parking lot.
12. Explore new ways to support Core Area property owners to dispose of found syringes.
13. Conduct three-week Core Area By-law Enforcement blitz.
14. Prioritize Core Area building and sign permits.
15. Streamline event processes.
16. Provide incentives for installing uplighting on privately-owned buildings.
17. Proactively recruit food trucks in dedicated area along Dundas Place.
18. Identify opportunities for new parking spaces in the Core Area.

Strategic Direction: **Medium-Term Actions**

Strategies:

1. Establish permanent Coordinated Informed Response Program.
2. Establish more daytime resting spaces.
3. Establish Core Area stabilization spaces.
4. Create new housing units with supportive living arrangements.
5. Expand case management approach for helping vulnerable populations.
6. Complete and implement Affordable Housing Community Improvement Plan.
7. Create four-year Core Area Ambassador pilot program.
8. Undertake Core Area safety audit.
9. Establish new storefront space for foot patrol, By-law Enforcement Officers and public washrooms.
10. Increase London Police Service foot patrol.
11. Enforce loitering regulations.
12. Develop and deliver safety training for business owners, employees and residents.
13. Utilize existing Façade Improvement Loan Program to incent decorative gates through existing Community Improvement Plans.
14. Undertake safety blitz for aggressive driving in the Core Area.
15. Proactive enforcement of *Property Standards By-law*.
16. Package Core Area patio, signage, licensing and other regular business processes.
17. Brand uniforms and equipment for all City staff providing service in the Core Area.
18. Establish, implement and regularly monitor a higher clean standard for the Core Area.
19. Implement new pressure wash program for sidewalks and civic spaces.
20. Provide incentives for installing plumbing and hose connections on storefront through existing Community Improvement Plans.
21. Implement Core Area infrastructure monitoring program.
22. Encourage shipping container pop-up retail uses during construction.
23. Provide incentives for installing awnings through existing Community Improvement Plans.
24. Fund four-year Core Area “construction dollars” pilot program.
25. Experiment with temporary free municipal parking.
26. Increase range and intensity of programming in Core Area.
27. Activate spaces and places with bistro chairs and tables.
28. Create a projection art program.
29. Create an infrastructure art and beautification program.
30. Engage Core Area businesses to lead, volunteer or fund initiatives.
31. Explore partnership opportunities with educational institutions for immersive learning in Core Area.

Strategic Direction: Long-Term Actions

Strategies:

1. Establish new Core Area garbage and recycling collection program.
2. Regenerate London and Middlesex Community Housing housing stock.
3. Complete and implement the *Housing Stability Plan*.
4. Open permanent supervised consumption facility in appropriate location and close existing temporary facility.
5. Provide grants to implement safety audit recommendations on privately-owned property through *Core Area Community Improvement Plan*.
6. Implement safety audit recommendations on public property.
7. Implement Core Area digital solutions.
8. Use CityStudio to explore innovative approaches to addressing Core Area social issues.
9. Work with surrounding communities to establish a regional strategy for addressing vulnerable populations.
10. Explore opportunities to partner with agencies to provide a Core Area Resource Centre.
11. Prioritize Core Area for public art.
12. Explore opportunities for additional public washrooms.
13. Eliminate encroachment fees for patios, signage and awnings in the Core Area through *Core Area Community Improvement Plan*.
14. Eliminate application fees for encroachments, signage and patios in the Core Area through *Core Area Community Improvement Plan*.
15. Eliminate fees for use of on-street parking spaces for temporary restaurant patios through *Core Area Community Improvement Plan*.
16. Discourage perpetual extension of temporary surface parking lots in Core Area.
17. Continue to enhance transit service to the Core Area.
18. Continue to improve cycling infrastructure in the Core Area.
19. Plan and save funds for a public parking garage.
20. Inventory social services in the Core Area.
21. Provide a deferral of payment for businesses holding City-issued CIP loans for the duration of construction projects.
22. Invest in Dundas Place.

London Strengthening Neighbourhoods Strategy 2017-2020

Strategic Direction: Engagement in Neighbourhoods

Strategies:

1. Increase awareness of resident-identified neighbourhoods.
 2. Encourage and support collaboration and information exchange between neighbourhood associations across the city.
 3. Support the creation and sustainability of neighbourhood associations.
-

Strategic Direction: Communication

Strategies:

1. Improve and coordinate communication within and amongst neighbourhoods.
 2. Increase and improve communication between the City of London and residents.
 3. Increase and improve communication between the City of London and neighbourhood associations.
-

Strategic Direction: Tools and Resources to Support Neighbourhoods

Strategies:

1. Grow the SPARKS! funding program to increase its reach in neighbourhoods across London.
2. Provide financial support to neighbourhood associations.
3. Support the development of a virtual hub that stores a variety of tools/resources/ideas/ etc. that is available for neighbourhoods to access.
4. City of London continues to share physical assets such as tents, movie kit, chairs, tables, etc. to support neighbourhood events and activities.
5. Explore shared assets for neighbourhood associations.
6. Decrease barriers (rules, regulations and cost) to holding events.

Strategic Direction: **Overarching Strategies**

Strategies:

1. Develop a plan to broaden engagement with diverse communities.
2. Evaluate London Strengthening Neighbourhoods Strategy.
3. Report annually on progress made.

Safe Cities London Action Plan

Strategic Direction: **Social Norms**

Expected Results:

Increased knowledge of what sexual violence is, what causes it, its effects, and intersectional impacts.

Strategies:

1. Provide education, tools, and resources about sexual violence.

Expected Results:

Increased skill and desire to take appropriate action.

Strategies:

1. Prepare and implement space-specific bystander intervention training.
2. Address a consent culture in the city.
3. Engage men as allies and hold men accountable to end sexual violence.

Strategic Direction: **Policy and Practice**

Expected Results:

Increased use of an intersectional gendered lens in policy development related to public spaces.

Strategies:

1. Support the review and update of current guidelines, policies, and practices to include the use of GBA+.

Expected Results:

Improved use and monitoring of new and existing policies to support behaviour change.

Strategies:

1. Strengthen and design new mechanisms to enforce policy.
2. Create new policies that drive system change.

Expected Results:

Improved evidence and understanding of the impact of policy use.

Strategies:

1. Measure the implementation of policies and behaviour change.

Expected Results:

Increase use of environmental design as a tool to promote safety.

Strategies:

1. Integrate GBA+ in environmental design and address identified gaps.

Strategic Direction: Collaboration**Expected Results:**

Increased collaboration among system partners.

Strategies:

1. Create collaborations that leverage unique strengths, differences, and contributions.
2. Establish a commitment to shared learning.

Expected Results:

Improved awareness and understanding of the system and its gaps.

Strategies:

1. Raise awareness of services and supports available across the system.
2. Identify gaps and emerging needs.

Expected Results:

Increased capacity to create change.

Strategies:

1. Bring new people to our work and create allies to enhance impact.
2. Develop and scale innovative solutions to address gaps and drive system change.

Thriving and Inclusive Economy Community Plans

2019-2023 Strategic Plan for the City of London

Strategic Direction: Growing our economy**Expected Results:**

Increase partnerships that promote collaboration, innovation, and investment.

Strategies:

1. Expand opportunities and activities through the London Waste to Resources Innovation Centre.
2. Implement the Smart City Strategy.
3. Seek out and develop new partnerships and opportunities for collaboration.
4. Plan for High Speed Rail.
5. Collaborate with regional partners on international missions for new investment attraction.
6. Undertake regional planning partnerships with neighbouring municipalities and promote regional connectivity.
7. Grow tourism revenues through initiatives that build awareness and interest in London.
8. Support tourism by facilitating local, provincial, and national stakeholders to encourage community economic development, business partnerships, product development and legacy development for London.
9. Support the development of agricultural industry and promote its value to the urban community through the establishment of an Agricultural Centre of Excellence.
10. Work with multi-sector stakeholders to develop a Screen-Based Industry Strategy.

Expected Results:

Maintain foreign investment attraction, local retention, and growth and entrepreneurship support programs.

Strategies:

1. Ensure job growth through attraction of new capital from a diverse range of markets and industries.

Expected Results:

Increase access to supports for entrepreneurs and small businesses, and community economic development.

Strategies:

1. Revitalize London's downtown and urban areas.
2. Support entrepreneurs, start-up, and scale-up companies.

Laying the Foundation: Ideas for Action to Power London's Community Recovery from COVID-19

Strategic Direction: Business and Employment**Strategies:**

1. Match employers with jobseekers.
2. Provide training and opportunities for jobseekers.
3. Develop centralized strategies for procurement of goods and resources.
4. Initiate childcare solutions.
5. Make available access to funding, grants, and market data to support local businesses.
6. Laying the foundations of a green recovery.

Strategic Direction: Explore, Support, and Buy Local**Strategies:**

1. Support local businesses through outdoor shopping events and promotions.
2. Investigate the use of space to promote local businesses.
3. Promote local restaurants.
4. Connect the community to local businesses.

Strategic Direction: Core Area and Infrastructure

Strategies:

1. Focus on bringing people to the downtown and core areas.
 2. Innovate transportation.
 3. Beautify and improve public spaces, core area buildings, and homes.
 4. Develop and enhance strategies to engage the core.
-

Strategic Direction: Housing, Health, and Social Supports

Strategies:

1. Address food insecurity.
 2. Provide relief through vital services.
 3. Address housing and homelessness crisis.
 4. Strengthen mental health supports and promote good mental health.
-

Strategic Direction: Supporting Arts, Culture, Tourism, and Hospitality Industries

Strategies:

1. Create spaces and events for live music.
2. Host outdoor arts and culture events.
3. Promote mural art in core area and support through grants.
4. Begin developing strategies for tourism and place activations.
5. Connect art and culture virtually.
6. Partner musical performances with other businesses.

Appendix B:

Community Plan Contact Information

Community Plan Name: Community Mental Health and Addiction Strategy for London
Contact Organization: London & Middlesex Mental Health and Addictions Strategic
Direction Council

Email Address: officestrategicdirection@gmail.com

Website: <https://pillarnonprofit.ca/content/organization/36949>

Community Plan Name: Middlesex-London Community Drug and Alcohol Strategy

Contact Organization: Middlesex-London Health Unit

Email Address: health@mlhu.on.ca

Website: <https://www.mldncdas.com/>

Community Plan Name: London's Community Diversity and Inclusion Strategy 2017

Contact Organization: City of London

Email Address: cdis@london.ca

Website: www.london.ca/CDIS

Community Plan Name: Housing Stability For All: The Housing Stability Action Plan for the
City of London 2019-2024

Contact Organization: City of London

Email Address: housing@london.ca

Website: www.london.ca/living-london/community-services/homeless-prevention-housing

Community Plan Name: London Police Service 2019-2023 Business Plan

Contact Organization: London Police Service

Email Address: csd@londonpolice.ca

Website: www.londonpolice.ca/en/about/2019---2021-business-plan.aspx

Community Plan Name: 2019-2023 Strategic Plan for the City of London

Contact Organization: City of London

Email Address: cocc@london.ca

Website: [https://london.ca/government/council-civic-administration/master-plans-strategies/
strategic-plan](https://london.ca/government/council-civic-administration/master-plans-strategies/strategic-plan)

Community Plan Name: Core Area Action Plan
Contact Organization: City of London
Email Address: cocc@london.ca
Website: <https://getinvolved.london.ca/corearea>

Community Plan Name: London Strengthening Neighbourhoods Strategy 2017-2020
Contact Organization: City of London
Email Address: neighbourgood@london.ca
Website: <https://london.ca/living-london/community-services/neighbourhood-building/neighbourhood-programs> and www.neighbourgoodlondon.ca

Community Plan Name: Safe Cities London Action Plan
Contact Organization: City of London / Anova
Email Address: annaliset@anovafuture.org and rwilcox@london.ca
Website: <http://www.anovafuture.org/safe-cities-london/>

Community Plan Name: Laying the Foundation: Ideas for Action to Power London's
Community Recovery from COVID-19
Contact Organization: London Community Recovery Network, City of London
Email Address: lcrn@london.ca
Website: <https://getinvolved.london.ca/lcrn>

Report to Community and Protective Services Committee

To: Chair and Members,
Community and Protective Services Committee

From: Cheryl Smith, Deputy City Manager, Neighbourhood and
Community-Wide Services

Subject: London Fire Department Emergency Apparatus Procurement

Date: August 31, 2021

Recommendation

That, on the recommendation of the Deputy City Manager, Neighbourhood and Community-Wide Services, the following actions be taken with respect to the emergency fire apparatus procurement:

- a) The following report, in accordance with Section 14.2 of the Procurement of Goods and Services Policy, on the London Fire Department Emergency Apparatus Procurement **BE RECEIVED** for information; and,
- b) That the funding for this procurement **BE APPROVED** as set out in the Source of Financing Report attached, hereto, as Appendix A.

Executive Summary

This report updates Council on the emergency purchase of one fire Engine and equipment to replace Engine 2, which has substantial maintenance requirements. This emergency purchase aids the London Fire Department in managing interruptions to the level of service.

Linkage to the Corporate Strategic Plan

Strengthening our Community

The London Fire Department Emergency Apparatus Procurement is aligned with the following strategic area of focus and outcome from the City of London Strategic Plan 2019-2023:

- Strengthening our Community – Londoners have access to the services and supports that promote well-being, health, and safety in their neighbourhoods and across the city.

Analysis

1.0 Background Information

1.1 Context

The London Fire Department (“LFD”) relies on having spare vehicles available to replace front-line vehicles that require maintenance. Without an adequate number of spare vehicles, the level of service is impacted. The LFD works to mitigate this type of situation by having all apparatus regularly serviced by the LFD Mechanical Division and by placing large apparatus on a 20-year lifecycle schedule.

The LFD has four spare Engines. Two of these spare Engines are currently receiving emergency repairs and are out of service. Further to this, the LFD has experienced unexpected breakdowns as well as traffic accidents involving in-service vehicles, thereby straining our resources.

The LFD has also had to frequently shift several other vehicles around between stations to ensure consistency in available service across the City.

As a triggering event, it was recently discovered that Engine 2 had an impending issue related to its pump seal. While Engine 2 was being worked on, the mechanics discovered that there is substantial damage to the body harness of this truck. With the previously reported issues of extensive frame corrosion and impending failure, the combined cost of bringing this 2007 vehicle back to service level does not provide a positive return on investment. Engine 7 (Spare 22) was brought to Station 2 and Station 7 ran with Truck 7 as the Engine 7. Without Engine 2, there were no spare Engines available.

This Engine had to be replaced to ensure continuance of service levels. Any further incidents that could put another vehicle out of service will have a direct, negative impact on the services that are provided to residents.

2.0 Discussion and Considerations

2.1 Severity of Issue Leading to Emergency Apparatus Procurement

In May 2021, two spare Engines had to be sent for emergency repairs due to significant extensive frame corrosion and impending failure. This left the LFD with only two spare Engines with which to work. These are currently assigned to Station 7 and Station 2 for the long term with no spare Engines available in the fleet. The LFD continues to experience issues with several other vehicles, ranging from collisions, unexpected mechanical breakdowns, to not meeting maintenance standards during inspections. This has resulted in all or part of these vehicles having to be placed out of service.

Under normal circumstances, a Request for Proposal would be drafted and distributed with the final decision on the vendor resting with Council. For this process, the normal wait time for delivery is approximately 18 months from purchase to outfitting a new vehicle of this size and capacity. The LFD has an Apparatus and Equipment Committee that has been working diligently to prepare specifications for a Request for Proposal document that will allow the purchase of five new apparatus before the end of 2023. This process takes several months at best, followed by the approximately 18-month waiting period for delivery of the first purchased vehicle. With the current apparatus shortage crisis, there is a very high risk during this waiting period that reductions in service will occur and worsen in severity.

To address this crisis, it was imperative that the LFD purchase an Engine that could be put into service as quickly as possible. There were some local vendors who had demonstration Engines available for purchase. In review of the specifications of these demonstration Engines, the most appropriate and available unit was selected. This unit required only minimal retrofitting to meet the pressing needs of the LFD.

Based on Section 14.2 of the Procurement of Goods and Services Policy (see below), the Deputy City Manager, Neighbourhood and Community-Wide Services provided approval to have this Engine urgently procured.

Section 14.2 of the Procurement of Goods & Services Policy

Procurement in Emergencies

For the purposes of this section, “Emergency” means an event or occurrence that the City Manager or Managing Director (*sic*) deem as an immediate threat to:

- Public health;
- The maintenance of essential City services; or
- The welfare and protection of persons, property, or the environment; and the event or occurrence necessitates the immediate need for goods or services to mitigate the emergency and time does not permit for a competitive procurement process.

In the event of an Emergency the City Manager or Managing Director (*sic*) and their respective delegates, Fire Chief or a Deputy Fire Chief, or Chief Building Official or Deputy Chief Building Official, are authorized to enter into a purchase agreement without the requirement for a formal competitive process.

A list of pre-qualified suppliers will be used to select the suppliers, whenever possible.

Where the procurement cost to mitigate the Emergency is anticipated to exceed \$50,000, there must be a notification sent (e-mail contact is acceptable) to the Manager of Purchasing and Supply (or delegate). The steps taken to mitigate the Emergency must always be clearly documented regardless of amount and where the aggregate costs for a single supplier are in excess of \$50,000, the emergency procurement shall be reported by the responsible Managing Director (*sic*) to Committee and City Council (including the source of financing) at the next scheduled meeting following the event.

2.2 Details of Purchase

Following approval of this urgent purchase, the recommendation was to procure a demonstration Engine from Safetek Profire to expedite the delivery and place this vehicle in service to manage further impacts on the level of service.

On August 17, 2021, an Engine was purchased from Safetek Profire for \$750,940 (excluding HST). The estimated cost for equipping this Engine is \$150,000 (including HST).

3.0 Next Steps

The LFD will continue to have all vehicles regularly inspected and serviced by its Mechanical Division. There are more front-line vehicles in the fleet expected to need significant maintenance before their current lifecycle is complete. Plans are being made to mitigate these expenses. These plans include scheduling lifecycle replacements to minimize expenses, organizing processes to ensure vehicles that require repair are serviced in a timely manner, and maintaining vehicles for a period of time after expense to ensure a return on investment.

In addition, the LFD is in the process of drafting the Fire Master Plan, which will go to the Community and Protective Services Committee later in 2021. This 10-year Plan provides an overall vision, direction, and guidance for Council to make decisions about service improvements and enhancements through fire hall locations, fleet configuration, and any other elements that affect the delivery of fire services to match the growing needs of the community. As part of the development of this Plan, Civic Administration is reviewing the current lifecycle of all fire department vehicles.

The current lifecycle standard for all large vehicles is 20 years (17 years front-line plus 3 additional years as a spare). The plan is to gradually reduce this lifecycle to avoid another shortage in the future. The Request for Proposal process that is well underway involves the purchase of five new apparatus before the end of 2023, and then regular purchases in line with the next multi-year budget plan.

4.0 Financial Impact/Considerations

Funding to address this emergency purchase is available in the Fire capital plan as well as through a one-time transfer from the corporate contingency budget per the Source of Financing Report attached as Appendix A.

Conclusion

Emergency procurement of one fire Engine and equipment as per Section 14.2 of the Procurement of Goods and Services Policy was required to manage the impact to service levels and to maintain essential City services.

Prepared by: Katerina Barton, Manager, Finance and Planning, Fire Services
Submitted by: Lori Hamer, Fire Chief
Recommended by: Cheryl Smith, Deputy City Manager, Neighbourhood and Community-Wide Services

c: John Freeman, Manager, Purchasing and Supply, Finance Supports
Doug Drummond, Financial Business Administrator, Finance Supports
Jason Davies, Manager III, Financial Planning & Policy

Appendix "A"

#21153
 August 31, 2021
 (Award Contract)

Chair and Members
 Community and Protective Services Committee

RE: London Fire Department Emergency Apparatus Procurement
 (Subledger FLT21002)
 Capital Project FS115221 - Emergency Fire Vehicle
 Safetek Profire - \$750,940.00 (excluding HST)

Finance Supports Report on the Sources of Financing:

Finance Supports confirms that the cost of this project cannot be accommodated within the financing available for it in the Capital Budget, but can be accommodated with a transfer from within the Fire Capital Plan and a one-time transfer from the Corporate Contingency Budget, and that, subject to the approval of the Deputy City Manager, Neighbourhood and Community-Wide Services, the detailed source of financing for this project is:

Estimated Expenditures	Approved Budget	Additional Requirement (Note 1)	Revised Budget	Committed To Date	This Submission	Balance for Future Work
Vehicles and Equipment	505,000	914,156	1,419,156	0	914,156	505,000
Total Expenditures	\$505,000	\$914,156	\$1,419,156	\$0	\$914,156	\$505,000

Sources of Financing


Drawdown from Fire Facilities, Vehicle, and Equipment Renewal Reserve Fund	505,000	0	505,000	0	0	505,000
Drawdown from Fire Facilities, Vehicle, and Equipment Renewal Reserve Fund - Transfer from FS104221 - Non Emergency Fire Vehicles	0	230,000	230,000	0	230,000	0
Transfer from Corporate Contingency Budget (one-time)	0	684,156	684,156	0	684,156	0
Total Financing	\$505,000	\$914,156	\$1,419,156	\$0	\$914,156	\$505,000

Financial Note:

Contract Price	\$750,940
Add: HST @13%	\$97,622
Total Contract Price Including Taxes	\$848,562
Less: HST Rebate	-\$84,406
Add: Internal cost to equip engine	\$150,000
Net Contract Price	<u>\$914,156</u>

Note 1: The additional funding requirement is available as a transfer from FS104221 - Non Emergency Fire Vehicles and a one-time transfer from the Corporate Contingency Budget.

Note 2: The life-to-date funding in FS115221 - Emergency Fire Vehicles is earmarked for the scheduled replacement of other fire vehicles and not available for use on this procurement.



 Kyle Murray
 Director, Financial Planning and Business Support

Report to Community and Protective Services Committee

To: Chair and Members,
Community and Protective Services Committee

From: Cheryl Smith, Deputy City Manager, Neighbourhood and
Community-Wide Services

Subject: London Fire Department Single Source Apparatus
Procurement

Date: August 31, 2021

Recommendation

That, on the recommendation of the Deputy City Manager, Neighbourhood and Community-Wide Services, the following actions be taken with respect to the single source procurement of a fire apparatus:

- a) in accordance with Sections 14.4(d) and (k) of the Procurement of Goods and Services Policy, Fire Administration **BE AUTHORIZED** to enter into negotiations with 1200⁰ Darch Fire of 9-402 Harmony Road, Ayr, Ontario, N0B 1E0 for pricing for a single source contract for one (1) year for the provision of one fire Engine for the London Fire Department;
- b) the approval a) above, **BE CONDITIONAL** upon The Corporation of the City of London negotiating satisfactory prices, terms, conditions, and entering into a contract with 1200⁰ Darch Fire to provide one fire Engine to the London Fire Department;
- c) the Civic Administration **BE AUTHORIZED** to undertake all the administrative acts that are necessary in connection with the authorization set out in parts a) and b) above; and,
- d) that the funding for this procurement **BE APPROVED** as set out in the Source of Financing Report attached, hereto, as Appendix A.

Executive Summary

This report requests authorization from Council for the immediate single source purchase of one fire Engine to manage interruptions to the level of service provided by the London Fire Department and to help mitigate the current vehicle shortage crisis.

Linkage to the Corporate Strategic Plan

Strengthening our Community

This London Fire Department Single Source Apparatus Procurement is aligned with the following strategic area of focus and outcome from the City of London Strategic Plan 2019-2023:

- Strengthening our Community – Londoners have access to the services and supports that promote well-being, health, and safety in their neighbourhoods and across the city.

Analysis

1.0 Background Information

1.1 Context

The London Fire Department (“LFD”) relies on having spare vehicles available to replace front-line vehicles that require maintenance. Without an adequate number of spare vehicles, the level of service has already been impacted. The current approved spare fleet consists of four Engines (pumpers), one Aerial, and one Tanker. On August 17, 2021, an emergency procurement took place for the replacement of Engine 2. However, with no spare vehicles available, it is still an urgent situation.

Two of the LFD’s spare Engines are currently receiving emergency repairs, are out of service, and are not anticipated to be returned until near the end of August. Further to this, the LFD has experienced unexpected breakdowns as well as traffic accidents involving in-service vehicles that continue to strain resources. The LFD has also had to frequently shift several other vehicles between stations to ensure available service across the City.

With long term maintenance issues on vehicles and the need to decommission those beyond repair, the strain on resources is such that this expeditious purchase is necessary. With the remaining Spare Engines being assigned to various stations, any further breakdowns, accidents, or other unforeseen circumstances will mean a negative impact to service levels.

2.0 Discussion and Considerations

2.1 Severity of Issue Leading to Single Source Apparatus Procurement

In May 2021, two Spare Engines had to be sent for emergency repairs due to extensive frame corrosion and impending failure. This left the LFD with only two Spare Engines with which to work. These are currently assigned to Station 7 and Station 2 for the long term with no spare Engines available. The LFD continues to experience issues with several other vehicles, ranging from collisions, unexpected mechanical breakdowns, to not meeting maintenance standards during inspections. This has resulted in all or part of these vehicles having to be placed out of service.

There is currently a wait time of approximately 18 months to purchase and outfit new vehicles of this size and capacity. The LFD has an Apparatus and Equipment Committee that has been working diligently to prepare specifications for a Request for Proposal document that will allow the purchase of five new apparatus before the end of 2023. This process takes several months at best, followed by the approximately 18-month period for delivery of the first purchased vehicle. With the current apparatus shortage crisis, there is a very high risk during this waiting period that reductions in service will continue to occur and worsen in severity.

To address this crisis, it has become imperative that the LFD purchase an Engine to replace an aging vehicle utilizing the single source procurement clause as outlined in sections 14.4(d) and (k) of the Procurement of Goods and Services Policy (see below). To this end, the Deputy City Manager, Neighbourhood and Community-Wide Services, seeks authorization to have this Engine procured from a single source.

Sections 14.4(d) and (k) of the Procurement of Goods & Services Policy

14.4 Single Source

Single Source means that there is more than one source of supply in the open market, but only one source is recommended due to predetermined and approved specifications.

The procurement may be conducted using a Single Source process if the goods and/or services are available from more than one source, but there are valid and sufficient reasons for selecting one supplier in particular, as follows:

d. There is a need for compatibility with goods and/or services previously acquired or the required goods and/or services will be additional to similar goods and/or services being supplied under an existing contract (i.e., contract extension or renewal);

k. Where due to abnormal market conditions, the goods, services or construction required are in short supply.

There are some demonstration Engines available through various suppliers, which have been assessed by the Fire Mechanical Division as well as some LFD personnel who are knowledgeable about fire vehicles. This group reviewed all specifications of the available demonstration Engines and selected one that will require the least amount of retrofitting to meet the LFD and the City of London's needs. Compatibility with the current fleet of fire apparatus is essential and will ensure that the LFD Mechanical Division can maintain these vehicles efficiently. It is a unique opportunity for the City of London that these demonstration vehicles can be available for such timely delivery, especially given the current market shortages of commodities.

2.2 Details of Purchase

The supplier of the available fire Engine selected by the subject matter expert group at the LFD is 1200⁰ Darch Fire. This Engine is available for immediate purchase with an expected delivery date in September 2021. The price of this Engine is \$695,000 (excluding HST) and the estimated cost for equipping the Engine is \$150,000 (including HST). This delivery, outfitting, and putting into service is expected to be completed by the end of September to the beginning of October.

It should be noted that the most recent Engine purchase in 2019 was \$775,000 not including any equipment. The emergency procurement just completed for \$750,940 (excluding HST) is a vehicle with differing specifications, some of which will be incorporated into this single source purchase. Being that these vehicles are prebuilt, the prices are fixed.

3.0 Next Steps

The LFD will continue to have all vehicles regularly inspected and serviced by its Mechanical Division. There are more front-line vehicles in the fleet expected to need significant maintenance before their current lifecycle is complete. Plans are being made to mitigate these expenses. These plans include scheduling lifecycle replacements to minimize expenses, organizing processes to ensure vehicles that require repair are serviced in a timely manner, and maintaining vehicles for a period of time after expense to ensure a return on investment.

In addition, the LFD is in the process of drafting the Fire Master Plan, which will go to the Community and Protective Services Committee later in 2021. This 10-year Plan provides an overall vision, direction, and guidance for Council to make decisions about service improvements and enhancements through fire hall locations, fleet configuration, and any other elements that affect the delivery of fire services to match the growing needs of the community. As part of the development of this Plan, Civic Administration is reviewing the current lifecycle of all fire department vehicles.

The current lifecycle standard for all large vehicles is 20 years (17 years front-line plus 3 additional years as a spare). The plan is to gradually reduce this lifecycle to avoid another shortage in the future. The Request for Proposal process that is well underway involves the purchase of five new apparatus before the end of 2023, and then regular purchases in line with the next multi-year budget plan.

4.0 Financial Impact/Considerations

Funding for this purchase is available in the Fire capital plan per the Source of Financing Report attached as Appendix A.

Conclusion

Immediate single source procurement of one fire Engine as per Sections 14.4(d) and (k) of the Procurement of Goods and Services Policy is required to minimize the impact to fire service levels and to maintain essential City services.

Prepared by: Katerina Barton, Manager, Finance and Planning, Fire Services
Submitted by: Lori Hamer, Fire Chief
Recommended by: Cheryl Smith, Deputy City Manager, Neighbourhood and Community-Wide Services

c: John Freeman, Manager, Purchasing and Supply, Finance Supports
Doug Drummond, Financial Business Administrator, Finance Supports
Jason Davies, Manager III, Financial Planning & Policy

Appendix "A"

#21154
 August 31, 2021
 (Award Contract)

Chair and Members
 Community and Protective Services Committee

RE: London Fire Department Single Source Apparatus Procurement
 (Subledger FLT21003)
 Capital Project FS115221 - Emergency Fire Vehicle
 1200^g Darch Fire - \$695,000 (excluding HST)

Finance Supports Report on the Sources of Financing:

Finance Supports confirms that the cost of this project cannot be accommodated within the financing available for it in the Capital Budget, but can be accommodated by advancing approved 2023 financing within the Fire Capital Plan, and that, subject to the approval of the Deputy City Manager, Neighbourhood and Community-Wide Services, the detailed source of financing for this project is:

Estimated Expenditures	Approved Budget	Advanced Financing (Note 1)	Revised Budget	Committed To Date	This Submission	Balance for Future Work
Vehicles and Equipment	1,419,156	773,000	2,192,156	914,156	857,232	420,768
Total Expenditures	\$1,419,156	\$773,000	\$2,192,156	\$914,156	\$857,232	\$420,768

Sources of Financing


Drawdown from Fire Facilities, Vehicle, and Equipment Renewal Reserve Fund	735,000	0	735,000	230,000	84,232	420,768
Drawdown from Fire Facilities, Vehicle, and Equipment Renewal Reserve Fund - Advanced from 2023 approved Capital Budget	0	773,000	773,000	0	773,000	0
Corporate Contingency Budget	684,156	0	684,156	684,156	0	0
Total Financing	\$1,419,156	\$773,000	\$2,192,156	\$914,156	\$857,232	\$420,768

Financial Note:

Contract Price	\$695,000
Add: HST @13%	\$90,350
Total Contract Price Including Taxes	\$785,350
Less: HST Rebate	-\$78,118
Add: Internal cost to equip engine	\$150,000
Net Contract Price	<u>\$857,232</u>

Note 1: The additional funding requirement can be accommodated by advancing \$773 thousand of the \$938 thousand 2023 approved budget in FS115223.

Note 2: The remaining life-to-date funding in FS115221 - Emergency Fire Vehicles is earmarked for the scheduled replacement of other fire vehicles and not available for use on this procurement.



 Kyle Murray
 Director, Financial Planning and Business Support

Report to Community and Protective Services Committee

To: Chair and Members
Community and Protective Services Committee

From: Cheryl Smith, Deputy City Manager, Neighbourhood and Community-Wide Services

Subject: Investing in Canada Infrastructure Plan: Community, Culture, and Recreation Stream – Transfer Payment Agreement

Date: August 31, 2021

Recommendation

That, on the recommendation of the Deputy City Manager, Neighbourhood and Community-Wide Services, the attached proposed by-law (Appendix “A”) **BE INTRODUCED** at the Municipal Council meeting on September 14, 2021, to:

- a) approve the Transfer Payment Agreement, attached as Schedule A to the proposed by-law, for the Investing in Canada Infrastructure Plan: Community, Culture, and Recreation Stream funding (the “Agreement”) between Her Majesty the Queen in Right of Ontario as represented by the Minister of Infrastructure for the Province of Ontario and The Corporation of the City of London;
- b) authorize the Mayor and the City Clerk to execute the Agreement;
- c) delegate authority to the Deputy City Manager, Neighbourhood and Community-Wide Services, or written delegate, to approve further Amending Agreements to the above-noted Transfer Payment Agreement for the Investing in Canada Infrastructure Plan Funding; and,
- d) authorize the Deputy City Manager, Neighbourhood and Community-Wide Services (or delegate) to execute any financial reports required under this Agreement.

Executive Summary

This report recommends that The Corporation of the City of London enter into the Investing in Canada Infrastructure Plan Transfer Payment Agreement between Her Majesty the Queen in Right of Ontario as represented by the Minister of Infrastructure (the “Province”) and The Corporation of the City of London (the “Recipient”), attached as Schedule A to the proposed by-law.

Linkage to the Corporate Strategic Plan

The Investing in Canada Infrastructure Plan funding is aligned with the following strategic area of focus and outcome from the City of London Strategic Plan 2019-2023:

- Building a Sustainable City – London’s infrastructure is built, maintained, and operated to meet the long-term needs of our community.

Analysis

1.0 Discussion and Considerations

1.1 Background and Purpose

In August 2019, the Province of Ontario announced the opening of the Community, Culture, and Recreation (CCR) Stream of funding under the Federal Investing in Canada Infrastructure Plan (ICIP).

Projects must contribute to improved access to and/or increased quality of cultural, recreational and/or community infrastructure, including Indigenous peoples and vulnerable populations.

The cost-sharing breakdown requires a minimum contribution by the Municipality of 26.67% of the total project cost with the Federal share at 40% and the Provincial share at 33.33%.

Municipalities and other eligible recipients were invited to submit projects starting on September 3, 2019, within two (2) categories:

1) Multi-purpose Category:

- New build, large-scale renovation or expansion of existing facility projects that provide integrated service delivery to address identified service gaps.
- Projects not to exceed \$50 million in total project costs.

2) Rehabilitation and Renovation Category:

- Renovation or rehabilitation that would improve the condition of existing facilities including small-scale improvements to address accessibility as well as small new build/construction projects of recreation, cultural or community infrastructure (e.g. playing fields, tennis courts, small community squares).
- Projects not to exceed \$5 million in total project costs.

On September 10, 2019, Civic Administration brought forward a report to the Community and Protective Services Committee, [Investing in Canada Infrastructure Program – Community, Culture and Recreation - Community and Protective Services Committee - September 10, 2019 \(escribemeetings.com\)](#), outlining seven (7) projects that were submitted to the CCR ICIP, with one (1) being in the multi-purpose category, and the remaining six (6) being in the rehabilitation and renovation category.

On January 8, 2021, The Corporation of the City of London was made aware that two (2) projects were successful in receiving funds through the program, Labatt Park and Carling Heights Optimist Community Centre (CHOCC), both in the rehabilitation and renovation category. A virtual funding announcement with all levels of government took place on March 4, 2021.

The purpose of this report is to:

- 1) Provide a summary and overview of London's successful projects; and,
- 2) Present for consideration of approval the ICIP Transfer Payment Agreement between Her Majesty the Queen in right of Ontario as represented by the Minister of Infrastructure (the "Province") and The Corporation of the City of London (the "Recipient").

1.2 Summary of City of London ICIP Funded Projects

1) Labatt Park:

- Project includes the installation of accessible washrooms, repair and replacement of bleachers, and replacement of sport lighting.
- Design to begin in the fall of 2021.
- Start of construction is scheduled for September 30, 2022, with completion scheduled for April 30, 2023.

2) Carling Heights Optimist Community Centre (CHOCC):

- Project includes converting current multi-purpose space into a teaching kitchen space, storage and meeting room, installation of an elevator, and renew the building envelope components: doors, flashing, and brick repair.
- Design to begin in the spring of 2022.
- Start of construction is scheduled for March 31, 2023, with completion scheduled for March 31, 2024.

It should be noted that the above dates and timing of projects were selected to minimize impact on user groups who utilize both facilities and that Civic Administration will follow City Council's Public Notice Policy to guide engagement activities with stakeholders and members of the public.

2.0 Financial Impact/Considerations

There is no financial impact to the City of London when entering into the Transfer Payment Agreements for Labatt Park and Carling Heights Optimist Community Centre as the municipal share is from existing approved capital budgets for life-cycle renewal (LCR) at these two (2) locations.

CCR ICIP Funding	Time Period	Federal Funding (40%)	Province Funding (33.33%)	City of London Funding (26.67%)	Total
Labatt Park	Fall 2021 – Spring 2023	\$814,000	\$678,266	\$542,734	\$2,035,000
CHOCC	Spring 2022 – Spring 2024	\$748,000	\$623,271	\$498,729	\$1,870,000

Conclusion

This report introduces a by-law to seek approval of the Transfer Payment Agreement between the Her Majesty the Queen in Right of Ontario as represented by the Minister of Infrastructure for the Province of Ontario and The Corporation of the City of London with respect to the Community, Culture, and Recreation (CCR) funding stream of the Investing in Canada infrastructure Plan and authorize the Mayor and the City Clerk to execute the agreement and any future amending agreements.

Prepared by: Jon-Paul McGonigle, Director, Recreation and Sport

Recommended by: Cheryl Smith, Deputy City Manager, Neighbourhood and Community-Wide Services

Appendix “A”

Bill No.
2021

By-law No.

A by-law to approve and authorize the execution of the Transfer Payment Agreement between Her Majesty the Queen in right of the Province of Ontario, as represented by the Minister of Infrastructure for the Province of Ontario and The Corporation of the City of London

WHEREAS subsection 5(3) of the *Municipal Act, 2001*, S.O. 2001, c. 25, as amended, provides that a municipal power shall be exercised by by-law;

AND WHEREAS section 9 of the *Municipal Act, 2001* provides that a municipality has the capacity, rights, powers, and privileges of a natural person for the purpose of exercising its authority under this or any other Act;

AND WHEREAS subsection 10(1) of the *Municipal Act, 2001* provides that a municipality may provide any service or thing that the municipality considers necessary or desirable for the public;

AND WHEREAS subsection 10(2) of the *Municipal Act, 2001* provides that a municipality may pass by-laws respecting economic, social, and environmental well-being of the municipality, including respecting climate change; and the financial management of the municipality;

NOW THEREFORE the Municipal Council of The Corporation of the City of London enacts as follows:

1. Investing in Canada Infrastructure Plan Transfer Payment Agreement (the “Agreement”) between Her Majesty the Queen in right of the Province of Ontario, as represented by the Minister of Infrastructure for the Province of Ontario and The Corporation of the City of London, substantially in the form attached as Schedule “A” to this by-law is hereby authorized and approved.
2. The Mayor and the City Clerk are hereby authorized to execute the Transfer Payment Agreement authorized and approved under section 1 of this by-law.
3. The Deputy City Manager, Neighbourhood and Community-Wide Services or written designate is delegated the authority to approve and execute any further Amendments to the Agreement if the Amendments are substantially in the form of the Agreement, approved in section 1, above.
4. The Deputy City Manager, Neighbourhood and Community-Wide Services or written designate is delegated the authority to undertake all the administrative, financial, and reporting acts that are necessary in connection with the Agreement as approved in section 1, above
5. This by-law shall come into force and effect on the day it is passed.

PASSED in Open Council on , 2021

Ed Holder
Mayor

Catharine Saunders
City Clerk

First Reading –
Second Reading –
Third Reading –

**TRANSFER PAYMENT AGREEMENT
FOR THE INVESTING IN CANADA INFRASTRUCTURE PROGRAM (ICIP):
COMMUNITY, CULTURE AND RECREATION STREAM**

THIS TRANSFER PAYMENT AGREEMENT for an Investing in Canada Infrastructure Program (ICIP): Community, Culture and Recreation (CCR) Stream Project (the “**Agreement**”) is effective as of the Effective Date.

B E T W E E N:

Her Majesty the Queen in right of Ontario,
as represented by the Minister of Infrastructure

(“**Ontario**” or the “**Province**”)

- and -

Corporation of the City of London

(CRA#119420883)

(the “**Recipient**”)

BACKGROUND

The Investing in Canada Infrastructure Program (“ICIP”) is a federal infrastructure program designed to create long-term economic growth, build inclusive, sustainable and resilient communities, and support a low-carbon economy.

The Government of Canada (“**Canada**”) announced, in its *Budget 2016* and *Budget 2017*, over \$180 billion for the ICIP to support sustainable and inclusive communities, while driving economic growth.

The Honourable Minister of Infrastructure and Communities and the Honourable Minister of Infrastructure entered into the Canada-Ontario Integrated Bilateral Agreement for the Investing in Canada Infrastructure Program for Canada to provide financial support to the Province.

Under the Bilateral Agreement, Canada agrees, amongst other things, to provide contribution funding to the Province under the Community, Culture and Recreation funding stream of ICIP. This stream supports projects that improve access to and / or quality of community, cultural, and recreation priority infrastructure projects.

Also, under the Bilateral Agreement, Ontario agrees to identify projects and be responsible for the transfer of ICIP and provincial funds to eligible recipients pursuant to transfer payment agreements.

The Recipient has applied to the Province for ICIP funds to assist the Recipient in carrying out a Community, Culture and Recreation stream project.

The Province has submitted to Canada for approval and the Province and Canada have approved, in accordance with the terms and conditions set out in the Bilateral Agreement, the Project as set out in Schedule “C”.

The Agreement sets out the terms and conditions upon which ICIP funds, up to the Maximum Funds, will be provided to the Recipient for carrying out the Project.

CONSIDERATION

In consideration of the mutual covenants and agreements contained in the Agreement and for other good and valuable consideration, the receipt and sufficiency of which are expressly acknowledged, the Province and the Recipient agree as follows:

1.0 ENTIRE AGREEMENT

1.1 **Schedules to the Agreement.** The following schedules and their sub-schedules, if any, form part of the Agreement:

Schedule “A” - General Terms and Conditions

Schedule “B” - Specific Information

Schedule “C” - Project Description, Financial Information, Timelines and Project Standards

Schedule “D” - Reports

Schedule “E” - Eligible Expenditures and Ineligible Expenditures

Schedule “F” - Evaluation

Schedule “G” - Communications Protocol

Schedule “H” - Disposal of Assets

Schedule “I” - Aboriginal Consultation Protocol

Schedule “J” - Requests for Payment and Payment Procedures

Schedule “K” - Committee

1.2 **Entire Agreement.** The Agreement constitutes the entire agreement between the Parties in respect to the subject matter contained in the Agreement and supersedes all prior oral or written representations and agreements save and except for the Bilateral Agreement, which shall apply in accordance with section Subsection 2.1.

2.0 CONFLICT OR INCONSISTENCY

2.1 **Conflict or Inconsistency.** In the event of a conflict or inconsistency between any of

the requirements of:

- (a) the Bilateral Agreement and the Agreement, the Bilateral Agreement will prevail to the extent of the conflict or inconsistency;
- (b) the main body of the Agreement and any of the requirements of a schedule or a sub-schedule, the main body of the Agreement will prevail to the extent of the conflict or inconsistency;
- (c) Schedule "A" (General Terms and Conditions) and any of the requirements of another schedule or a sub-schedule, Schedule "A" (General Terms and Conditions) will prevail to the extent of the conflict or inconsistency; or
- (d) a schedule and any of the requirements of a sub-schedule, the schedule will prevail to the extent of the conflict or inconsistency.

3.0 EXECUTION, DELIVERY AND COUNTERPARTS

3.1 One and the Same Agreement. The Agreement may be executed in any number of counterparts, each of which will be deemed an original, but all of which together will constitute one and the same instrument.

3.2 Electronic Execution and Delivery of Agreement. The parties agree that the Agreement may be validly executed electronically, and that their respective electronic signature is the legal equivalent of a manual signature. The electronic or manual signature of a party may be evidenced by one of the following means and transmission of the Agreement may be as follows:

- (i) a manual signature of an authorized signing representative placed in the respective signature line of the Agreement and the Agreement delivered by facsimile transmission to the other Party;
- (ii) a manual signature of an authorized signing representative placed in the respective signature line of the Agreement and the Agreement scanned as a Portable Document Format (PDF) and delivered by email to the other Party;
- (iii) a digital signature, including the name of the authorized signing representative typed in the respective signature line of the Agreement, an image of a manual signature or an Adobe signature of an authorized signing representative, or any other digital signature of an authorized signing representative, placed in the respective signature line of the Agreement and the Agreement delivered by email to the other Party; or
- (iv) any other means with the other Party's prior written consent.

4.0 AMENDING THE AGREEMENT AND AGREEMENT REVIEW

4.1 **Amending the Agreement.** The Agreement may only be amended by a written agreement duly executed by the Parties.

4.2 **Agreement Review.** If, pursuant to section 25.10 (Review of Agreement) of the Bilateral Agreement, the Bilateral Agreement is reviewed after three or five years, or both, of the effective date of the Bilateral Agreement, and any changes to the Bilateral Agreement are required as a result, the Parties agree to amend the Agreement as necessary and in a manner that is consistent with such changes.

5.0 ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

5.1 **Acknowledgement from Recipient.** The Recipient acknowledges, in respect of the Project, that:

- (a) the Funds are to assist the Recipient to carry out the Project and not to provide goods or services to the Province or Canada;
- (b) the Province and Canada are not responsible for carrying out the Project;
- (c) the Province's and Canada's role in respect of the Project is limited to making a financial contribution to the Recipient for the Project, and the Province and Canada are not involved in the Project or its operation;
- (d) the Province and Canada are neither decision-makers nor administrators in respect of the Project;
- (e) the Province is bound by the *Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act* (Ontario) and any information provided to the Province in connection with the Project or otherwise in connection with the Agreement may be subject to disclosure in accordance with that Act;
- (f) Canada is bound by the *Access to Information Act* (Canada) and any information provided to Canada by either the Province or the Recipient in connection with the Project or otherwise in connection with the Agreement may be subject to disclosure in accordance with that Act;
- (g) by receiving Funds, the Recipient may be subject to legislation applicable to organizations that receive funding from the Government of Ontario, including the *Broader Public Sector Accountability Act, 2010* (Ontario), the *Public Sector Salary Disclosure Act, 1996* (Ontario), and the *Auditor General Act* (Ontario); and

(h) the Recipient has read and understood the Bilateral Agreement.

5.2 **Acknowledgement from Province.** The Province acknowledges that the Recipient may be bound by the *Municipal Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act* (Ontario) and any information provided to the Recipient in connection with the Project or otherwise in connection with the Agreement may be subject to disclosure in accordance with that Act.

6.0 CANADA'S RIGHTS AND INFORMATION SHARING WITH CANADA

6.1 **Third Party Beneficiary.** The Recipient agrees that, although the Agreement is between the Province and the Recipient, Canada is, in respect of the rights, covenants, remedies, obligations, indemnities, and benefits (together referred to as "**Rights**") undertaken or given to Canada in the Agreement, a third party beneficiary under the Agreement and is entitled to rely upon and directly enforce those Rights as if Canada were a party to the Agreement.

6.2 **Sharing of Information with the Province and Canada.** The Recipient agrees that, consistent with section 6.1 (Third Party Beneficiary) and for the implementation of the Bilateral Agreement:

- (a) the Province or Canada, or both, and in respect of Canada either directly or through the Province, may, upon Notice to the Recipient, request additional information from the Recipient including, without limitation, information for any determination under Article A.27.0 (Environmental Requirements and Assessments) and Article A.28.0 (Aboriginal Consultation);
- (b) if the Province or Canada, or both, provide the Recipient with Notice under paragraph 6.2(a), the Recipient will, within the timelines set out in the Notice, deliver the information to either the Province or Canada, or both, as required; and
- (c) the Province or Canada, or both, may share any information received from the Recipient pursuant to the Agreement with each other.

[SIGNATURE PAGE FOLLOWS]

The Parties have executed the Agreement on the dates set out below.

HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN IN RIGHT OF ONTARIO, as
represented by the Minister of Infrastructure

Date

p.p. Adam Redish, Assistant Deputy Minister
The Honourable Kinga Surma
Minister of Infrastructure

AFFIX
CORPORATE
SEAL (if
applicable)

Corporation of the City of London

Date

Name:
Title:

I have authority to bind the Recipient.

Date

Name:
Title:

I have authority to bind the Recipient.

[SCHEDULE “A” – GENERAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS FOLLOWS]

**SCHEDULE “A”
GENERAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS**

A.1.0 INTERPRETATION AND DEFINITIONS

A.1.1 **Interpretation.** For the purposes of interpretation:

- (a) words in the singular include the plural and vice-versa;
- (b) words in one gender include all genders;
- (c) the background and headings do not form part of the Agreement; they are for information and reference only and will not affect the interpretation of the Agreement;
- (d) any reference to dollars or currency will be in Canadian dollars and currency;
- (e) “shall” and “will” are used interchangeably in the Agreement and denote the same affirmative and imperative obligation on the applicable Party.
- (f) all accounting terms not otherwise defined in the Agreement have their ordinary meanings; and
- (g) “include”, “includes”, and “including” denote that the subsequent list is not exhaustive.

A.1.2 **Definitions.** In the Agreement, the following terms have the following meanings:

“Aboriginal Community” has the meaning ascribed to it in section I.1.1 (Definitions).

“Aboriginal Consultation Record” means the Aboriginal Consultation Record described in section I.3.1 (Requirements for Aboriginal Consultation Record).

“Agreement” means this agreement entered into between the Province and the Recipient, all of the schedules and sub-schedules listed in section 1.1 (Schedules to the Agreement), and any amending agreement entered into pursuant to section 4.1 (Amending the Agreement).

“Asset” means any real or personal property, or immovable or movable asset, acquired, purchased, constructed, rehabilitated, or improved, in whole or in part, with any of the Funds.

“Authorities” means any government authority, agency, body or department having or claiming jurisdiction over the Agreement or the Project, or both.

“Bilateral Agreement” means the Canada-Ontario Integrated Bilateral Agreement for

the Investing in Canada Infrastructure Program entered into between Canada and Her Majesty the Queen in right of Ontario, effective as of March 26, 2018, as amended.

“Business Day” means any working day the Province is open for business, Monday to Friday inclusive, excluding statutory and other holidays, namely: New Year’s Day; Family Day; Good Friday; Easter Monday; Victoria Day; Canada Day; Civic Holiday; Labour Day; Thanksgiving Day; Remembrance Day; Christmas Day; Boxing Day; and any other day on which the Province is not open for business.

“Canada” means, unless the context requires otherwise, Her Majesty the Queen in right of Canada.

“Canada’s Maximum Contribution” means the maximum contribution from Canada as set out in Schedule “C”.

“Committee” refers to a Committee established pursuant to section A.29.1 (Establishment of Committee).

“Communications Activities” means, but is not limited to, public or media events or ceremonies including key milestone events, news releases, reports, web and social media products or postings, blogs, news conferences, public notices, physical and digital signs, publications, success stories and vignettes, photos, videos, multi-media content, advertising campaigns, awareness campaigns, editorials, multi-media products, and all related communication materials under the Agreement.

“Contract” means a contract between the Recipient and a Third Party whereby the Third Party agrees to supply goods or services, or both, in respect of the Project in return for financial consideration.

“Effective Date” means the date of signature by the last signing party to the Agreement.

“Eligible Expenditures” means the costs in respect of the Project that the Recipient has incurred and paid and that are eligible for payment under the terms and conditions of the Agreement, and that are further described in Schedule “E” (Eligible Expenditures and Ineligible Expenditures).

“Environmental Laws” means all applicable governmental, regulations, by-laws, orders, rules, policies, or guidelines respecting the protection of the natural environment or the public, and the manufacture, importation, handling, transportation, storage, disposal, and treatment of environmental contaminants and includes, without limitation, the *Environmental Protection Act* (Ontario), *Environmental Assessment Act* (Ontario), *Ontario Water Resources Act* (Ontario), *Canadian Environmental Protection Act, 1999* (Canada), *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, 2012* (Canada), *Fisheries Act* (Canada), and *the Canadian Navigable Waters Act* (Canada).

“Evaluation” means an evaluation in respect of the Project or the ICIP as described in Article F.1.0 (Project and ICIP Evaluations).

“Event of Default” has the meaning ascribed to it in section A.12.1 (Events of Default).

“Expiration Date” means the expiry date set out in Schedule “B” (Specific Information).

“Federal Approval Date” means the date on which Canada has approved the Project identified in Schedule “C” (Project Description, Financial Information, Timelines, and Project Standards).

“Funding Year” means:

- (a) in the case of the first Funding Year, the period commencing on the Effective Date and ending on the following March 31; and
- (b) in the case of Funding Years subsequent to the first Funding Year, the period commencing on April 1 following the end of the previous Funding Year and ending on the following March 31 or the Expiration Date, whichever comes first.

“Funds” means the money the Province provides to the Recipient pursuant to the Agreement, and in any event, will not exceed the Maximum Funds.

“Holdback” means the Holdback described in and to be paid in accordance with section A.4.12 (Retention of Contribution) and Article J.7.0 (Holdback).

“ICIP” means the Investing in Canada Infrastructure Program, a federal infrastructure program described in the first paragraph of the “Background” to the Agreement.

“Indemnified Parties” means Her Majesty the Queen in right of Ontario and Her Majesty the Queen in right of Canada, and includes their respective ministers, officers, servants, agents, appointees and employees.

“Ineligible Expenditures” means the costs that are ineligible for payment under the terms and conditions of the Agreement, and that are described in Schedule “E” (Eligible Expenditures and Ineligible Expenditures).

“Interest or Interest Earned” means the amount of money earned by the Recipient from placing the Funds in an interest bearing account as set out under section A.4.4 of Schedule “A” of this Agreement, and includes any and all interest or other income generated from the Funds.

“Loss” means any cause of action, liability, loss, cost, damage, or expense (including

legal, expert, and consultant fees) that anyone incurs or sustains as a result of or in connection with the Project or any part of the Agreement or the Bilateral Agreement.

“Maximum Funds” means the maximum Funds amount as set out in Schedule “B” (Specific Information).

“Notice” means any communication given or required to be given pursuant to the Agreement.

“Ontario’s Maximum Contribution” means the maximum contribution from Ontario as set out in Schedule “C”.

“Parties” means the Province and the Recipient.

“Party” means either the Province or the Recipient.

“Person” means, without limitation, a person, the Recipient, a Third Party, a corporation, or any other legal entity, and their officers, servants, employees, or agents.

“Proceeding” means any action, claim, demand, lawsuit, or other proceeding, whether in contract, tort (including negligence), or otherwise, that anyone makes, brings, or prosecutes as a result of or in connection with the Project or any part of the Agreement or the Bilateral Agreement.

“Progress Report” means the Progress Report described in Article D.1.0 (Reporting Requirements).

“Project” means the undertaking described in Schedule “C” (Project Description, Financial Information, Timelines, and Project Standards).

“Records Review” means any assessment the Province conducts pursuant to section A.7.4 (Records Review).

“Remedial Period” means the period of time within which the Recipient is required to remedy an Event of Default, pursuant to paragraph A.12.3 (b), and includes any such period or periods of time by which the Province extends that time in accordance with section A.12.4 (Recipient Not Remediating).

“Reports” means the reports described in Schedule “D” (Reports).

“Requirements of Law” means all applicable requirements, laws, statutes, codes, acts, ordinances, approvals, orders, decrees, injunctions, by-laws, rules, regulations, official plans, permits, licences, authorizations, directions, and agreements with all Authorities, and includes the Environmental Laws.

“Substantial Completion” or **“Substantially Completed”** means that the Project can be used for the purpose for which it was intended and, in any event, no later than March 31, 2027.

“Term” means the period of time described in section A.3.1 (Term).

“Third Party” means any person or legal entity, other than a Party, who participates in the implementation of the Project by means of a Contract.

“Total Financial Assistance” means the total Project funding from all sources including, but not limited to, funding from federal, provincial, territorial, municipal, regional, band council, and Indigenous government sources; private sources; and in-kind contributions.

A.2.0 REPRESENTATIONS, WARRANTIES, AND COVENANTS

A.2.1 General. The Recipient represents, warrants, and covenants that, in respect of the Project:

- (a) it has, and will continue to have, the experience and expertise necessary to carry out the Project;
- (b) it is in compliance with, and will continue to comply with, all Requirements of Law related to any aspect of the Project, the Funds, or both;
- (c) unless otherwise provided for in the Agreement, any information the Recipient provided to the Province in support of its request for Funds (including, without limitation, any information relating to any eligibility requirements) was true and complete at the time the Recipient provided it and will continue to be true and complete;
- (d) the Project meets and will continue to meet all of the program’s eligibility criteria, construction conditions and the Recipient will abide by all of the Province’s and Canada’s respective requirements set out in the guidelines, including the financial, contractual and reporting requirements;
- (e) the Project meets the outcomes of the Community, Culture and Recreation stream, being:
 - (i) Improved access to and/or increased quality of cultural, recreational and/or community infrastructure for Canadians, including Indigenous peoples and vulnerable populations.
- (f) any Funds received have not displaced, and will continue to not displace, the Recipient’s own funding and spending on public transit.

A.2.2 **Execution of Agreement.** The Recipient represents and warrants that it has:

- (a) the full power and authority to enter into the Agreement; and
- (b) taken all necessary actions to authorize the execution of the Agreement, in a manner that is satisfactory to the Province, including passing of municipal by-law or council resolution authorizing the Recipient to enter into the Agreement, where required.

A.2.3 **Governance.** The Recipient represents, warrants, and covenants that it has, will maintain in writing, and will follow:

- (a) procedures to enable the Recipient to manage Funds prudently and effectively;
- (b) procedures to enable the Recipient to complete the Project successfully;
- (c) procedures to enable the Recipient to identify risks to the completion of the Project and strategies to address the identified risks, all in a timely manner;
- (d) procedures to enable the preparation and submission of all Reports required pursuant to Article A.7.0 (Reporting, Accounting, and Review); and
- (e) procedures to enable the Recipient to address such other matters as the Recipient considers necessary to enable the Recipient to carry out its obligations under the Agreement.

A.2.4 **Supporting Proof.** Upon the request of the Province, the Recipient will provide the Province with proof of the matters referred to in this Article A.2.0 (Representations, Warranties, and Covenants).

A.3.0 TERM OF THE AGREEMENT AND SUBSTANTIAL COMPLETION

A.3.1 **Term.** The term of the Agreement will commence on the Effective Date and will expire on the Expiration Date, unless terminated earlier pursuant to Article A.11.0 (Termination on Notice) or Article A.12.0 (Event of Default, Corrective Action, and Termination for Default).

A.3.2 **Substantial Completion.** The Recipient will ensure that the Project is Substantially Completed on or before March 31, 2027.

A.4.0 FUNDS AND CARRYING OUT THE PROJECT

A.4.1 Funds Provided. The Province will:

- (a) provide the Recipient funding up to the Maximum Funds for the sole purpose of carrying out the Project;
- (b) provide the Funds to the Recipient in accordance with the request for payment and payment procedures provided for in Schedule “J” (Requests for Payment and Payment Procedures); and
- (c) deposit the Funds into an account the Recipient designates, provided that the account:
 - (i) is at a branch of a Canadian financial institution in Ontario; and
 - (ii) is solely in the name of the Recipient.

A.4.2 Limitation on Payment of Funds. Despite section A.4.1 (Funds Provided):

- (a) in addition to any other limitation under the Agreement on the payment of Funds, the Province is not obligated to provide:
 - (i) any Funds to the Recipient until the Recipient fulfils the special conditions listed in section A.31.1 (Special Conditions); and
 - (ii) any Funds to the Recipient until the Province and Canada are satisfied with the progress of the Project;
- (b) the Province, at its sole discretion, may adjust the amount of Funds it provides to the Recipient based upon the Province’s assessment of the information the Recipient provides to the Province pursuant to section A.7.2 (Preparation and Submission); and
- (c) any payment of Funds is subject to:
 - (i) the requirements of the *Financial Administration Act* (Ontario), including the availability of an appropriation by the Ontario Legislature that is sufficient and constitutes lawful authority for the payment;
 - (ii) ministerial funding levels in respect of transfer payments, the program under which the Agreement was made, or otherwise that are sufficient for the payment; and
 - (iii) Canada’s payment of funds to the Province, pursuant to the Bilateral Agreement, that are sufficient for the payment.

The Province, at its sole discretion, may reduce or cancel any amount of Funds or terminate the Agreement in response to a reduction or lack of federal or

provincial government appropriation, ministerial funding levels, or Canada's payment of funds. Notwithstanding Article A.9.0 (Limitation of Liability and Indemnity), the Province will not be liable for any direct, indirect, consequential, exemplary, or punitive damages, regardless of the form of action, whether in contract or in tort (including negligence) or otherwise, arising from any reduction or cancellation of Funds. If any changes to the Agreement, including changes in respect of the Project, are required as a result, the Parties agree to amend the Agreement accordingly.

A.4.3 Use of Funds and Carry Out the Project. The Recipient will, in respect of the Project, do all of the following:

- (a) carry out the Project in accordance with the Agreement;
- (b) use the Funds only for the purpose of carrying out the Project;
- (c) spend the Funds only on Eligible Expenditures as described in Schedule "E" (Eligible Expenditures and Ineligible Expenditures);
- (d) not use the Funds to cover any Ineligible Expenditure; and
- (e) not use the Funds to cover any Eligible Expenditure that has or will be funded or reimbursed by one or more of any third party, or ministry, department, agency, or organization of the Government of Ontario or of the Government of Canada.

A.4.4 Interest-Bearing Account. If for any reason, Funds were provided to the Recipient before the Recipient's immediate need for the Funds, the Recipient will place the Funds in an interest-bearing account solely in the name of the Recipient at a branch of a Canadian financial institution in Ontario. The Recipient will hold the Funds plus any Interest Earned in trust for the Province until the Funds are used in accordance with the Agreement.

A.4.5 Interest. If the Recipient earns any Interest on the Funds, the Province may do either or both of the following:

- (a) deduct an amount equal to the Interest Earned from the remaining Funds, if any;
- (b) demand from the Recipient the payment of an amount equal to the Interest Earned.

A.4.6 Maximum Funds and Recovery of Excesses. The Recipient acknowledges that:

- (a) the Funds available to it pursuant to the Agreement will not exceed the Maximum Funds;
- (b) if Canada's total contribution from all federal sources in respect of the Project

exceeds forty percent of Total Eligible Expenditures, the Province may demand the return of the excess from the Recipient and the Recipient shall return the excess forthwith or the Province, at its discretion, may reduce the remaining Funds under the Agreement by an amount equal to the excess;

- (c) if the Total Financial Assistance received in respect of the Project exceeds one hundred percent (100%) of Total Eligible Expenditures, the Province, at its sole discretion, may, up to the Maximum Funds, demand the return of the excess from the Recipient and the Recipient shall return the excess forthwith or the Province may reduce the remaining Funds under the Agreement by an amount equal to the excess.

A.4.7 **Disclosure of Other Financial Assistance.** The Recipient will inform the Province promptly of any financial assistance received in respect of the Project.

A.4.8 **Rebates, Credits, and Refunds.** The Province will, in respect of the Project, calculate Funds based on the actual costs to the Recipient to carry out the Project, less any costs (including taxes) for which the Recipient has received, will receive, or is eligible to receive, a rebate, credit, or refund.

A.4.9 **Recipient's Acknowledgement of Responsibility for Project.** The Recipient will, in respect of the Project, assume full responsibility for the Project, including, without limitation:

- (a) complete, diligent, and timely Project implementation within the costs and timelines specified in the Agreement and in accordance with all other terms and conditions of the Agreement;
- (b) all of the costs of the Project, including, without limitation, unapproved expenditures, Ineligible Expenditures, and cost overruns, if any;
- (c) subsequent operation, maintenance, repair, rehabilitation, construction, demolition, or reconstruction, as required and in accordance with industry standards, and any related costs for the full lifecycle of the Project; and
- (d) the engineering work being undertaken in accordance with industry standards.

A.4.10 **Increase in Project Costs.** If, at any time during the Term the Recipient determines that it will not be possible to complete the Project unless it expends amounts in excess of all funding available to it (a "**Shortfall**"), the Recipient will immediately notify the Province of that determination. If the Recipient so notifies the Province, it will, within 30 days of a request from the Province, provide a summary of the measures that it proposes to remedy the Shortfall. If the Province is not satisfied that the measures proposed will be adequate to remedy the Shortfall, then the Province may exercise one or more of the remedies available to it pursuant to section A.12.4 (Recipient Not Remediating).

A.4.11 **Recipient's Request for Payment and Payment Procedures.** The Recipient agrees to submit its requests for payment in accordance with the payment procedures provided for in Schedule "J" (Requests for Payment and Payment Procedures).

A.4.12 **Retention of Contribution.** The Province will retain 10% of the Maximum Funds in respect of the Project ("**Holdback**") up until the Recipient has fulfilled all of its obligations under the Agreement for the Project.

A.5.0 RECIPIENT'S ACQUISITION OF GOODS OR SERVICES, CONTRACT PROVISIONS, AND DISPOSAL OF ASSETS

A.5.1 **Acquisition.** The Recipient will ensure that all Contracts are awarded in way that is:

- (a) is fair, transparent, competitive, and consistent with value for money principles, or in a manner otherwise acceptable to the Province and Canada; and
- (b) if applicable, is in accordance with the Canadian Free Trade Agreement and international agreements.

A.5.2 **Non-Compliance with Acquisition Requirements.** If the Province or Canada determines that a Contract is awarded in a manner that is not in compliance with the requirements in section A.5.1 (Acquisition), upon giving Notice to the Recipient, the Province may consider the expenditures associated with the Contract to be an Ineligible Expenditure.

A.5.3 **Exemptions to Competitive Awarding.** The Province and Canada may consent to the provision of exemptions from competitive awarding of Contracts on a case-by-case basis, in their sole and absolute discretion, if the Recipient:

- (a) provides a written request indicating the business case rationale for the exemption, in advance of the Contract being awarded;
- (b) attests to:
 - (i) following value-for-money procurement processes for materials and sub-contracts; and
 - (ii) following its own policies and procedures.

A.5.4 **Contract Provisions.** The Recipient will ensure that all Contracts are consistent with and incorporate the relevant provisions of the Agreement, including its insurance provisions. More specifically, but without limiting the generality of the foregoing, the Recipient agrees to include provisions in all Contracts to ensure:

- (a) that proper and accurate accounts and records are kept and maintained as described in the Agreement including, but not limited to, in paragraph A.7.3(a);
- (b) that all applicable Requirements of Law including, without limitation, labour and human rights legislation, are complied with; and
- (c) that the Contract secures the respective rights of the Province and Canada, and any authorized representative or independent auditor identified by the Province or Canada, and the Auditor General of Ontario and the Auditor General of Canada to:
 - (i) inspect and audit the terms of any Contract, record or account in respect of the Project; and
 - (ii) have free and timely access to the Project sites and facilities, and any records, documentation or information, as contemplated pursuant to section A.7.5 (Inspection and Removal).

A.5.5 Disposal of Assets. The Recipient will not, unless in accordance with the terms and conditions set out in Schedule “H” (Disposal of Assets), sell, lease, encumber, or otherwise dispose, directly or indirectly, of any Asset.

A.6.0 CONFLICT OF INTEREST

A.6.1 Conflict of Interest Includes. For the purposes of this Article A.6.0 (Conflict of Interest), a conflict of interest includes any circumstances where:

- (a) the Recipient or any person who has the capacity to influence the Recipient’s decisions has outside commitments, relationships, or financial interests that could, or could be seen by a reasonable person to interfere with the Recipient’s objective, unbiased, and impartial judgment in respect of the Project or the use of the Funds, or both; or
- (b) a former public servant or public office holder to whom any post-employment, ethics and conflict of interest legislation, guidelines, codes, or policies of Canada apply will derive a direct benefit from the Agreement, unless the provision or receipt of such benefits complies with such legislation, guidelines, policies, or codes.

A.6.2 No Conflict of Interest. The Recipient will carry out the Project and use the Funds without an actual, potential, or perceived conflict of interest unless:

- (a) the Recipient:
 - (i) provides Notice to the Province disclosing the details of the actual, potential,

or perceived conflict of interest; and

- (ii) requests the consent of the Province to carry out the Project with an actual, potential, or perceived conflict of interest;
- (b) the Province consents in writing to the Recipient carrying out the Project with an actual, potential, or perceived conflict of interest; and
- (c) the Recipient complies with any terms and conditions the Province may prescribe in its consent.

A.7.0 REPORTING, ACCOUNTING, AND REVIEW

A.7.1 Province and Canada Include. For the purpose of sections A.7.4 (Records Review), A.7.5 (Inspection and Removal) and A.7.6 (Cooperation), “Province” includes Canada and any auditor or representative that the Province or Canada, or both, may identify.

A.7.2 Preparation and Submission. The Recipient will:

- (a) submit to the Province at the address referred to in section A.15.1 (Notice in Writing and Addressed):
 - (i) all Reports in accordance with the timelines and content requirements provided for in Schedule “D” (Reports); and
 - (ii) any other reports in accordance with any timelines and content requirements the Province may specify from time to time; and
- (b) ensure that all Reports and other reports are:
 - (i) completed to the satisfaction of the Province; and
 - (ii) signed by an authorized signing officer of the Recipient.

A.7.3 Record Maintenance. The Recipient will keep and maintain until March 31, 2034 :

- (a) proper and accurate financial accounts and records, kept in a manner consistent with generally accepted accounting principles, including but not limited to its contracts, invoices, statements, receipts, and vouchers and any other evidence of payment relating to the Funds or otherwise to the Project; and
- (b) all non-financial records and documents relating to the Funds or otherwise to the Project.

- A.7.4 **Records Review.** The Province, at its sole discretion and expense, may, upon 24 hours' Notice to the Recipient and during normal business hours, enter upon the Recipient's premises to conduct an audit or investigation of the Recipient or the Project regarding the Recipient's compliance with the Agreement, including assessing any of the following:
- (a) the truth of any of the Recipient's representations and warranties;
 - (b) the progress of the Project; or
 - (c) the Recipient's allocation and expenditure of the Funds.
- A.7.5 **Inspection and Removal.** For the purposes of any Records Review, the Province may take one or more of the following actions:
- (a) inspect and copy any records or documents referred to in section A.7.3 (Record Maintenance);
 - (b) remove any copies the Province makes pursuant to section A.7.5(a); and
 - (c) share any documents, records and findings with Canada.
- A.7.6 **Cooperation.** To assist the Province in respect of its rights provided for in section A.7.5 (Inspection and Removal), the Recipient will cooperate with the Province by:
- (a) ensuring that the Province has access to the records and documents wherever they are located;
 - (b) coordinating access with any Third Party;
 - (c) assisting the Province to copy the records and documents;
 - (d) providing to the Province, in the form the Province specifies, any information the Province identifies; and
 - (e) carrying out any other activities the Province requests.
- A.7.7 **No Control of Records.** No provision of the Agreement will be construed so as to give the Province or Canada, or both, any control whatsoever over the Recipient's records.
- A.7.8 **Auditor General (Ontario and Canada).** The Province's rights under this Article A.7.0 (Reporting, Accounting, and Review) are in addition to any rights provided to the Auditor General of Ontario pursuant to section 9.2 of the *Auditor General Act* (Ontario)

and to the Auditor General of Canada pursuant to section 7.1 of the *Auditor General Act* (Canada).

A.7.9 **Sharing of Audit Findings and Reports.** The Recipient acknowledges that Canada and the Province may:

- (a) inform each other, and any of their respective authorized representatives and auditors, that an audit is being conducted; and
- (b) share the findings of any audit or investigation, including any ensuing report, with each other and any of their respective authorized representatives and auditors.

A.7.10 **Evaluation.** The Recipient agrees to participate in any Evaluation and comply with the requirements for such Evaluation that are set out in Schedule “F” (Evaluation).

A.7.11 **Calculations.** The Recipient will make all calculations and prepare all financial data to be submitted in accordance with the generally accepted accounting principles in effect in Canada. These will include, without limitation, those principles and standards approved or recommended from time to time by the Chartered Professional Accountants of Canada or the Public Sector Accounting Board, as applicable, or any successor institute, applied on a consistent basis.

A.7.12 **Adverse Fact or Event.** The Recipient will inform the Province immediately of any fact or event of which it is aware that has or will compromise, wholly or in part, the Project.

A.8.0 COMMUNICATIONS REQUIREMENTS

A.8.1 **Communications Protocol.** The Parties agree to be bound by the terms and conditions of the communications protocol provided for in Schedule “G” (Communications Protocol).

A.9.0 LIMITATION OF LIABILITY AND INDEMNITY

A.9.1 **Province and Canada Limitation of Liability.** In no event will any of the Indemnified Parties be held liable for any damages, including direct, indirect, consequential, exemplary, or punitive damages, regardless of the form of action, whether in contract, tort (including negligence), or otherwise, for:

- (a) any injury to any Person, including, but not limited to, death, economic loss, or infringement of rights;
- (b) any damage to or loss or destruction of property of, any Person; or
- (c) any obligation of any Person, including, but not limited to, any obligation arising from a loan, capital lease, or other long-term obligation

in relation to the Agreement, the Bilateral Agreement, or the Project.

A.9.2 Indemnification of the Province and Canada. The Recipient will indemnify and hold harmless the Indemnified Parties from and against any Loss and any Proceeding based upon or occasioned by:

- (a) any injury to any Person, including, but not limited to, death, economic loss, or any infringement of rights;
- (b) any damage to, or loss or destruction of, property of any Person; or
- (c) any obligation of any Person, including, but not limited to, any obligation arising from a loan, capital lease, or other long-term obligation,

except to the extent to which such Loss or Proceeding is caused by the negligence or wilful misconduct of any Indemnified Party in the performance of that Indemnified Party's duties.

A.9.3 Recipient's Participation. The Recipient will, at its expense, to the extent requested by the Province or Canada, or both, participate in or conduct the defence of any Proceeding against any of the Indemnified Parties and any negotiations for their settlement.

A.9.4 Province's Election. The Province or Canada, or both, may elect to participate in, or conduct the defence of, any Proceeding by providing Notice to the Recipient of such election, without prejudice to any other rights or remedies of the Province under the Agreement or of the Province or Canada under the Bilateral Agreement, at law or in equity. If the Province, Canada, or the Recipient, as applicable, participates in the defence, it will do so by actively participating with the other's counsel.

A.9.5 Settlement Authority. The Recipient will not enter into a settlement of any Proceeding against any of the Indemnified Parties unless the Recipient has obtained from the Province or Canada, as applicable, prior written approval or a waiver of this requirement. If the Recipient is requested by the Province or Canada to participate in or conduct the defence of any Proceeding, the Province or Canada, as applicable, will cooperate with and assist the Recipient to the fullest extent possible in the Proceeding and any related settlement negotiations.

A.9.6 Recipient's Cooperation. If the Province or Canada conducts the defence of any Proceeding, the Recipient will cooperate with and assist the Province or Canada, as applicable, to the fullest extent possible in the Proceeding and any related settlement negotiations.

A.10.0 INSURANCE

A.10.1 Recipient's Insurance. The Recipient represents, warrants, and covenants that it has, and will maintain at its own cost and expense, with insurers having a secure A.M. Best rating of B+ or greater, or the equivalent, all the necessary and appropriate insurance that a prudent person carrying out a project similar to the Project would maintain, including commercial general liability insurance on an occurrence basis for third party bodily injury, personal injury, and property damage, to an inclusive limit of not less than \$2,000,000.00 per occurrence, and including products and completed operations coverage with the endorsements identified below:

- (a) the Indemnified Parties as additional insureds in respect of liability arising in the course of performance of the Recipient's obligations under, or otherwise in connection with, the Agreement;
- (b) a cross-liability clause;
- (c) contractual liability coverage; and
- (d) a 30-day written notice of cancellation.

A.10.2 Proof of Insurance. At the request of the Province from time to time, the Recipient will:

- (a) provide to the Province, either:
 - (i) annually, certificates of insurance that confirm the insurance coverage as provided in section A.10.1 (Recipient's Insurance); or
 - (ii) other proof that confirms the insurance coverage as provided for in section A.10.1 (Recipient's Insurance); and
- (b) at the Province's request, the Recipient will provide to the Province a copy of any of the Recipient's insurance policies that relate to the Project or otherwise to the Agreement or both.

A.11.0 TERMINATION ON NOTICE

A.11.1 Termination on Notice. The Province may terminate the Agreement at any time without liability, penalty, or costs upon giving at least 30 days' Notice to the Recipient.

A.11.2 Consequences of Termination on Notice by the Province. If the Province terminates the Agreement pursuant to section A.11.1 (Termination on Notice), the

Province may take one or more of the following actions:

- (a) Direct the Recipient not to incur any further costs for the Project subsequent to the Notice of termination. If the Recipient fails to comply with such direction and unless with the Province's prior written consent, the Recipient shall be solely responsible for any further costs incurred after such Notice was given;
- (b) cancel all further instalments of Funds; and
- (c) demand the payment of any Funds plus any Interest Earned remaining in the possession or under the control of the Recipient.

A.12.0 EVENT OF DEFAULT, CORRECTIVE ACTION, AND TERMINATION FOR DEFAULT

A.12.1 Events of Default. It will constitute an Event of Default if, in the opinion of the Province, the Recipient breaches any representation, warranty, covenant, or other material term of the Agreement, including:

- (a) failing to carry out the Project in whole or in part in accordance with the terms of the Agreement;
- (b) failing to use or spend Funds in accordance with the terms of the Agreement;
- (c) failing to provide, in accordance with section A.7.2 (Preparation and Submission), Reports or such other reports as the Province may have requested pursuant to the Agreement);
- (d) the Recipient's operations, its financial condition, its organizational structure or its control changes such that it no longer meets one or more of the eligibility requirements of the program under which the Province provides the Funds;
- (e) the Recipient makes an assignment, proposal, compromise, or arrangement for the benefit of creditors, or a creditor makes an application for an order adjudging the Recipient bankrupt, or applies for the appointment of a receiver; or
- (f) the Recipient ceases to operate.

A.12.2 Consequences of Events of Default and Corrective Action. If an Event of Default occurs, the Province may, at any time, and at its sole discretion, take one or more of the following actions:

- (a) initiate any action the Province considers necessary in order to facilitate the

successful continuation or completion of the Project;

- (b) provide the Recipient with an opportunity to remedy the Event of Default;
- (c) suspend the payment of Funds for such period as the Province determines appropriate;
- (d) reduce the amount of the Funds;
- (e) cancel all further instalments of Funds;
- (f) demand from the Recipient the payment of any Funds plus any Interest Earned remaining in the possession or under the control of the Recipient;
- (g) demand from the Recipient the payment of an amount equal to any Funds the Recipient used, but did not use in accordance with the Agreement;
- (h) demand from the Recipient the repayment of an amount equal to any Funds the Province provided to the Recipient;
- (i) demand from the Recipient an amount equal to the costs the Province incurred or incurs to enforce its rights under the Agreement, including the costs of any Records Review and the costs it incurs to collect any amounts the Recipient owes to the Province; and
- (j) terminate the Agreement at any time, including immediately, without liability, penalty, or costs to the Province upon giving Notice to the Recipient.

A.12.3 Opportunity to Remedy. If, in accordance with paragraph A.12.2(b), the Province provides the Recipient with an opportunity to remedy the Event of Default, the Province will provide Notice to the Recipient of:

- (a) the particulars of the Event of Default; and
- (b) the Remedial Period.

A.12.4 Recipient Not Remediating. If the Province provided the Recipient with an opportunity to remedy the Event of Default pursuant to paragraph A.12.2(b), and:

- (a) the Recipient does not remedy the Event of Default within the Remedial Period;
- (b) it becomes apparent to the Province that the Recipient cannot completely remedy the Event of Default within the Remedial Period; or
- (c) the Recipient is not proceeding to remedy the Event of Default in a way that is satisfactory to the Province,

the Province may extend the Remedial Period or initiate any one or more of the actions provided for in paragraphs A.12.2(a), (c), (d), (e), (f), (g), (h), (i) and (j).

A.12.5 **When Termination Effective.** Termination under this Article A.12.0 (Event of Default, Corrective Action, and Termination for Default) will take effect as provided for in the Notice.

A.13.0 FUNDS UPON EXPIRY

A.13.1 **Funds Upon Expiry.** The Recipient will, upon expiry of the Agreement, pay to the Province any Funds plus Interest Earned remaining in its possession, under its control, or both.

A.14.0 DEBT DUE AND PAYMENT

A.14.1 **Payment of Overpayment.** If at any time the Province provides Funds in excess of the amount the Recipient is entitled to under the Agreement, the Province may:

- (a) deduct an amount equal to the excess Funds plus any Interest Earned from any further instalments of Funds; or
- (b) demand that the Recipient pay to the Province an amount equal to the excess Funds plus any Interest Earned.

A.14.2 **Debt Due.** If, pursuant to the Agreement:

- (a) the Province demands from the Recipient the payment of any Funds, an amount equal to any Funds, or any other amounts owing under the Agreement; or
- (b) the Recipient owes to the Province any Funds, an amount equal to any Funds, or any other amounts under the Agreement, whether or not the Province has demanded their payment,

such amounts will be deemed to be debts due and owing to the Province by the Recipient, and the Recipient will pay the amounts to the Province immediately, unless the Province directs otherwise.

A.14.3 **Interest Rate.** The Province may charge the Recipient interest on any money owing to the Province by the Recipient under the Agreement at the then-current interest rate charged by the Province of Ontario on accounts receivable.

A.14.4 **Payment of Money to Province.** The Recipient will pay any money owing to the Province by cheque payable to the "Ontario Minister of Finance" and delivered to the

Province at the address set out in Schedule “B” (Specific Information) for the purposes of Notice to the Province.

A.14.5 **Failure to Repay.** Without limiting the application of section 43 of the *Financial Administration Act* (Ontario), if the Recipient fails to pay any amount owing under the Agreement, Her Majesty the Queen in right of Ontario may deduct any unpaid amount from any money payable to the Recipient by Her Majesty the Queen in right of Ontario.

A.15.0 NOTICE

A.15.1 **Notice in Writing and Addressed.** Notice will be:

- (a) in writing;
- (b) delivered by email, postage-prepaid mail, personal delivery, or courier; and
- (c) addressed to the Province and the Recipient as set out in Schedule “B” (Specific Information), or as either Party later designates to the other by Notice.

A.15.2 **Notice Given.** Notice will be deemed to have been given:

- (a) in the case of postage-prepaid mail, five Business Days after the Notice is delivered; and
- (b) in the case of email, personal delivery, or courier, on the date on which the Notice is delivered.

A.15.3 **Postal Disruption.** Despite paragraph A.15.2(a), in the event of a postal disruption:

- (a) Notice by postage-prepaid mail will not be deemed to be given; and
- (b) the Party giving Notice will provide Notice by email, personal delivery, or courier.

A.16.0 CONSENT BY PROVINCE OR CANADA AND COMPLIANCE BY RECIPIENT

A.16.1 **Consent.** When the Province or Canada provides its consent pursuant to the Agreement:

- (a) it will do so by Notice;
- (b) it may attach any terms and conditions to the consent; and
- (c) the Recipient may rely on the consent only if the Recipient complies with any terms and conditions the Province or Canada may have attached to the consent.

A.17.0 SEVERABILITY OF PROVISIONS

A.17.1 **Invalidity or Unenforceability of Any Provision.** The invalidity or unenforceability of any provision of the Agreement will not affect the validity or enforceability of any other provision of the Agreement.

A.18.0 WAIVER

A.18.1 **Waiver Request.** Either Party may, by Notice, ask the other Party to waive an obligation under the Agreement.

A.18.2 **Waiver Applies.** If in response to a request made pursuant to section A.18.1 (Waiver Request) a Party consents to a waiver, the waiver will:

- (a) be valid only if the Party that consents to the waiver provides the consent by Notice; and
- (b) apply only to the specific obligation referred to in the waiver.

A.18.3 **Waivers in Writing.** If a Party fails to comply with any term of the Agreement, that Party may only rely on a waiver of the other Party if the other Party has provided a written waiver in accordance with the Notice provisions in Article A.15.0 (Notice). Any waiver must refer to a specific failure to comply and will not have the effect of waiving any subsequent failures to comply.

A.19.0 INDEPENDENT PARTIES

A.19.1 **Parties Independent.** The Recipient is not an agent, joint venturer, partner, or employee of either the Province or Canada, and the Recipient will not represent itself in any way that might be taken by a reasonable person to suggest that it is, or take any actions that could establish or imply such a relationship.

A.19.2 **No Authority to Represent.** Nothing in the Agreement is to be construed as authorizing any Person, including a Third Party, to contract for or to incur any obligation on behalf of the Province or Canada, or both, or to act as an agent for the Province or Canada. The Recipient will take the necessary action to ensure that any Contract between the Recipient and a Third Party contains a provision to that effect.

A.20.0 ASSIGNMENT OF AGREEMENT OR FUNDS

A.20.1 **No Assignment.** The Recipient will not, without the prior written consent of the Province, assign any of its rights or obligations under the Agreement.

A.20.2 **Agreement Binding.** All rights and obligations contained in the Agreement will extend

to and be binding on:

- (a) the Recipient's successors and permitted assigns; and
- (b) the successors to Her Majesty the Queen in right of Ontario.

A.21.0 GOVERNING LAW

A.21.1 **Governing Law.** The Agreement and the rights, obligations, and relations of the Parties will be governed by and construed in accordance with the laws of the Province of Ontario and the applicable federal laws of Canada. Any actions or proceedings arising in connection with the Agreement will be conducted in the courts of Ontario, which will have exclusive jurisdiction over such proceedings.

A.22.0 FURTHER ASSURANCES

A.22.1 **Agreement into Effect.** The Recipient will:

- (a) provide such further assurances as the Province may request from time to time in respect to any matter to which the Agreement pertains; and
- (b) do or cause to be done all acts or things necessary to implement and carry into effect the terms and conditions of the Agreement to their full extent.

A.23.0 JOINT AND SEVERAL LIABILITY

A.23.1 **Joint and Several Liability.** Where the Recipient is comprised of more than one entity, each entity will be jointly and severally liable to the Province for the fulfillment of the obligations of the Recipient under the Agreement.

A.24.0 RIGHTS AND REMEDIES CUMULATIVE & JOINT AUTHORSHIP

A.24.1 **Rights and Remedies Cumulative.** The rights and remedies of the Province under the Agreement are cumulative and are in addition to, and not in substitution for, any of its rights and remedies provided by law or in equity.

A.24.2 **Joint Authorship Of Agreement.** Each and every provision of this Agreement shall be construed as though both Parties participated equally in the drafting of same, and any rule of construction that a document shall be construed against the drafting party, including without limitation, the doctrine commonly known as contra proferentem, shall not be applicable to this Agreement. The Parties shall not seek to avoid a provision

herein because of its authorship through recourse to a third-party, court, tribunal or arbitrator.

A.25.0 FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH OTHER AGREEMENTS

A.25.1 **Other Agreements.** If the Recipient:

- (a) has failed to comply with any term, condition, or obligation under any other agreement with Her Majesty the Queen in right of Ontario or one of Her agencies (a “**Failure**”);
- (b) has been provided with notice of such Failure in accordance with the requirements of such other agreement;
- (c) has, if applicable, failed to rectify such Failure in accordance with the requirements of such other agreement; and
- (d) such Failure is continuing,

the Province, at its sole discretion, may suspend the payment of Funds for such period as the Province determines appropriate and may demand immediate repayment or deduct such amounts owing plus any Interest Earned from the remaining Funds, if any, as a result of such Failure.

A.26.0 SURVIVAL

A.26.1 **Survival.** Any rights and obligations of the Parties that, by their nature, extend beyond the termination of the Agreement will continue in full force and effect for a period of seven years from the date of expiry or termination of the Agreement. Surviving provisions include, without limitation, the following Articles, sections and paragraphs, and all applicable cross-referenced Articles, sections, paragraphs, schedules, and sub-schedules: Articles 1.0 (Entire Agreement), 2.0 (Conflict or Inconsistency), 5.1 (Acknowledgement from Recipient), 6.0 (Canada’s Rights and Information Sharing with Canada), A.1.0 (Interpretation and Definitions) and any other applicable definitions, A.2.0 (Representations, Warranties, and Covenants), A. 4.1(c), A.4.2(c), sections A.4.4 (Interest-Bearing Account), A.4.5 (Interest), A.4.6 (Maximum Funds and Recovery of Excesses), A.4.8 (Rebates, Credits, and Refunds), A.4.9 (Recipient’s Acknowledgement of Responsibility for Project), A.5.5 (Disposal of Assets), A.7.1 (Province and Canada Include), A.7.2 (Preparation and Submission) (to the extent that the Recipient has not provided the Reports or other reports as may have been requested to the satisfaction of the Province), A.7.3 (Record Maintenance), A.7.4 (Records Review), A.7.5 (Inspection and Removal), A.7.6 (Cooperation), A.7.7 (No Control of Records), A.7.8 (Auditor General (Ontario and Canada)), A.7.9 (Sharing of Audit Findings and Reports), A.7.10 (Evaluation), A.7.11 (Calculations), Articles A.8.0 (Communications Requirements), A.9.0 (Limitation of Liability and Indemnity), A.10.1,

for a period extending 90 Business Days beyond the Terms, sections A.11.2 (Consequences of Termination on Notice by the Province), A.12.1 (Events of Default), paragraphs A.12.2(d), (e), (f), (g), (h) and (i), A.13.0 (Funds Upon Expiry), A.14.0 (Debt Due and Payment), A.15.0 (Notice), and A.17.0 (Severability of Provisions), section A.20.2 (Agreement Binding), and Articles A.21.0 (Governing Law), A.23.0 (Joint and Several Liability), A.24.0 (Rights and Remedies Cumulative & Joint Authorship), A.26.0 (Survival), A.27.0 (Environmental Requirements and Assessments), A.28.0 (Aboriginal Consultation), and A.31.0 (Special Conditions).

A.27.0 ENVIRONMENTAL REQUIREMENTS AND ASSESSMENTS

A.27.1 Federal Environmental Requirements. Without limitation to the Recipient's obligations to comply with Environmental Laws and for greater clarity:

- (a) no site preparation, removal of vegetation or construction will occur in respect of the Project; and
- (b) the Province will have no obligation to pay any Eligible Expenditures that are capital costs, as determined by the Province, until Canada is satisfied that federal requirements are met, and continue to be met, under the following:
 - (i) *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, 2012*;
 - (ii) other applicable environmental assessment legislation that is or may come into force during the term of the Agreement; and
 - (iii) other applicable agreements between Canada and Aboriginal Communities.

A.27.2 Assessments. The Recipient will complete the assessments that are further described in Schedule "D" (Reports).

A.28.0 ABORIGINAL CONSULTATION

A.28.1 Aboriginal Consultation Protocol. The Parties agree to be bound by the terms and conditions of the Aboriginal Consultation Protocol provided for in Schedule "I" (Aboriginal Consultation Protocol).

A.28.2 Legal Duty to Consult. Until Canada and, if applicable, the Province are satisfied that any legal duty to consult and, where appropriate, to accommodate Aboriginal Communities, or any other federal consultation requirement, has been, and continues to be met:

- (a) no site preparation, removal of vegetation or construction will occur in respect of the Project; and

- (b) despite section A.4.1, the Province has no obligation to pay any Eligible Expenditures that are capital costs, as determined by the Province and Canada; and, for the Project requiring consultation, Canada and, if applicable, the Province must be satisfied that:
- (i) Aboriginal Communities have been notified and, if applicable, consulted;
 - (ii) where consultation has occurred, the Recipient has provided a summary of consultation or engagement activities, including a list of Aboriginal Communities consulted, concerns raised, and how each of the concerns have been addressed or, if not addressed, an explanation as to why not;
 - (iii) the Recipient is carrying out accommodation measures, where appropriate; and
 - (iv) any other information has been provided which Canada or the Province, or both, may deem appropriate.

A.28.3 Funding Conditional upon Meeting Aboriginal Consultation Obligations. No Funds will be provided to the Recipient under the Agreement unless Canada and, if applicable in the opinion of the Province, the Province are satisfied that their respective obligations have been met in respect of the legal duty to consult and, if applicable, accommodate any Aboriginal Community.

A.29.0 COMMITTEE

A.29.1 Establishment of Committee. The Province may, at its sole discretion, require the establishment of a committee to oversee the Agreement (the "Committee").

A.29.2 Notice of Establishment of Committee. Upon Notice from the Province, the Parties will hold an initial meeting to establish, in accordance with Schedule "K" (Committee), the Committee described in section A.29.1 (Establishment of Committee).

A.30.0 DISPUTE RESOLUTION

A.30.1 Contentious Issues. The Parties will keep each other informed of any issues that could be contentious.

A.30.2 Examination by the Committee and Parties. If a contentious issue arises and a Committee has been established under section A.29.1 (Establishment of Committee), the Parties will refer the contentious issue that may arise to the Committee for examination. In the absence of a Committee, the Parties will examine the contentious issue.

- A.30.3 **Potential Dispute Resolution by Committee.** The Committee or the Parties, as the case may be, will attempt, reasonably and in good faith, to resolve disputes as soon as possible and, in any event, within, for the Committee, 30 days, or, for the Parties, 90 days of receiving Notice of a contentious issue.
- A.30.4 **Dispute Resolution by the Parties.** If the Committee cannot agree on a resolution, the matter will be referred to the Parties for resolution. The Parties will provide a decision within 60 Business Days of the Notice.
- A.30.5 **Alternative Mechanisms for Dispute Resolutions.** Where the Parties cannot agree on a resolution, the Parties may use any alternative dispute resolution mechanisms available to them to resolve the issue.
- A.30.6 **Suspension of Payments.** The Province may suspend any payments related to any contentious issue or dispute raised by either Party, together with the obligations related to such issue, pending resolution.

A.31.0 SPECIAL CONDITIONS

- A.31.1 **Special Conditions.** The Province's funding under the Agreement is conditional upon,
- (a) on or before the Effective Date, the Recipient having provided to the satisfaction of the Province with:
 - (i) a copy of the by-law(s), council resolution(s) or both or any other necessary instrument applicable to the Recipient authorizing its entry into the Agreement;
 - (ii) the certificates of insurance or any other proof the Province may request pursuant to section A.10.2 (Proof of Insurance);
 - (iii) banking information, such as a void cheque or a bank letter, for an interest-bearing account in the name of the Recipient at a Canadian financial institution, into which the Province may transfer funds electronically; and
 - (iv) any other Reports requested by the Province in the format specified.
 - (b) prior to submitting a request for payment in respect of the Project under the Agreement if required by the Province,
 - (i) the Recipient having provided to the satisfaction of the Province with written confirmation that:
 - a. the Recipient is in compliance with all Environmental Laws, including

- the Recipient's obligations under section A.27.1 (Federal Environmental Requirements), and has obtained all necessary approvals and permits;
- b. the Recipient has met any requirements under Article A.28.0 (Aboriginal Consultation) that may apply to the Project; and
 - c. the Recipient has the necessary ownership of any real property required for the completion of the Project; and
- (ii) the Recipient having provided to the satisfaction of the Province with any required assessments pursuant to Article A.27.0 (Environmental Requirements and Assessments); and
- (c) where the Recipient is a municipality, the Recipient having submitted to the satisfaction of the Province, in a form and at an address supplied by the Province, an asset management self-assessment on or before the Effective Date, and, thereafter annually on or before a date provided by the Province, until the Project reaches Substantial Completion.

For greater certainty, if the Province provides any Funds to the Recipient before the conditions set out in this Article A.31.0 (Special Conditions) have been met, and unless the Province has waived compliance with such condition in writing, the Province may exercise one or more of the remedies available to it pursuant to section A.12.2 (Consequences of Event of Default and Corrective Action).

END OF GENERAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS

[SCHEDULE "B" – SPECIFIC INFORMATION FOLLOWS]

**SCHEDULE “B”
SPECIFIC INFORMATION**

B.1.0 EXPIRATION DATE

B.1.1 **Expiration date.** The Expiration Date is **March 31, 2028**.

B.2.0 MAXIMUM FUNDS

B.2.1 **Maximum Funds.** Maximum Funds means the sum of Canada’s Maximum Contribution and Ontario’s Maximum Contribution.

B.3.0 ADDRESSEES

B.3.1 **Addressees.** All Reports and Notices under the Agreement will be submitted to the Province at the address listed below:

<p>Contact information for the purposes of Notice to the Province</p>	<p>Address: Ministry of Infrastructure Infrastructure Program Delivery Branch 777 Bay Street, Floor 4, Suite 425 Toronto, Ontario, M7A 2J3</p> <p>Attention: Manager, Program Delivery Unit</p> <p>Email: ICIPculture@ontario.ca</p>
<p>Contact information for the purposes of Notice to the Recipient</p>	<p>Position: Deputy City Manager</p> <p>Address: City Hall 300 Dufferin Avenue, London, Ontario, N6A4L9</p> <p>Email: llivings@london.ca</p>

**[SCHEDULE “C” - PROJECT DESCRIPTION, FINANCIAL INFORMATION, TIMELINES
AND PROJECT STANDARDS FOLLOWS]**

SCHEDULE “C”
PROJECT DESCRIPTION, FINANCIAL INFORMATION, TIMELINES AND PROJECT STANDARDS

C.1.0 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

C.1.1 **Project Description.** The Recipient will carry out each Project as described in Sub-schedule “C.1” (Project Description and Financial Information).

C.2.0 PROJECT STANDARDS

C.2.1 **Canada’s Requirements for Standards.** In addition to any other standards that the Recipient must meet or exceed for each Project, the Recipient will ensure the Project meets or exceeds the following:

- (a) any applicable energy efficiency standards for buildings outlined in Canada’s *Pan-Canadian Framework on Clean Growth and Climate Change* provided by Canada at www.canada.ca/en/services/environment/weather/climatechange/pan-canadian-framework.html, or at any other location the Province may provide; and
- (b) the accessibility requirements of the highest accessibility standards published in Ontario, in addition to accessibility requirements in applicable provincial building codes and relevant municipal by-laws.

C.3.0 CHANGES TO THE PROJECT DESCRIPTION, FINANCIAL INFORMATION, TIMELINES, AND PROJECT STANDARDS

C.3.1 **Province’s and Canada’s Consent.** Any change to any Project will require the Province’s and Canada’s consent. When seeking to make a change in respect of any Project, the Recipient will submit updated Project information and any other information that the Province or Canada, or both, may require to the satisfaction of Canada and the Province.

**SUB-SCHEDULE “C.1”
PROJECT DESCRIPTION, FINANCIAL INFORMATION AND REPORTING TIMELINE**

CASE NUMBER:	2019-09-1-1413131094
PROJECT NAME:	Carling Heights Optimist Community Centre - Teaching Kitchen & Elevator
FEDERAL APPROVAL DATE (mm/dd/yyyy)	2/5/2021
PROJECT DESCRIPTION:	
<p>The project will meet the increasing demands for accessible and inclusive educational cooking and life skills programming, will improve accessibility and renew the building envelope.</p> <p>Project activities include converting/reconfiguring existing multi-purpose community space with small servery to a 63 square meter teaching kitchen space, 245 square meter storage, multi-purpose meeting rooms. The project will also involve adding an elevator to allow full access to the second-floor viewing gallery to the gymnasium and pool, and renewing the building envelope components including doors and windows, flashing, brick repair.</p> <p>The project will result in increased total program hours by 3,750 per year and 2000 individuals in registered programs. The populations served include all ages, specifically persons with disabilities who will be able to use a fully accessible kitchen space within an existing community centre. Persons with disabilities and older adults will have access to the entire building.</p>	

Total Eligible Expenditures of the Project (\$)	Canada's Maximum Contribution (\$)	Percentage of Federal Support (%)	Ontario's Maximum Contribution (\$)	Percentage of Provincial Support (%)	Progress Reports Refer to Schedule D – Reports for final Progress Report
\$1,870,000.00	\$748,000.00	40.00%	\$623,271.00	33.33%	For 2021: September 1 For 2022: March 1, September 1 For 2023: March 1, September 1 For 2024: March 1

**SUB-SCHEDULE “C.1”
PROJECT DESCRIPTION, FINANCIAL INFORMATION AND REPORTING TIMELINE**

CASE NUMBER:	2019-09-1-1413300654
PROJECT NAME:	Labatt Park
FEDERAL APPROVAL DATE (mm/dd/yyyy)	1/8/2021
PROJECT DESCRIPTION:	
<p>The project will improve accessibility, fan safety, and playability and impact to the local neighbourhood. Project activities include installation of accessible washrooms, repairing and replacing bleachers, and replacing current sport lighting with energy efficient lighting. Labatt Park is one of the oldest baseball parks in Canada and North America. It currently supports local non-profit baseball organizations at all levels and community events such as day camps and movie nights. The project will result in cost avoidance for future lifecycle work.</p>	

\$2,035,000.00	\$814,000.00	40.00%	\$678,265.50	33.33 %	For 2021: September 1 For 2022: March 1

[SCHEDULE “D” – REPORTS FOLLOWS]

SCHEDULE “D” REPORTS

D.1.0 REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

D.1.1 **Reports.** The Recipient will submit all Reports to the Province in a manner, format, at such dates and with such content, as may be prescribed by the Province from time to time, at its sole discretion, prior to its required submission by the Province. Without limitation and at the sole discretion of the Province, Reports will include the following:

- (a) **Progress Reports.** The Recipient will submit Progress Reports to the Province in a format to be prescribed by the Province. The Recipient will:
 - (i) submit to the Province, up and until the final payment has been made pursuant to Schedule “J” (Request for Payment and Payment Procedures), a Progress Report no less frequently than twice a year on dates to be provided by the Province; and
 - (ii) ensure that each Progress Report will include, without limitation and at the sole discretion of the Province, the following information in respect of the Project:
 - a. Canada’s and the Province’s respective forecasted contributions to the Project by Funding Year;
 - b. the construction start date and the construction end date (forecasted and actual where applicable);
 - c. the percentage of the Project that has been completed;
 - d. risks and mitigation strategies;
 - e. confirmation that the Project is on track to achieve expected results or, if the Project is Substantially Completed, confirmation of actual results; and
 - f. confirmation that all required signage for the Project has been installed.
- (b) **Claim Reports.** Other than for the Final Payment, once per year, the Recipient will submit a request for payment for Eligible Expenditures in respect of the Project to the Province that is in a format to be prescribed by the Province. The request for payment must be submitted by an authorized representative of the Recipient.

Subject to any other information the Province, at its discretion, may require from time to time, a request for payment shall include:

- (i) a detailed breakdown of invoices that are being claimed for reimbursement; and
- (ii) copies of invoices.

Subject to the prior written consent of the Province, which shall be at the Province's sole and absolute discretion, the Recipient may request in writing the submission of a request for payment on a more frequent basis. Notwithstanding anything to the contrary, such request shall in no circumstance be more frequent than once per quarter.

- (c) **Reporting Requirements at Project Substantial Completion.** Within 60 Business Days of reaching Substantial Completion, the Recipient shall submit:
 - (i) a declaration of project Substantial Completion;
 - (ii) a final Progress Report that includes a summary of the final timelines, costs, and outcomes (how the Project aligns with provincial and federal objectives);
 - (iii) a Final Payment request, following the form and requirements set out in D1.1(b);
 - (iv) a summary of any Communications Activities made for the Project; and,
 - (v) a photograph of the Project
- (d) **Other Reports.** Any other reports that the Province so directs on or before such date and with such content as the Province directs.

D.2.0 ABORIGINAL CONSULTATION RECORD

D.2.1 Inclusion of Aboriginal Consultation Record. The Recipient will include an updated Aboriginal Consultation Record, if consultation with any Aboriginal Community is required, in its Progress Report.

D.3.0 RISK ASSESSMENT

D.3.1 Further Details on Risk Assessment. Upon the Province's written request and within the timelines set out by the Province, the Recipient will provide further details on the risk assessment in respect of the Project.

D.4.0 COMPLIANCE AUDIT(S)

D.4.1 Compliance Audit(s). Without limiting the generality of section A.7.4 (Records Review), if requested by the Province from time to time, which request shall be at the Province's sole discretion, the Recipient, at its own expense, will forthwith retain an independent third party auditor to conduct one or more compliance audits of the Recipient or any Project. The audit will be conducted in accordance with Canadian Generally Accepted Auditing Standards, as adopted by the Canadian Institute of Chartered Accountants, applicable as of the date on which a record is kept or required to be kept under such standards. In addition, the audit will assess the Recipient's compliance with the terms of the Agreement and will address, with respect to each Project, without limitation, the following:

- (a) whether the Funds were spent in accordance with the Agreement and with due regard to economy, efficiency, and effectiveness;
- (b) the Project's progress or state of completion;
- (c) whether the financial information the Recipient provided is complete, accurate, and timely, and in accordance with the Agreement;
- (d) whether the Recipient's information and monitoring processes and systems are adequate to identify, capture, validate, and monitor the achievement of intended benefits of the Project;
- (e) the overall management and administration of the Project;
- (f) recommendations for improvement or redress; and
- (g) whether prompt and timely corrective action is taken on prior audit findings.

**[SCHEDULE "E" - ELIGIBLE EXPENDITURES AND INELIGIBLE EXPENDITURES
FOLLOWS]**

SCHEDULE “E”
ELIGIBLE EXPENDITURES AND INELIGIBLE EXPENDITURES

E.1.0 ELIGIBLE EXPENDITURES

E.1.1 Notwithstanding anything to the contrary herein the Agreement, Eligible Expenditures shall only include those direct costs that are considered, in the Province’s and Canada’s sole and absolute discretion, to be directly necessary for the successful completion of the Project, and must be properly and reasonably incurred and paid to an arm’s length party as evidenced by invoices, receipts or other records that are satisfactory to the Province and Canada, in their sole and absolute discretion, and that are associated with the acquisition, planning, environmental assessments, design and engineering, project management, materials and construction or renovation of the Project. Eligible Expenditures exclude costs set out as Ineligible Expenditures in section E.2.1 below, but may include:

- (a) The incremental costs of the Recipient’s staff or employees provided that:
 - (i) The Recipient is able to demonstrate that it is not economically feasible to tender a Contract that ensures the acquisition of the required goods or services at the best value for money; and
 - (ii) The arrangement is approved in advance in writing by the Province and Canada.
- (b) Any costs that are determined by the Province and Canada, in their sole discretion, to be Eligible Expenditures; and
- (c) Notwithstanding section E.2.1(a) of this Schedule, expenditures related to the Project associated with completing climate lens assessments or associated with Aboriginal consultation and engagement activities, if applicable, that were incurred after February 15, 2018.

E.2.0 INELIGIBLE EXPENDITURES

E.2.1 Without limiting the discretion of Province and Canada in section E.1.1, the following costs are Ineligible Expenditures and are therefore ineligible to be paid from the Funds:

- (a) Costs incurred prior to the Federal Approval Date;
- (b) Costs incurred after March 31, 2027;
- (c) All expenditures related to Contracts signed prior to the Federal Approval Date;
- (d) Costs incurred for terminated or cancelled Projects;

- (e) Costs related to developing a business case or proposal or application for funding;
- (f) Costs associated with the acquisition, expropriation or leasing of:
 - (i) Land,
 - (ii) Buildings, or
 - (iii) Other facilities
- (g) Costs associated with the acquisition or leasing of equipment other than equipment directly related to the construction, improvement, repair, rehabilitation or reconstruction of the Project where the Province has not provided its prior written approval;
- (h) Costs that have not been claimed for reimbursement by March 31st of the year following the year in which the costs were incurred;
- (i) Capital costs, including site preparation and construction costs, until Canada and if applicable the Province have confirmed in writing that environmental assessment and Aboriginal consultation obligations have been fully met and continue to be fully met;
- (j) Costs related to any component of the Project other than its approved scope;
- (k) Real estate fees and related costs;
- (l) Costs incurred for the general operation, repair and regularly scheduled maintenance of the Project;
- (m) Services or works normally provided by the Recipient, incurred in the course of implementation of the Project, except those specified as Eligible Expenditures;
- (n) Expenditures related to any goods and services which are received through donations or in-kind contributions;
- (o) Any overhead costs, including salaries and other employment benefits of any employees of the Recipient, its direct or indirect operating or administrative costs, and more specifically its costs related to planning, engineering, architecture, supervision, management and other activities normally carried out by its staff, except in accordance with the list of Eligible Expenditures above;
- (p) Unreasonable meal, hospitality or incidental costs or expenses of any Third Party;
- (q) Any amount for which the Recipient has received, will receive or is eligible to receive, a rebate, credit or refund, in full or in part;
- (r) Taxes of any kind;
- (s) Costs of relocating entire communities;
- (t) In the Province's sole discretion, the costs of communication activities undertaken by the Recipient that did not conform with the requirements of the Communications Protocol in Schedule "G";

- (u) Any amounts incurred or paid by the Recipient to an entity that is not at arm's length from the Recipient, except in accordance with the list of Eligible Expenditures above;
- (v) Costs incurred contrary to Article 5 of Schedule "A" (Recipient's Acquisition of Goods or Services, Contract Provisions, and Disposal of Assets) of this Agreement;
- (w) The costs, charges, penalties or fees incurred or paid by the Recipient in the process of having a cost determined to be an Ineligible Expenditure.
- (x) Costs, charges, penalties or fees incurred or paid by the Recipient that are a result of late or non-payment, rush requests, or contract termination or non-compliance;
- (y) Legal fees, financing charges and loan interest payments, including those related to easements (e.g., surveys);
- (z) Costs of furnishings and non-fixed assets which are not essential for the operation of the funded Asset or Project, as well as all costs associated with moveable assets or rolling stock; and
- (aa) Any other cost which is not specifically listed as an Eligible Expenditure under Article E.1.0 (Eligible Expenditures) and which, in the opinion of the Province, is considered to be ineligible.

[SCHEDULE "F" – EVALUATION FOLLOWS]

SCHEDULE “F” EVALUATION

F.1.0 PROJECT AND ICIP EVALUATIONS

F.1.1 Recipient’s Participation in Project and ICIP Evaluations. The Recipient understands that the Province or Canada, or both, may ask the Recipient to participate in one or more evaluation in respect of the Project or the ICIP during and for a period of up to six years after March 31, 2028. The Recipient agrees, if asked and at its own expense, to provide Project-related information to the Province or Canada, or both, for any evaluation.

F.1.2 Results of Project and ICIP Evaluations. The result of any evaluation carried under section F.1.1 (Recipient’s Participation in Project and ICIP Evaluations) will be made available to the public, subject to all applicable laws and policy requirements.

[SCHEDULE “G” – COMMUNICATIONS PROTOCOL FOLLOWS]

SCHEDULE “G” COMMUNICATIONS PROTOCOL

G.1.0 DEFINITIONS

G.1.1 **Definitions.** For the purposes of this Schedule “G” (Communications Protocol):

“**Joint Communications**” means events, news releases, and signage that relate to the Agreement or the Bilateral Agreement, or both, that are not operational in nature, and that are collaboratively developed and approved by,

- (a) in the case of the Bilateral Agreement, Canada, the Province and the Recipient; and
- (b) in the case of the Agreement, the Province and the Recipient.

G.2.0 PURPOSE

G.2.1 **Purpose.** This communications protocol outlines the roles and responsibilities of each of the Parties to the Agreement in respect of Communications Activities related to the Project.

G.2.2 **Guidance.** This communications protocol will guide all planning, development and implementation of Communications Activities with a view to ensuring efficient, structured, continuous, consistent, and coordinated communications to the Canadian public.

G.2.3 **Application to Communications Activities.** The provisions of this communications protocol apply to all Communications Activities related to the Agreement and the Project.

G.3.0 GUIDING PRINCIPLES

G.3.1 **Information to Canadians.** Communications Activities undertaken through this communications protocol should ensure that Canadians are informed about the Project’s benefits, including the ways in which the Project helps improve their quality of life.

G.3.2 **Factors to Consider.** The scale and scope of Communications Activities undertaken for any Project will take into consideration the financial value, scope and duration of the Project and the feasibility of Joint Communications for such Communications Activities.

- G.3.3 **Deficiencies and Corrective Actions.** The Province will communicate to the Recipient any deficiencies or corrective actions, or both, identified by the Province, Canada or, as applicable, the Committee.
- G.3.4 **Approval of Communications Material.** The announcement or publication of the Project must be approved by the Parties and Canada prior to being carried out.
- G.3.5 **Costs of Communication Activities.** With the exception of advertising campaigns outlined in Article G.10.0 (Advertising Campaigns), the costs of Communication Activities and signage will follow the eligibility rules established in Schedule “E” (Eligible Expenditures and Ineligible Expenditures).

G.4.0 JOINT COMMUNICATIONS

- G.4.1 **Subject Matter.** The Parties and Canada may have Joint Communications about the funding and status of the Project.
- G.4.2 **Prior Knowledge and Agreement.** Joint Communications in respect of the Project should not occur without the prior knowledge and agreement of the Parties and Canada.
- G.4.3 **Recognition of the Province’s and Canada’s Contributions.** All Joint Communications material must be approved by the Province and Canada and will recognize the Province’s and Canada’s contribution or the Total Financial Assistance, or both, received in respect of the Project.
- G.4.4 **Notice and Timing.** The Recipient and the Province, on its own behalf or that of Canada, may request Joint Communications. The Party requesting the Joint Communications will provide at least 15 Business Days’ notice to the other Party. If the Communications Activity is an event, it will take place at a date and location mutually agreed to by the Parties and, if applicable, Canada.
- G.4.5 **Participation and Representatives.** The Party requesting a Joint Communications will provide the opportunity for the other Party and Canada to choose to participate and, if they do so choose, their own designated representative (in the case of an event).
- G.4.6 **English and French.** Canada has an obligation to communicate in English and French. Communications products related to events must be bilingual and include the Canada word mark and the logos of the Parties. In such cases, Canada will provide the translation services and final approval on products.
- G.4.7 **Table of Precedence for Canada.** The conduct of all Joint Communications will, as applicable, follow the *Table of Precedence for Canada* provided by Canada at

<https://www.canada.ca/en/canadian-heritage/services/protocol-guidelines-special-event/table-precedence-canada.html>, or at any other location as the Province may provide.

G.5.0 INDIVIDUAL COMMUNICATIONS

- G.5.1 **Canada's Obligations.** Notwithstanding Article G.4.0 (Joint Communications), the Parties agree that Canada or the Province, or both, have the right to communicate information to Canadians and Ontarians about the Agreement and the use of Funds to meet its legislated and regulatory obligations through their respective own Communications Activities.
- G.5.2 **Restrictions.** Each Party may include general ICIP messaging and an overview in respect of the Project in their own Communications Activities. The Province and the Recipient will not unreasonably restrict the use of, for their own purposes, Communications Activities related to the Project and, if the communications are web- or social-media based, the ability to link to it. Canada has also agreed, in the Bilateral Agreement, to the above.
- G.5.3 **Publication.** The Recipient will indicate, in respect of the Project-related publications, whether written, oral, or visual, that the views expressed in the publication are the views of the Recipient and do not necessarily reflect those of Canada and the Province.
- G.5.4 **Canada's Recognition in Documents.** In respect of the Project where the deliverable is a document, such as but not limited to plans, reports, studies, strategies, training material, webinars, and workshops, the Recipient will clearly recognize Canada's and the Province's respective financial contribution for the Project.
- G.5.5 **Acknowledgement of Support.** Unless the Province directs the Recipient to do otherwise, the Recipient will, in respect of the Project-related publications, whether written, oral, or visual, acknowledge the Province's and Canada's support for the Project.

G.6.0 OPERATIONAL COMMUNICATIONS

- G.6.1 **Responsibility of Recipient.** The Recipient is solely responsible for operational communications in respect of the Project, including but not limited to calls for tender, contract awards, and construction and public safety notices. Operational communications as described above are not subject to the *Official Languages Act* of Canada.

G.7.0 MEDIA RELATIONS

G.7.1 **Significant Media Inquiry.** The Province and the Recipient will share information promptly with the other Party and Canada if significant media inquiries are received or emerging media or stakeholder issues arise in respect of a Project or the ICIP.

G.8.0 SIGNAGE

G.8.1 **Recognition of Funding Contribution.** The Parties agree that Canada, the Province and the Recipient may each have signage recognizing their funding contribution in respect of the Project.

G.8.2 **Funding Recognition.** Unless otherwise agreed by Canada or the Province, or both, the Recipient will produce and install a sign to recognize the funding contributed by the Province or Canada, or both, at the Project site in accordance with, as applicable, their current respective signage guidelines. Federal sign design, content, and installation guidelines will be provided by Canada. Provincial sign design, content, and installation guidelines will be provided by the Province.

G.8.3 **Permanent Plaque.** Where the Recipient decides to install a permanent plaque or another suitable marker in respect of the Project, the Recipient will:

- (a) on the marker, recognize the Province's and Canada's contributions; and
- (b) prior to installing the marker, seek the prior written approval of both Canada and the Province, each respectively, for its content and installation.

G.8.4 **Notice of Sign Installation.** The Recipient will inform the Province of sign installations, including providing the Province with photographs of the sign, once the sign has been installed.

G.8.5 **Timing for Erection of Sign.** If erected, signage recognizing Canada's and the Province's respective contributions will be installed at the Project site(s) 30 days prior to the start of construction, be visible for the duration of the Project, and remain in place until 30 days after construction is completed and the infrastructure is fully operational or opened for public use.

G.8.6 **Size of Sign.** If erected, signage recognizing Canada's and the Province's respective contribution will be at least equivalent in size and prominence to Project signage for contributions by other orders of government and will be installed in a prominent and visible location that takes into consideration pedestrian and traffic safety and visibility.

G.8.7 **Responsibility of Recipient.** The Recipient is responsible for the production and installation of Project signage, and for maintaining the signage in a good state of repair during the Project, or as otherwise agreed upon.

G.9.0 COMMUNICATING WITH RECIPIENT

G.9.1 **Facilitation of Communications.** The Province agrees to facilitate, as required, communications between Canada and the Recipient for Communications Activities.

G.10.0 ADVERTISING CAMPAIGNS

G.10.1 **Notice of Advertising Campaigns.** Recognizing that advertising can be an effective means of communicating with the public, the Recipient agrees that Canada or the Province, or both, may, at their own cost, organize an advertising or public information campaign in respect of the Project or the Agreement. However, such a campaign will respect the provisions of the Agreement. In the event of such a campaign, Canada or the Province will inform each other and the Recipient of its intention no less than 21 Business Days prior to the campaign launch.

[SCHEDULE “H” – DISPOSAL OF ASSETS FOLLOWS]

SCHEDULE “H” DISPOSAL OF ASSETS

H.1.0 DEFINITIONS

H.1.1 **Definitions.** For the purposes of this Schedule “H” (Disposal of Assets):

“**Asset Disposal Period**” means the period commencing on the Effective Date and ending five (5) years after the Expiration Date.

H.2.0 DISPOSAL OF ASSETS

H.2.1 **Asset Disposal Period.** Unless otherwise agreed to by the Province, the Recipient will maintain the ongoing operations and retain title to and ownership of any Asset acquired in respect of the Project for the Asset Disposal Period.

H.2.2 **Disposal of Asset and Payment.** If, at any time within the Asset Disposal Period, the Recipient sells, leases, encumbers, or otherwise disposes, directly or indirectly, of any Asset other than to Canada, the Province, or a municipal or regional government established by or under provincial statute, the Province may require the Recipient to reimburse the Province or Canada, via the Province, for any Funds received for the Project.

[SCHEDULE “I” – ABORIGINAL CONSULTATION PROTOCOL FOLLOWS]

SCHEDULE “I” ABORIGINAL CONSULTATION PROTOCOL

I.1.0 DEFINITIONS

I.1.1 Definitions. For the purposes of this Schedule “I” (Aboriginal Consultation Protocol):

“**Aboriginal Community**”, also known as “Aboriginal Group”, includes First Nation, Métis, and Inuit communities or peoples of Canada.

“**Aboriginal Consultation Plan**” means the Aboriginal Consultation Plan described in section I.2.1 (Development of Plan).

I.2.0 ABORIGINAL CONSULTATION PLAN

I.2.1 Development of Plan. The Province, based on the scope and nature of the Project or at the request of Canada, may require the Recipient, in consultation with the Province or Canada, or both, to develop and comply with an Aboriginal consultation plan (“Aboriginal Consultation Plan”).

I.2.2 Procedural Aspects of Aboriginal Consultation. If consultation with Aboriginal Communities is required, the Recipient agrees that:

- (a) the Province or Canada, or both, may delegate certain procedural aspects of the consultation to the Recipient; and
- (b) the Province or Canada, or both, will provide the Recipient with an initial list of the Aboriginal Communities the Recipient will consult.

I.2.3 Provision of Plan to Province. If, pursuant to section I.2.1 (Development of Plan), the Province provides Notice to the Recipient that an Aboriginal Consultation Plan is required, the Recipient will, within the timelines provided in the Notice, provide the Province with a copy of the Aboriginal Consultation Plan.

I.2.4 Changes to Plan. The Recipient agrees that the Province or Canada, in the sole discretion of the Province or Canada and from time to time, may require the Recipient to make changes to the Aboriginal Consultation Plan.

I.3.0 ABORIGINAL CONSULTATION RECORD

I.3.1 Requirements for Aboriginal Consultation Record. If consultation with an Aboriginal Community is required, the Recipient will maintain an Aboriginal Consultation Record and provide such record to the Province, and any update to it, as part of its reporting to the Province pursuant to section D.3.1 (Inclusion of Aboriginal Consultation Record).

I.4.0 RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE RECIPIENT

I.4.1 Notification to and Direction from the Province. The Recipient will immediately notify the Province:

- (a) of contact by Aboriginal Communities regarding the Project; or
- (b) of any Aboriginal archaeological resources that are discovered in relation to the Project,

and, in either case, the Recipient agrees that the Province or Canada, or both, may direct the Recipient to take such actions as the Province or Canada, or both, may require. The Recipient will comply with the Province's or Canada's direction.

I.4.2 Direction from the Province and Contracts. In any Contract, the Recipient will provide for the Recipient's right and ability to respond to direction from the Province or Canada, or both, as the Province or Canada may provide in accordance with section I.4.1 (Notification to and Direction from the Province).

[SCHEDULE "J" – REQUESTS FOR PAYMENT AND PAYMENT PROCEDURES FOLLOWS]

**SCHEDULE “J”
REQUESTS FOR PAYMENT AND PAYMENT PROCEDURES**

J.1.0 DEFINITION

J.1.1 **Definition.** For the purposes of this Schedule “J” (Requests for Payment and Payment Procedures):

“**Final Payment**” means the final payment by the Province to the Recipient in respect of the Project as described in and to be paid in accordance with Article J.8.0 (Final Payment).

J.2.0 PROCEDURES AND TIMING FOR REQUESTS FOR PAYMENT

J.2.1 **Procedures.** The procedures provided for in Article J.3.0 of this Schedule “J” (Procedures for Requests for Payment for Eligible Expenditures) will apply to requests for payment that the Recipient submits to the Province under the Agreement.

J.2.2 **Diligent and Timely Manner.** The Recipient will submit its requests for payment for Eligible Expenditures in respect of the Project to the Province in a diligent and timely manner. If no Eligible Expenditures have been incurred in the twelve months preceding the date before which a request for payment is due under D.1.1(b), the Recipient will notify the Province that no claim is being submitted for that period.

J.3.0 PROCEDURES FOR REQUESTS FOR PAYMENT FOR ELIGIBLE EXPENDITURES

J.3.1 **Timing, Reports and Documents.** The Recipient will submit each request for payment for Eligible Expenditures, including the Final Payment request, in respect of the Project to the Province in accordance with, and on the frequency as indicated in Schedule “D” (Reports) and, if the Province so requested pursuant to paragraph K.4.1(f), after review by the Committee.

J.4.0 PAYMENTS OF FUNDS

- J.4.1 **Payment by the Province.** Subject to the terms and conditions of the Agreement, upon receipt of a request for payment fully completed in accordance with this Schedule “J” (Requests for Payment and Payment Procedures), the Province will use its reasonable efforts to pay Funds to the Recipient based on the Recipient’s incurred and paid Eligible Expenditures up to the Maximum Funds, if due and owing under the terms of the Agreement. Claims will be reimbursed based on the Percentage of Provincial Support and the Percentage of Federal Support as set out in Schedule “C”.
- J.4.2 For greater certainty and without limitation, before the Province makes a payment to the Recipient, the following terms and conditions of the Agreement must be met, in the opinion of the Province or Canada, or both:
- (a) the conditions set out in paragraph A.4.2(c) of Schedule “A”;
 - (b) the special conditions listed in Article A.31.0 of Schedule “A” (Special Conditions);
 - (c) receipt and acceptance by the Province of all required Reports and other reports, as applicable;
 - (d) compliance with all applicable audit requirements under the Agreement; and
 - (e) applicable communications requirements, as set out Schedule “G” (Communications Protocol).
- J.4.3 The Province will under no circumstances be liable for interest for failure to make a payment within the time limit provided for in this Article J.4.0 (Payments).

J.5.0 TIME LIMITS FOR REQUESTS FOR PAYMENTS

- J.5.1 **Timing.** The Recipient will submit all requests for payment within 60 Business Days of the Project’s Substantial Completion, or on or before March 31, 2027, whichever is earlier.
- J.5.2 **No Obligation for Payment.** Notwithstanding anything to the contrary herein, the Province will have no obligation to make any payment for a request for payment that is received by the Province after:
- (a) 60 Business Days following the Substantial Completion of the project; or,
 - (b) March 31, 2027
- whichever is earlier.

J.6.0 FINAL RECONCILIATION AND ADJUSTMENTS

J.6.1 **Final Reconciliation and Adjustments.** For the Project, following the submission of the final Progress Report and the declaration of Substantial Completion, the Province will carry out a final reconciliation of all requests for payments and payments in respect of the Project and make any adjustments required in the circumstances.

J.7.0 HOLDBACK

J.7.1 **Holdback.** For the Project, the Province may hold back funding in accordance with section A.4.12 (Retention of Contribution).

J.8.0 FINAL PAYMENT

J.8.1 **Final Payment.** Subject to paragraph A.4.2(c) of Schedule “A”, the Province will pay to the Recipient the remainder of the Funds under the Agreement, including the Holdback, after all of the conditions under section A.4.12 of Schedule “A” (Retention of Contribution) have been met.

[SCHEDULE “K” – COMMITTEE FOLLOWS]

SCHEDULE “K” COMMITTEE

K.1.0 ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMITTEE

K.1.1 Establishment and Term of Committee. If the Province requires the establishment of a Committee to oversee the Agreement, pursuant to section A.29.1 (Establishment of Committee), the Parties will, within 60 days of the Province providing Notice, hold an initial meeting to establish the Committee. The Committee’s mandate will expire on the Expiration Date of the Agreement.

K.2.0 COMMITTEE MEMBERS, CO-CHAIRS, AND OBSERVERS

K.2.1 Appointments by the Province. The Province will appoint two persons as members of the Committee.

K.2.2 Appointments by the Recipient. The Recipient will appoint two persons as members of the Committee.

K.2.3 Chairs of the Committee. The Committee will be headed by co-chairs chosen from its members, one appointed by the Province and one appointed by the Recipient. If a co-chair is absent or otherwise unable to act, the member of the Committee duly authorized in writing by the Province or the Recipient, as applicable, will replace him or her and will act as co-chair in his or her place.

K.2.4 Non-committee Member Staff. The Parties may invite any of their staff to participate in Committee meetings. The Province may invite up to two representatives from Canada to sit as observers on the Committee. For greater certainty, the staff and representative(s) from Canada will not be considered members and will not be allowed to vote.

K.3.0 MEETINGS AND ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

K.3.1 Rules of Committee. The Committee will:

- (a) meet at least two times a year, and at other times at the request of a co-chair; and
- (b) keep minutes of meetings approved and signed by the co-chairs as a true record of the Committee meetings.

K.3.2 Quorum. A quorum for a meeting of the Committee will exist only when both co-chairs are present.

K.4.0 COMMITTEE MANDATE

K.4.1 Mandate. Provided that no action taken by the Committee will conflict with the rights of the Parties under the Agreement, the mandate of the Committee will include, but not be limited to:

- (a) monitoring the implementation of the Agreement including, without limitation, the implementation of Schedule “G” (Communications Protocol), for compliance with the terms and conditions of the Agreement;
- (b) acting as a forum to resolve potential issues or disputes and address concerns;
- (c) reviewing and, as necessary, recommending to the Parties amendments to the Agreement;
- (d) approving and ensuring audit plans are carried out as per the Agreement;
- (e) establishing sub-committees as needed;
- (f) at the request of the Province, reviewing requests for payments; and
- (g) attending to any other function required by the Agreement, including monitoring project risk and mitigation measures, or as mutually directed by the Parties.

K.4.2 Committee Decisions. Decisions of the Committee will be made as follows:

- (a) the co-chairs will be the only voting members on the Committee; and
- (b) decisions of the Committee must be unanimous and recorded in writing.

K.5.0 ROLE OF THE RECIPIENT

K.5.1 Requirements. The Recipient undertakes to fulfill, in addition to any other requirements provided for in this Schedule “K” (Committee), the following:

- (a) establish a fixed location where the Agreement will be managed, and maintain it until the expiry of the Committee’s mandate and, if relocation is required, establish a new location;
- (b) prepare and retain, at the location described in paragraph K.5.1(a), and make available to the Committee, all documents needed for the work of the Committee, including payment request forms, approval documents, contracts, and agendas and minutes of meetings of the Committee and its subcommittees;

- (c) ensure that any audit required of the Recipient pursuant to the Agreement is carried out and the results are reported to the Committee;
- (d) ensure that administrative and financial systems are developed and implemented for the Project and the work of the Committee;
- (e) promptly inform the Committee of all proposed changes in respect of the Project; and
- (f) provide the Committee, as requested and within the timelines set by the Committee, and to the Committee's satisfaction, project status information related to Schedule "D" (Reports).

Report to Community and Protective Services Committee

To: CHAIR AND MEMBERS
COMMUNITY AND PROTECTIVE SERVICES COMMITTEE

From: GEORGE KOTSIFAS, P. ENG.
DEPUTY CITY MANAGER, PLANNING AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Subject: CANADA-ONTARIO COMMUNITY HOUSING INITIATIVE (COCHI) AND ONTARIO
PRIORITIES HOUSING INITIATIVE (OPHI) APPROVAL OF ONTARIO TRANSFER
PAYMENT AMENDING AGREEMENT

Date: AUGUST 31, 2021

Recommendation

That, on the recommendation of the Deputy City Manager, Planning and Economic Development, that the following actions Be Taken:

- 1) The attached proposed by-law (Appendix "A") BE INTRODUCED at the Municipal Council meeting to be hold on September 14, 2021 to:
 - (a) Authorize and approve an Amending Agreement between The Corporation of the City of London and Her Majesty the Queen in right of Ontario as represented by The Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing substantially in the form attached as (Schedule "A" to the by-law) and satisfactory to the City Solicitor, for the purpose of approving the Ontario Transfer Payment Amending Agreement for the Canada-Ontario Community Housing Initiative and Ontario Priorities Housing Initiative;
 - (b) Authorize the Mayor and the City Clerk to execute the Agreement authorized and approved in part a), above; and
 - (c) Authorize the Deputy City Manager, Planning and Economic Development, or their written designate, to approve and execute such further and other documents, including an Investment Plan and including agreements, that may be required in furtherance of this Agreement.

Executive Summary

On August 16, 2021, The Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing announced an additional \$21 million of COCHI funding for the 2021-2022 period. The funding is intended to support community housing providers across Ontario, including the state of repair of the aging social housing stock. COCHI funding helps sustain, repair and grow the community housing sector.

As a result of the additional COCHI investment, the City of London will receive an additional \$465,300 COCHI funding for the 2021-2022 fiscal year. This funding is in addition to the original 2021-2022 COCHI allocation of \$1,958,512, brining the City of London's 2021-2022 COCHI allocation to \$2,423,812.

Linkage to the Corporate Strategic Plan

2019-2023 Strategic Plan for the City of London

Administering the Canada-Ontario Community Housing Initiative (COCHI) and Ontario Priorities Housing Initiative (OPHI) Amending Agreement links to the Corporate Strategic Plan's key area of focus of Strengthening Our Community, specifically:

- Increase Affordable and Quality of Housing Options; and
- Reduce the Number of Individuals and Families Experiencing Chronic Homelessness or At Risk of Becoming Homeless

Analysis

1.0 Background Information

1.1 Previous Reports Related to this Matter

- Community & Neighbourhoods Committee – October 18, 2011 – Investment in Affordable

- Housing for Ontario, Approval of Administration Agreement
- Community & Protective Services Committee – August 24, 2014 – Recommendations for Proposals Under Investment in Affordable Housing (IAH) Program Year 4 and IAH (2014 Extension)
- Community & Protective Services Committee – September 22, 2014 – Investment in Affordable Housing for Ontario (2014 Extension), Approval of Administration Agreement
- Community & Protective Services Committee – September 22, 2014 – Assignment of Rental Component of Administration Agreement for the Investment in Affordable Housing for Ontario (2014 Extension) to the Housing Development Corporation, London
- Community & Protective Services Committee – July 19, 2016 – Approval of Service Manager Administration Agreement for the 2016 Social Infrastructure Fund (SIF) and Pending Assignment to HDC
- Community & Protective Services Committee – July 18, 2017 – Delegation of the Rental Housing Component of the Provincial Service Manager Administration Agreements for the Development of Affordable Housing to the Housing Development Corporation, London (HDC)
- Community & Protective Services Committee – June 17, 2019 – Canada-Ontario Community Housing Initiative (COCHI) and Ontario Priorities Housing Initiative (OPHI) Approval of Ontario Transfer Payment Agreement

2.0 Discussion and Considerations

2.1 Purpose

The City of London as the Service Manager for London as well as for Middlesex County, has received an additional \$465,300 in COCHI funding for the 2021-2022 period. In order to receive this additional funding, the City of London is required to enter into the Amended Transfer Payment agreement with the province and submit an Investment Plan by September 15, 2021.

2.2 Background

The Service Manager is required to develop and submit an Investment Plan that outlines how the funding allocation will be used during the 2021-2022 funding period. The Investment Plan is intended to outline the broad activities to be taken, the amount of funding to be used, and the amount requested for administration.

COCHI funding focuses on providing the opportunity for Service Managers and housing providers (including public housing) to protect tenants in projects reaching the end of their operating agreements and/or mortgage maturity and to begin stabilizing the supply of community housing through new development, repairs, renovations, and operating support.

Housing providers/projects that receive funding under the COCHI Capital Component must remain affordable for a ten (10) year period after the completion of the funded retrofit work, including a minimum of five (5) years during which it will continue to operate as a social housing provider under the *Housing Services Act, 2011*.

The components of COCHI include:

New Development and Repair

New development and capital repair project eligibility criteria supports both community housing providers and Local Housing Corporations (public housing).

Service Managers are encouraged to utilize COCHI funding for strategic capital repairs which preserve and extend the functional lifespan of the social housing supply, such as investments based on capital needs identified in current building condition audits and that help support ongoing housing provider sustainability.

Eligible repair work could include:

- Replacing and/or repairing core building systems, and sub-systems (e.g. heating and/or cooling, leaking roof systems, water issues, structural repairs, etc.); and
- Carrying out health and safety repairs (e.g., accessibility renovations).

Rent Supplements

A rent supplement is a subsidy paid to the landlord on behalf of a household in need of rental assistance.

Providing rent supplements is intended to promote housing stability for tenants who would otherwise face affordability challenges.

Transitional Operating Funding

COCHI funding may also be used as a short-term transitional operating subsidy. The expectation is that housing providers would use this funding to address immediate areas of concern with the clear objective of reaching an operational and financial status that does not require an ongoing government subsidy but could transition to a rent subsidy agreement that is not an ongoing subsidy.

The following represents the current approved Investment Plan:

COCHI Component	2021-2022
New Build	
Repair	\$1,360,586
Housing Supplements	150,000
Transitional Operating (End Of Agreement Support)	350,000
Administration (5% Max)	97,926
Total	\$1,958,512

The following represents the Investment Plan template and the various program components required for completion and submission by September 15, 2021:

COCHI Component	2021-2022
New Build	TBD
Repair	TBD
Housing Supplements	TBD
Transitional Operating (End Of Agreement Support)	TBD
Administration (5% Max)	TBD
Total	\$465,300

Civic Administration is working to complete the required Investment Plan submission by the ministry's due date of September 15, 2021. Civic Administration will report back at a future committee meeting with pertinent developments related to the additional COCHI funding.

3.0 Financial Impact/Considerations

3.1 Funding

Funding for the COCHI is funded 100% by the Province however the COCHI program guidelines require municipal social housing expenditures, to at a minimum, match the total annual COCHI allocation provided. The municipal expenditures included in the 2020-2023 Multi-year Budget are sufficient to meet the program matching requirement resulting in no financial impact to the City's budget.

Service Managers may use up to 5% of the additional COCHI funding to assist with the administration cost of the program.

Prepared and Submitted by: Dave Purdy, Manager, Housing Services, Planning and Economic Development
Recommended by: George Kotsifas, P. Eng., Deputy City Manager, Planning and Economic Development

Appendix “A”

Bill No.
2021

By-law No.

A by-law to approve the Ontario Transfer Payment Amending Agreement for the Canada-Ontario Community Housing Initiative (CHOCI) and the Ontario Priorities Housing Initiative (OPHI) with the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing.

WHEREAS section 2 of the Municipal Act, 2001, S.O. 2001, c.25, as amended, provides that municipalities are created by the Province of Ontario to be responsible and accountable governments with respect to matters within their jurisdiction and each municipality is given powers and duties under this Act and many other Acts for the purpose of providing good government with respect to those matters;

WHEREAS subsection 5(3) of the *Municipal Act* 2001, S.O.2001, c. 25, as amended, provides that a municipal power shall be exercised by by-law;

AND WHEREAS section 9 of the Municipal Act, 2001 provides that a municipality has the capacity, rights, powers, and privileges of a natural person for the purpose of exercising its authority under this or any other Act;

AND WHEREAS section 10 of the Municipal Act, 2001 provides that the City may provide any service or thing that the City considers necessary or desirable for the public, and may pass by-laws respecting same, and respecting economic, social and environmental well-being of the City, and the health, safety and well-being of persons;

NOW THEREFORE the Municipal Council of The Corporation of the City of London enacts as follows:

1. The Ontario Transfer Payment Amending Agreement substantially in the form attached as Schedule “A” to this by-law and satisfactory to the City Solicitor, between Her Majesty the Queen in the Right of Ontario as represented by the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing and The Corporation of the City of London is approved.
2. The Mayor and City Clerk are authorized to execute the agreement approved in section 1 above.
3. The Deputy City Manager, Planning and Economic Development or their written designate, are severally delegated the authority to authorize and approve such further and other documents, including an Investment Plan, and including agreements, that may be required in furtherance of the Agreement approved in paragraph 1 above that are consistent with the requirements contained in that Agreement, and that do not require additional funding or are provided for in the City’s current budget, and that do not increase the indebtedness or contingent liabilities of The Corporation of the City of London, subject to prior review and approval by the Deputy City Manager, Planning and Economic Development and the City Solicitor.
4. This by-law shall come into force and effect on the day it is passed.

PASSED in Open Council September 14, 202

Ed Holder
Mayor

Cathy Saunders
City Clerk

First reading – September 14, 2021
Second reading – September 14, 2021
Third reading – September 14, 2021

AMENDING AGREEMENT

Ontario Transfer Payment Amending Agreement

This Amending Agreement is effective as of the ___ day of _____, 2021

B E T W E E N :

**HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN IN RIGHT OF ONTARIO as represented by the
Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing**

(the "**Minister**")

- and -

CORPORATION OF THE CITY OF LONDON

(the "**Service Manager**")

BACKGROUND

1. The Minister entered into an Ontario Transfer Payment Agreement for COCHI/OPHI with the Service Manager, named in the agreement as "Corporation of the City of London", effective as of August 13, 2019 (the "**Agreement**").
2. The Minister wishes to allocate additional COCHI funding of \$465,300 to the Service Manager for fiscal year 2021-2022.
3. Schedule B of the CMHC-Ontario Bilateral Agreement under the 2017 National Housing Strategy speaks to the use of COCHI funding to protect, regenerate and expand Social Housing and Community Housing having regard to regional needs and priorities.
4. The Parties wish to amend the Agreement in the manner set out in this Amending Agreement to increase the Maximum Funds set out in Schedule B of the Agreement.

IN CONSIDERATION of the mutual covenants and agreements contained herein, and for other good and valuable consideration, the receipt and sufficiency of which are hereby acknowledged, the Parties hereto agree as follows:

1. Capitalized terms used but not defined in this amending agreement (the "**Amending Agreement**") have the meanings ascribed to them in the Agreement.

2. Schedule "B" of the Agreement is amended to reflect that the Maximum Funds in respect of the Canada-Ontario Community Housing Initiative are \$4,580,659.
3. This Amending Agreement shall be effective as of the date set out at the top of this Amending Agreement.
4. Except for the amendments provided for in this Amending Agreement, all provisions in the Agreement shall remain in full force and effect.

The Parties have executed this Amending Agreement on the dates set out below.

**HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN IN RIGHT OF ONTARIO
as represented by the Minister of Municipal Affairs and
Housing**

Name: _____ Date _____
Title:

CORPORATION OF THE CITY OF LONDON

Name: _____ Date _____
Title:

Name: _____ Date _____
Title:

I/We have authority to bind the Service Manager.

London Housing Advisory Committee

Report

The 4th Meeting of the London Housing Advisory Committee
July 14, 2021
Advisory Committee Virtual Meeting - during the COVID-19 Emergency

Attendance PRESENT: B. Harris (Chair), M. Joudrey, W. Latuszak, C. O'Brien, B. Odegaard, J. Peaire, and D. Peckham; A. Pascual (Committee Clerk)

ABSENT: J. Banninga, M. Courey, J. Lane, R. Peaker, and M. Richings.

ALSO PRESENT: C. Cooper, J. D'Oria, S. Giustizia, C. Lovell, G. Matthews, D. Purdy, and B. Westlake-Power.

The meeting was called to order at 12:16 PM; it being noted that the following Members were in remote attendance: B. Harris, M. Joudrey, J. Lane, W. Latuszak, C. O'Brien, B. Odegaard, J. Peaire, and D. Peckham.

1. Call to Order

1.1 Disclosures of Pecuniary Interest

That it BE NOTED that no pecuniary interests were disclosed.

2. Scheduled Items

2.1 Coordinated Access

That it BE NOTED that the presentation as appended to the agenda, from C. Cooper, Director, Housing Stability Services and J. D'Oria, Manager, Homeless Prevention, with respect to Coordinated Access, was received.

3. Consent

3.1 2nd Report of the London Housing Advisory Committee

That it BE NOTED that the 2nd Report of the London Housing Advisory Committee, from its meeting held on May 12, 2021, was received.

3.2 Municipal Council Resolution related to Current Advisory Committee Appointments

That it BE NOTED that the Municipal Council Resolution with respect to its meeting on May 4, 2021, related to Current Advisory Committee Appointments, was received.

3.3 Notice of Planning Application - Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendments - 2009 Wharncliffe Road South

That the following actions be taken with respect to the Notice of Planning Application dated May 12, 2021 from C. Maton, Planner II, related to an Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendments for the property at 2009 Wharncliffe Road South:

- a) Civic Administration BE REQUESTED to attend the next London Housing Advisory Committee to provide additional information with respect to the above-mentioned application; and,
- b) the above-mentioned Notice BE RECEIVED.

3.4 Housing Stability for All Plan 2020 Update and Priorities for 2021

That it BE NOTED that the staff report dated May 11, 2021, from K. Dickins, Acting Managing Director, Housing, Social Services and Dearness Home, with respect to the Housing Stability for All Plan 2020 Update and Priorities for 2021, was received.

4. Items for Discussion

4.1 Advisory Committee Review - Interim Report VI

That the following actions be taken with respect to the staff report dated May 17, 2021, from C. Saunders, City Clerk, related to the Advisory Committee Review – Interim Report VI:

- a) the Governance Working Group BE ADVISED that the London Housing Advisory Committee (LHAC) endorses the continuation of an advisory committee dedicated to addressing housing and homelessness issues in the City of London;
- b) the Governance Working Group BE REQUESTED to consider broadening the mandate of LHAC; and,
- c) the above-noted report BE RECEIVED;

it being noted that B. Westlake-Power, Deputy City Clerk provided an overview with respect to this matter.

5. (ADDED) Deferred Matters / Additional Business

5.1 (ADDED) Notice of Planning Application - Revised Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendments - 560-562 Wellington Street

That it BE NOTED that the Notice of Planning of Application dated June 28, 2021, from S. Wise, Senior Planner, related to a Revised Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendments for the properties at 560 and 562 Wellington Street, was received.

5.2 (ADDED) 2022 Mayor's Honour List - Call for Nominations

That it BE NOTED that the communication from C. Saunders, City Clerk and B. Westlake-Power, Deputy City Clerk, with respect to the 2022 Mayor's Honour List - Call for Nominations, was received; it being noted that the London Housing Advisory Committee members will submit nominations for consideration at their next meeting.

6. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 1:19 PM.

Good afternoon,

My name is Callista Ryan and I am requesting delegation status with Jaya Scott to speak at the Community and Protective Services Committee.

Jaya and I are both graduates of Western University and entered the 2021 Policy Pitch Association's Case Competition which focused on the London Opioid Crisis. Our pitch was well-received and placed in the competition. Councillor Maureen Cassidy reached out and recommended we bring our pitch to present at the Community and Protective Services Committee.

We understand the pitch length time is five minutes and are prepared to present at the next meeting that we can receive delegation status for. I see there is a meeting scheduled for August 31, 2021. If we are able to be put on the agenda that would be wonderful. If the meetings transition from online to in-person, I would be able to attend as I work in London currently.

Our presentation is titled, "Municipal Health and Communications Strategies to Tackle London's Opioid Crisis". In working on our policy pitch to support tackling the opioid crisis, we noticed the City of London's website could improve its ability to communicate with citizens on health and wellness resources which can ultimately support prevention, de-stigmatization and improve response time for individuals who need support.

Our ask is for the CPSC to task City staff within web development/IT and communications to update health and wellness communications on the website.

Please me know if this request is accepted and when the materials would need to be provided by. Councillor Cassidy explained that presentations are printed out for all committee members in black and white print. We are happy to send out our presentation and proposal ahead of time.

Thank you so much for your time and we both look forward to your response.

Sincerely,

Callista Ryan and Jaya Scott

Municipal Health and Communications Strategies to Tackle London's Opioid Crisis

Jaya Scott and Callista Ryan

Our proposal focuses on:

- ▶ Connecting people to resources that can help individuals and their family, friends, clients etc.
- ▶ Reduce barriers and de-stigmatize access to supports and services
- ▶ Increase awareness and accessibility so community members get supports faster

How can we raise awareness about opioids and connect our community members to resources?

Update City of London Website to better communicate resources and services!

Effective Communications can Maximize Prevention Efforts

Getting individuals, their social security network (friends, families, care groups) the information they need to be adequately aware of the causes and appropriate responses to opioid use and addiction is crucial.

Finding information or support for addictions is difficult on the City of London Website

Under “Living in London” > “Community Services” > “Homeless Prevention and Housing” > “Community Supports” > “Mental Health and Addiction Services Resources” > Links to: (two resources, not up to date)

Individuals and families who are home-insecure are not the only demographic affected by the opioid crisis.

Example: City of Vancouver




Contact Shape Your City Careers Guides

Green Vancouver Your government About Vancouver Parks, recreation, and culture Home, property, and development **People and programs** Streets and transportation Doing business

Find city information, s

COVID-19 in Va
Wearing a mask is rec
library facilities, even
Continue to stay hom
2 m apart from others
Stay strong, support
orders to help slow th

Building community	Housing	Grants and awards	Donating and volunteering
Equity, diversity, and inclusion	Finding rental housing	Arts and culture grants	Help refugees
Neighbourhood planning	Rental and renter protection	Community grants	Neighbourhood Cleanup Party
Children and childcare	Homelessness services	Green grants	Donating to parks and recreation
+ Show more	+ Show more	+ Show more	+ Show more
Healthy Vancouver	Food	Resilient Vancouver	
Healthy City Strategy	Help get and give food during COVID-19	Resilient buildings	
Health clinics, training, and groups	Growing food	Resilient Neighbourhoods Program	
Mental health and addiction	Buying, sharing, and accessing food		



Example: City of Vancouver

Find the help you need

[Metro Vancouver Indigenous Services Society \(MVISS\)](#)

MVISS provides culturally diverse support services creating a safe and caring environment for people to connect with self and community.

[Toward the Heart](#)

Visit BC Centre for Disease Control's guide to learn about responding to an overdose, naloxone programs, and how to stay safer and healthier.

[Moms Stop the Harm](#)

If you have lost a loved one to overdose, reach out to Moms Stop the Harm, a network of Canadian families whose loved ones have died from substance use. This organization offers grief support for those struggling with this loss.

[BC211's Redbook](#)

View a complete online directory of programs and services in Vancouver for residents with alcohol or drug misuse issues.

[Stronger Together](#)



Our Ask: Update the Website!

One of the solutions to the opioid crisis is **grounded in community, communications, and prevention** strategies.

We believe this is **feasible, affordable, and actionable for the City of London** and we would look forward to seeing a **proactive communications approach** take place in the coming months.

Thank you!

Web Links

City of London: <https://london.ca/living-london>

MHLU: <https://www.healthunit.com/opioids> (on opiouds)

<https://www.healthunit.com/opioids-middlesex-london> (on the opioid crisis)

<https://www.healthunit.com/opioids-middlesex-london-response>
(on the response)

City of Vancouver:

<https://vancouver.ca/people-programs/mental-health-and-addiction.aspx>

<https://vancouver.ca/people-programs/drugs.aspx>

DEFERRED MATTERS

COMMUNITY AND PROTECTIVE SERVICES COMMITTEE

as of August 4, 2021

File No.	Subject	Request Date	Requested/Expected Reply Date	Person Responsible	Status
1.	<p><u>Proposed Accessible Vehicle for Hire Incentive Program – Update</u> That, on the recommendation of the Managing Director, Development and Compliance Services and Chief Building Official the following actions be taken with respect to the staff report dated September 10, 2019 related to an update on a proposed accessible vehicle for hire incentive program:</p> <p>b) the Civic Administration BE DIRECTED to hold a public participation meeting at a future meeting of the Community and Protective Services Committee with respect to amending the Vehicle for Hire By-law to make the necessary changes to implement an incentive program for accessible vehicles for hire.</p>	September 10, 2019	TBD	Anti Racism, Anti Oppression Service area	
2.	<p><u>Special Events Policies and Procedure Manual</u> That the following actions be taken with respect to the “Special Events Policies and Procedure Manual”:</p> <p>a) the communication dated September 6, 2019 from Councillor A. Kayabaga, with respect to the “Special Events Policies and Procedures Manual” BE RECEIVED; and,</p> <p>b) the Civic Administration BE DIRECTED to review the City’s “Special Events Policies and Procedures Manual” and report back on possible amendment to the Manual to address the following matters:</p> <p>i) the disruption caused by special events being held in the evenings prior to a work and/or school day;</p>	September 10, 2019	June 2022	C. Smith J.P. McGonigle	

File No.	Subject	Request Date	Requested/Expected Reply Date	Person Responsible	Status
	ii) the application of the same rules/restrictions that are in place for Victoria Park to Harris Park; and, iii) increased fines and penalties for special events that contravene the Manual.				
3.	<p><u>Short-Term Accommodations - Proposed Regulations</u></p> <p>That, on the recommendation of the Managing Director, Development and Compliance Services and Chief Building Official, the following actions be taken with respect to the staff report dated February 19, 2020 related to short-term accommodations:</p> <p>a) the Civic Administration BE DIRECTED to amend all necessary by-laws to address short-term accommodations and hold a public participation meeting at a future meeting of the Community and Protective Services Committee;</p> <p>b) the Civic Administration BE DIRECTED to continue consulting with short-term accommodation platforms on the further collection of Municipal Accommodation Tax;</p>	February 19, 2020	Q4 2021/ Q1 2022	G. Kotsifas O. Katolyk	
4.	<p><u>Graphic, Unsolicited Flyer Deliveries to Residential Properties</u></p> <p>That the following actions be taken with respect to graphic, unsolicited flyer deliveries to residential properties:</p> <p>a) the Civic Administration BE DIRECTED to investigate options to address community concerns around graphic, unsolicited flyer deliveries to residential properties and report back to a future meeting of the Community and Protective Services Committee, outlining information and options including, but not limited to:</p> <p>i) steps taken by other municipalities with respect to this matter; and,</p> <p>ii) potential amendments to the existing municipal nuisance by-law or introduction of a new by-law with respect to this matter;</p> <p>b) the communication, dated November 1, 2020, from Councillor van Holst, with respect to this matter,</p>	November 3, 2020	Q3 2021	Legal Department	

File No.	Subject	Request Date	Requested/Expected Reply Date	Person Responsible	Status
	<p>BE REFERRED to the Civic Administration for consideration;</p> <p>c) the delegation request by M. McCann, London Against Abortion, BE REFERRED to a future public participation meeting with respect to this matter; it being noted that a communication from M. McCann, dated October 30, 2020, with respect to this matter, was received;</p>				
5.	<p><u>London Community Recovery Network - Ideas for Action by Municipal Council</u></p> <p>That, on the recommendation of the Managing Director, Neighbourhood, Children and Fire Services, the Acting Managing Director, Housing, Social Services and Dearness Home, and the Managing Director, Parks and Recreation, the following actions be taken with respect to the staff report dated February 9, 2021 related to the London Community Recovery Network and ideas for action by Municipal Council:</p> <p>ii) the implementation plan for item #2.3 Downtown Recovery – free transit to the downtown, as it relates to transit initiatives to the downtown, BE REFERRED back to the Civic Administration to continue working with the London Transit Commission on this matter, with a report back to a future meeting of the Community and Protective Services Committee (CPSC) when additional details are available; and,</p> <p>iii) implementation plan for item #2.3 Downtown Recovery – free transit to the downtown, as it relates to parking initiatives in the downtown BE REFERRED back to the Civic Administration with a report back to a future meeting of the CPSC when additional details are available;</p>	February 9, 2021	TBD	C. Smith K. Dickins S. Stafford	
6.	<p><u>Affordable Housing Units in London</u></p> <p>That the following actions be taken with respect to the creation of affordable housing units in London:</p> <p>b) the Civic Administration BE DIRECTED to report back to a future meeting of the Community and Protective Services Committee with an</p>	March 30, 2021	TBD	K. Dickins	

File No.	Subject	Request Date	Requested/Expected Reply Date	Person Responsible	Status
	implementation plan, inclusive of financial impacts, that sets out the best supports for the development of affordable housing units;				
7.	<p><u>Animal By-law PH-3</u> That the communication, dated April 1, 2021, from Councillor M. Cassidy, with respect to By-law PH-3, being "A by-law to provide for the regulation, restriction and prohibition of the keeping of animals in the City of London", BE REFERRED to the Civic Administration for review and a report back at a future meeting of the Community and Protective Services Committee related to revisions or updates that could be made to the by-law; it being noted that a communication from K. and K. Beattie, as appended to the Added Agenda, with respect to this matter, was received.</p>	April 20, 2021	Q4, 2021	G. Kotsifas O. Katolyk	
8.	<p><u>School Planning</u> That the Civic Administration BE DIRECTED to provide an information report at a future meeting of the Community and Protective Services Committee with respect to the roles and responsibilities of the local school boards and how the City of London interacts with the boards related to the items listed in the communication, as appended to the Agenda, from Councillors S. Lewis and P. Squire; it being noted that the above-noted communication, with respect to this matter, was received.</p>	June 22, 2021	TBD	C. Smith	
9.	<p><u>Recognizing the Impact of Hosting the COVID-19 Assessment Centres at Oakridge Arena and Carling Heights Optimist Community Centre</u> That the following actions be taken with respect to the communication, dated July 6, 2021, from Councillors S. Lehman and J. Helmer and Mayor E. Holder, related to Recognizing the Impact of Hosting COVID-19 Assessment Centres at Oakridge Arena and Carling Heights Optimist Community Centre: a) the Civic Administration BE DIRECTED to consult residents, especially those close to the COVID-19</p>	July 27, 2021	TBD	C. Smith	

File No.	Subject	Request Date	Requested/Expected Reply Date	Person Responsible	Status
	<p>assessment centres, about priorities for new recreational amenities or upgrades to existing recreational amenities in the general area; and,</p> <p>b) the Civic Administration BE DIRECTED to explore potential provincial and federal funding opportunities for recreational infrastructure and to report back with recommended new or upgraded recreational amenities in the general area of both testing centres, along with a recommended source of financing;</p>				