

**Special Committee of the Whole – April 27, 2016**  
**Questions and Answers to Strategic Plan Grant Applications**

**1. Burnside Gorge Community Association**

*No questions.*

**2. Fernwood Neighbourhood Resource Group Society**

*No questions.*

**3. HOME IS WHERE WE LIVE – LifeCycles Project Society**

*Questions:*

1. What is the difference in priority between the components asked for? What is the most important? - *Councillor Coleman*
2. How would your organization respond if council approved an amount substantially less? - *Councillor Isitt*

*Answers:*

1. The priority for funding is as follows:  
The first \$30,000 of funding will help support the Harvest Coordinator, Fruit Tree Project Coordinator and Summer Student wages through the height of the season.  
  
The next \$15,000 of City funding will support both the purchase of a secondary van, and the cooler rebuild in our new location, enabling us to expand operations at the height of our season.  
  
The last \$15,000 will go towards food literacy and food justice workshops.
2. If funding was substantially less than asked for we would prioritize as outlined above.

Beyond that our program delivery would be restricted. We will not be able to harvest and redistribute as much food, and our delivery of food literacy programs for marginalized communities will be curtailed. The extent of these restrictions will be determined by the size of our short-fall. Without sufficient funding we may not be able to operate for the entire harvest season; such a short-fall will impact our ability to build program assets (secondary van and cooler rebuild).

That said, as this is our flagship program, we will do everything we can to secure more funding elsewhere, or we may decide to run a deficit.

**4. James Bay Community Project**

*No questions.*

**5. Peers Victoria Resource Society**

*Questions:*

1. The program reduced hours before due to loss of funding from provincial government, would like to have a historical reminder of previous funding, and an account of the struggle to continue hours. – *Councillor Thornton-Joe*
2. Esquimalt has funded \$1,500, what amount was applied for from Esquimalt? – *Mayor Helps*

*Answers:*

1. For close to a decade, the Peers drop in centre was funded by the Province of BC, Ministry of Social Development and Social Innovation (previously the Ministry of Social Development). Specifically, Peers was contracted to provide employment services, or what is now referred to as the Employment Program of BC (EPBC). While Peers operated this program it covered the costs of both the Employment Program (Elements) as well as the associated Drop-In Centre, which was open close to full time hours to the public (with 2.5 FTE's of program staff). Each year, 50-60 persons participated in Elements, while many more (200+) accessed the associated Drop-In Centre, which was low barrier entry point to Peers' services and provided a steady stream of new participants for the employment program. Peers was fortunate to benefit from many dedicated staff within the Province of BC who helped us to shape the program to meet the needs of our participants. Over time, the Province of BC reorganized the contracted service model, often accompanied by incremental decreases in funding. These decreases were in part determined by the transfer of funds between the federal and provincial government for employment services. In the final reorganization of EPBC, the services were to be delivered by Peers as a subcontractor within a larger structure of regional employment centres who contracted directly with the Province of BC. Most importantly, our services would be paid for through a fixed fee-for-service model. The fixed fee-for-service model, combined with the introduction of eligibility criteria which did not favour clients who needed to start and stop the program several times within the year, complete it multiple times, or struggled with regular participation, was a poor match for those served by Peers. From a financial point of view, what had been a contract that resulted in more than 350,000 in funding in 2006, had been reduced to a contract that provided just under 200,000 by 2012. After piloting the program under the new fee- for- service model in early 2013, it became apparent that we would not realize more than 120,000 in funding annually, which was significantly less than the cost of operating the program. Therefore, in August of 2013, Peers Victoria gave notice to withdraw from the EPBC contract. This decision resulted in the closure of the Elements employment program as well as the associated Drop In Centre. This was a difficult decision as the program provided an employment support service to a group of citizens who face multiple, interacting barriers to other employment service settings. Moreover, participant feedback about the program had been consistently positive; to this day, it is not uncommon to hear from alumni who regard the program as a transformational turning point in their lives.

Given that the Drop In Centre was regarded as a foundational part of the service continuum at Peers - a hub from which participants access basic services around food security, social support and harm reduction, while also exploring more specific programs related to housing, health, and safety - the decision was made to re-open it

on a part time basis (Mon -Thurs 11-230) in early 2014. Recognizing that there was little opportunity to replace the longer term Elements program (which was a full-time educational program for six months) the drop in Centre was conceived as more of a community centre which would offer educational opportunities in the form of short afternoon workshops delivered by community partners. The reopening of the Drop In Centre was enabled by a one time grant provided by the Ministry of Justice (100,00), combined with a one time grant provided by the Victoria Foundation to support a weekly health clinic (14,000). Our new model of Drop In Centre programming is based on part-time service, but still includes educational workshops delivered by community partners at Peers, a daily meal, harm reduction supplies, health clinics, and group and individual social support. In addition, Peers has been able to leverage the Drop-In Centre operations to obtain funding for one-to-one health and housing support services, with funding provided by MAC AIDS and Canada/CRD, respectively. We are now in our third year of operating the revised Drop In Centre. While the Ministry of Justice has continued to provide annual grants through the Civil Forfeiture program, the grants have fluctuated from year to year (2014-100,000, 2015 - 20,000, 2016- 40,000, with the latest grant confirmed after submission of this application). In addition to the funds provided by The Ministry of Justice, the United Way has provided 40,000 per year (2015-2018) to support the drop-in centre. These two sources of funding constitute the majority of funding for the Drop-in Centre, which is projected to cost about 93,000 in 2016. The funds applied for from the city of Victoria would meet the small gap in funding that exists presently, allow for a small increase in staffing, a more generous schedule of educational workshops, as well as contribute to food and administrative costs associated with the program.

While we are happy with the new model of service in the Drop In centre, in particular that we are able to provide a cost effective hub of social support to a large participant population, as well as a site for other community members to learn about the highly stigmatized and hidden sex work population, we remain interested in exploring other options for offering a longer term, more intensive educational program at the Drop In Centre to replace Elements. Further, we hope to obtain a longer term contract with either the Province of BC or Canada to match the United Way funding as an annual funding scheme is not ideal for program planning and growth.

2. The funding from Esquimalt comes in the form of a property tax exemption. The value of that exemption is \$10,000 in total and this is allocated across our programs.

## **6. BC Healthy Communities Society**

### *Questions:*

1. It is noted that the society is expanding their program to other communities through the region, need clarity on if this is a regional program or just for the City Of Victoria. If regional, have funds been requested from other municipalities? – *Councillor Thornton-Joe*
2. Which neighbourhood associations have indicated their support for this project? And which neighbourhood associations have you worked with in recent years? - *Councillor Isitt*

*Answers:*

1. This program is for the City of Victoria (was an error indicating it was regional). Our intention is to offer the Resilient Streets program to all 12 neighbourhoods in the City of Victoria. We anticipate that some neighbourhoods will be more responsive than others, and expect to deliver the program in a minimum of 8 neighbourhoods, based on interest. The neighbourhood of Hillside Quadra is currently well-served for neighbourhood small grants through a pilot project with the Victoria Foundation so we would not be offering grants in this neighbourhood, however, other program supports such as the Toolkit and orientation sessions would be made available.
2. Our Collaborative Partnership Table that is providing leadership to this next phase of Resilient Streets currently includes representatives from the Coalition of Neighbourhood Houses and neighbourhood associations of Victoria West, Fairfield-Gonzales and Fernwood. In addition to those actively engaged in this leadership role, representatives from the following neighbourhood associations have been engaged in the Building Resilient Neighbourhoods project to date: James Bay, Hillside-Quadra, Downtown, Burnside-Gorge, South Jubilee, Oaklands, North Park.

Our intention for this next phase of Resilient Streets would be to build relationships with each neighbourhood association in the City of Victoria to explore the opportunity to collaborate on offering the program in their neighbourhood. While neighbourhood associations often play a critical role in local community building, through our network of partners, our engagement efforts would also extend beyond neighbourhood associations, recognizing that not all residents may be active members in these associations.

## **7. Beacon Community Services**

*Questions:*

1. Have you looked at models of school protocols that are present in other school districts, such as involving students? – *Councillor Isitt*
2. Why isn't there a dedicated crossing guard at the busy roads near George Jay School, like there is on Bay Street? – *Councillor Isitt*
3. The total program costs are 165,000, but the funding is only for \$144,000, what's the discrepancy? – *Councillor Coleman*

*Answers:*

1. Prior to making the shift from volunteer to employee positions, we looked at other crossing guard models. Our preliminary research indicates that there are still some districts that involve students in their crossing guard programs, but that these are not as common as they used to be. Two main reasons for the decrease in student crossing guard programs are:
  - The change in the structure of elementary schools that used to be K-7 that are now K-5 resulting in the oldest children in the school being younger than they used to be.
  - Decreased interest/ability for teachers to be involved in before and after school activities and thus such programs require the support of volunteer parents to function effectively. The crossing guard program in SD61 used to

be managed by the individual school PACs but ended due to the inability of the PACs to provide sufficient support to operate the program.

We have given consideration to a model where it returns to parent-supervised crossing guards (schools could choose whether these guards would be parent volunteers or children or a combination). Funds could be distributed to the PACs and the individual schools could determine how best to structure the program for their school. This would allow the program at the individual sites to be monitored more closely. We would be interested in participating in a group with representation from the municipalities in SD61 to review the current structure of the program and determine if there may be a more efficient and effective operating model that would meet the needs of the community.

2. There is a guard located at the corner of Cook and Princess for George Jay Elementary school. We try to review the position of the guards on a periodic basis to ensure they are located at the highest needs areas. We also receive feedback from parents and schools from time to time regarding requests for additional guards throughout the community that we try to address, but the demand for guards is greater than what the current funding supports.
3. The total cost of the program is \$165,000 and funding requested from the City of Victoria and other sources equates to \$165,000. The details are as follows:

Organization providing funding	Total Pending Funding
Municipality of Oak Bay	\$9,360
Municipality of Saanich	70,480
Town of view Royal	23,000
Macaulay PAC	18,720
<b>Total Pending Funding</b>	<b>\$121,560</b>
Gaming Funds	6,000
<b>Total Confirmed Funding</b>	<b>6,000</b>
<b>Total Eligible Dollars Requested from the City of Victoria</b>	<b>37,440</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b><u>165,000</u></b>

#### **8. Bridges for Women Society**

*No questions.*

#### **9. Capital Region Food and Agriculture Initiative Roundtable Society**

*No questions.*

#### **10. Communica: Dialogue and Resolution Services Society**

*Questions:*

1. Question to planning staff: Does this fit with the current work the city is doing with Community Associations? – *Councillor Madoff*

2. Question to staff: Can list of services the Ministry of Social Services is responsible for be provided to Council? – *Councillor Isitt*

*Answers:*

1. Based on the limited information in the application it does not look like this represents an overlap with existing City services, programs or processes. That said, it is unclear how much direct engagement the Community Associations undertake and initiate themselves and so feedback from them would need to be garnered to understand the ultimate benefit of this program.  
In terms of the current City process with the CALUC's, staff are reviewing the role the CALUC's play in the development process. While this is related to community outreach for development applications, the CALUC process is somewhat narrowly defined and may change based on the outcomes of the current review process. Given this, it's unclear at this time how this program will align with that future process.
2. Information on the various Ministry responsibilities are attached:
  - Ministry of Children and Family Development
  - Ministry of Community, Sport and Cultural Development
  - Ministry of Health
  - Ministry of Social Development and Social Innovation

#### **11. Community Social Planning Council of Greater Victoria**

*No questions.*

#### **12. Crisis Intervention & Public Information Society of Greater Victoria dba NEED2 Suicide Prevention Education & Support**

*No questions.*

#### **13. Disaster Aid Canada**

*No questions.*

#### **14. Greater Victoria SportHost Association**

*No questions.*

#### **15. Greater Victoria Visitors & Convention Bureau**

*Question:*

1. Can the requested funds be provided through other revenues?– *Councillor Isitt*

*Answer:*

1. Tourism Victoria had a very strong revenue year in 2015, but it was an exceptional year. While indicators for 2016 are strong, revenues will be constrained in 2016 in ways they were not in 2015 due to hotel rooms being pulled out of inventory for

renovations in the spring, fall and winter. While grant proposal initiatives could be funded by other revenue sources, it would mean significant and unplanned cuts to other initiatives and a further and deeper reduction in student employment opportunities. We have hired our student contingent already based on our planned budgeting and discussions with the City through the grant application process.

Tourism Victoria received notice in the fall of 2015 that its longstanding grant for visitor services would be reduced from \$47,500 to \$25,000. Tourism Victoria planned ahead and re-allocated monies within its 2016 budgeting process to adjust for a 47% reduction in its grant. We also adjusted downward our grant application from the District of Saanich as we are aware that the two are tied to each other given both regions are aware of what the other does. Proactively responding to the planned grant reduction by the City of Victoria, Tourism Victoria worked collaboratively and quietly with city officials and its board representative to absorb these reductions rather than approaching media or starting a campaign. A reduction of greater than 47% to the valued visitor services work, could only be viewed as punitive by the tourism community and would have further negative effects to our other grants for which we have adjusted for reductions.

Tourism Victoria has worked hard to be a strong collaborative partner with the City of Victoria which is seen in our financial investment back to the City of Victoria on joint programs. Tourism Victoria has become a very reliable and generous financial partner including resourcing, sponsoring and off-setting costs of city lead initiatives including: Mayor's mission to San Francisco and the subsequent reverse mission, Rogers Hometown Hockey and Canada Day among others. In addition, Tourism Victoria took on majority of the cost of planning and organizing our joint mission to Ottawa to lobby for Belleville Terminal in December 2015 (with the exception of the costs of travel for City Staff). All of which indicates that we value this partnership and trust that the City of Victoria sees the value and the strategic alignment of Tourism Victoria's work to its own strategic plan and to our combined work to make our City a truly vibrant place. We are pleased to do so and view ourselves as a good constructive partner driving many similar aims. We hope to continue to deepen our investments with the City of Victoria in many ways including the renovations and significant investments into the 812 Wharf Street Visitor Centre, which is now at the planning stage working with City staff. In short, we deeply respect our two-way relationship.

Tourism Victoria has also worked hard to develop very strong fiscal prudence and is very open and transparent about its results. Tourism Victoria, unlike many not-for-profits or government agencies will not spend to simply make its year end numbers look "cleaner". Instead in a very strong 2015 year, Tourism Victoria's Board took the approach to invest prudently in programs that will take some time to execute properly, so the notable amount of resources from 2015 to 2016 was carried over as a one-time event in order to prepare for one time large investments such as new digital platform and plans for investments in renovating the 812 Wharf Street Visitor Centre. These one-time investments will benefit all.

After a very soft tourism decade between 2003-2013, Tourism Victoria has very weak contingency reserves compared to other Destination Marketing Organizations in British Columbia and the Tourism Victoria Board has prudently placed a priority on building these over the medium term. An exceptional year such as 2015 is a good time to help build up these reserves.

In conclusion we value our long standing relationship and trust that the value of the work that Tourism Victoria delivers against the grant application and Tourism Victoria's broad alignment and support of the City of Victoria's strategy will see us remain partners both in good and bad revenue years.

## 16. InterArts Centre Cooperative

*No questions.*

## 17. James Bay Neighbourhood Association

*No questions.*

## 18. Maritime Museum of BC

*Questions:*

1. Noticed the total project cost is 511,998 and the total funding pending is \$215,908, how is the difference in funding accounted for? – *Mayor Helps*
2. Federal, Provincial, and the Victoria Foundation funding is pending, when will the funding be confirmed? – *Mayor Helps*
3. For the Franklin / Cook exhibition, what engagement is being done with First Nations in regards to those materials? – *Councillor Isitt*

*Answers:*

1. The Operating Budget for 2016/17 is attached. This outlines where we expect to get our revenues that will make up the balance. These numbers are projected and will be confirmed at the end of the 2016/17 fiscal year.

MARITIME MUSEUM OF BC - INITIAL OPERATING BUDGET 2016/17 - Board Approval on March 24, 2016				
	Budget 2016/17 Operating Fund	Budget 2015/16 Operating Fund	Actual 2014/15 Operating Fund	Actual 2013/14 Operating Fund
<b>\$</b>				
<b>INCOME</b>				
<b>REVENUES</b>				
Admissions (current year is by donation)	100,000	2,300	100,477	136,542
Memberships	10,000	1,650	6,941	8,564
Gift shop	25,000	6,600	18,693	21,987
Rental income	-	350	12,093	20,950
Fund raising	49,000	40,000	29,136	23,353
Outreach Initiatives	14,640	1,500	23,971	20,284



<b>TOTAL REVENUES</b>	<b>198,640</b>	<b>52,400</b>	<b>191,311</b>	<b>231,680</b>
<b>GIFTS AND DONATIONS</b>	<b>64,200</b>	<b>62,000</b>	<b>165,255</b>	<b>115,741</b>
<b>GRANTS AND OTHER</b>				
Federal	68,908	52,795	16,300	62,857
Provincial - Arts Council	-	-	25,000	-
Provincial - Gaming	90,000	45,000	95,000	101,000
Provincial - Moving	-	80,000	30,000	-
Municipal	40,000	36,730	36,500	37,000
Nootka	-	10,000	-	-
Other - Coast Capital	-	12,500	-	44,700
Naval Association	-	3,000	-	-
Foundation Support	55,000	-	-	-
Transfer from Victoria Endowment Fund	2,000	1,914	1,264	793
<b>TOTAL GRANTS AND OTHER</b>	<b>255,908</b>	<b>241,939</b>	<b>204,064</b>	<b>246,350</b>
<b>TOTAL INCOME</b>	<b>518,748</b>	<b>356,339</b>	<b>560,630</b>	<b>593,771</b>
<b>EXPENSES</b>				
Accounting	4,300	4,300	3,000	3,000
Bank charges and interest	2,500	2,500	5,406	6,524
Collection and exhibits	20,000	250	18,364	27,581
Shelving and cabinets - Seymour storage	25,000	50,168	-	-
Maintenance and security	3,500	2,200	16,096	29,982
Facility rental	37,272	15,242	92	15,165
Fund raising	5,000	2,500	280	986
Gift shop - cost of goods sold	10,000	5,000	6,791	10,903
Insurance	15,000	14,000	10,426	10,713
Licences, dues and subscriptions	3,500	3,500	4,166	5,313
Marketing and promotion	45,000	1,300	20,947	29,534
Office - telephone, internet	4,000	3,500	3,586	6,912
Nootka costs including moving	-	3,000	-	-
Catering	5,000	2,600	6,340	-
Volunteer/staff recognition	1,500	700	-	-
Freight and postage	1,500	1,500	2,512	2,871
Professional fees incl computer tech	18,000	16,000	59,987	17,775
Program & Exhibit Contract Services	51,070			
Salaries and benefits	254,670	181,625	343,968	410,693
Supplies	6,000	6,000	6,014	6,256
Travel and Professional Development	5,000	2,250	10,218	10,886
<b>TOTAL EXPENSES</b>	<b>517,812</b>	<b>318,135</b>	<b>518,193</b>	<b>595,094</b>
<b>(SHORTFALL) EXCESS OF REVENUES OVER EXPENSES</b>	<b>936</b>	<b>38,204</b>	<b>42,437</b>	<b>(1,323)</b>

2. The following is a list of the grants that we have applied for and when we expect to hear the final results:
- Federal: Documentary Heritage Communities Program, May 2016
  - Young Canada Works, confirmed as of April 2016
  - Canada Summer Jobs, May 2016
  - Provincial: Gaming Grant, by August 31, 2016

Victoria Foundation: Confirmed by October or November, 2016

3. The Franklin Network Outreach Project is a travelling exhibit developed by The Royal Ontario Museum (ROM) in collaboration with Parks Canada and the History Museums Network and over the next three years will be updated with fascinating new materials about underwater excavations, Inuit knowledge and new discoveries from the HMS Erebus. First Nations involvement is coordinated through the ROM and Parks Canada.

The Cook/ Vancouver exhibit is part of our summer 2016 strategy, which is heavily weighted on the theme of re-discovery and the associated Treasure Hunt that is being designed with a tourist focus since this is the high tourist season. The Treasure Hunt highlights maritime history, First Nations art and culture and Emily Carr.

Our fall/ winter exhibits on kayaking and canoeing will have a local focus and involve engagement with the local First Nations communities. Looking further ahead, we will also be developing a whaling exhibit that will also have First Nations engagement.

## **19. Open Space Arts Society**

*No questions.*

## **20. Our Place Society**

*Question:*

1. Since the issue of homelessness is region wide, has funding been requested from other regional municipalities? – *Councillor Thornton-Joe*

*Answer:*

1. We have not requested funding for this specific project from other municipalities but Our Place continually seeks out grant opportunities within the CRD and beyond to any of those whose criteria are the right fit. In the past we have struggled to obtain financial support from the municipalities outside of Victoria.

With the help of the Victoria Mayor, Our Place has been working on a strategy to engage municipalities within the CRD to provide financial support, including recent data gathering indicating that over 20% of people using Our Place services reside outside of Victoria, with most coming from Saanich and Esquimalt. Although we have not approached these municipalities for this project, the data will give us the information needed to request future support. We continue to provide engagement and educational opportunities for politicians around the region on the issues of poverty and homelessness.

Ultimately Our Place aims to provide programs and services from early in the morning until late in the evening throughout the year. The request to the City of Victoria will allow us to come closer to reaching this goal. Our intention is to continue to seek financial support from other sources.

## **21. Silver Threads Service**

*Question:*

1. Question for consistency between the application and the presentation, are there one to three events a year, or one to three events a week? – *Councillor Madoff*

*Answer:*

1. We plan on doing one to three events per week over the course of the year. At the minimum we expect to hold 40 events and connect with 300+ seniors.  
Based on our results during the fall of 2015 we held 24 events and connected with 110 seniors so the increase is achievable and realistic.

## **22. Société Radio Communautaire Victoria**

*Question:*

1. It was noted that 10% of Greater Victoria residents benefit from their program, have funds from other municipalities been requested? – *Mayor Helps*

*Answer:*

2. We have not requested funds from other municipalities as our radio is based and operated in downtown Victoria. The name of the city of Victoria is part of the official name and logo of our radio. And even if our radio is also streamed live on the internet, we are known among our listeners as the French community radio of Victoria, and no other municipality.

This morning show will focus on informing and entertaining the residents of Victoria by providing them local news and information (weather, traffic in the downtown area...). Most of the showcased artists and interviewees will be from the Victoria area. Furthermore, all the people (volunteers and employees) working on the morning show are currently from Victoria.

Therefore, we felt that it would not have been relevant to request funds from other municipalities. The city of Victoria is at the core of the identity of our radio and our objective through the morning show is to serve the French-speaking community of Victoria.

## **23. SPAR Lab, University of Victoria**

*Question:*

1. Can you identify specifically where and how the members of the public are going to be targeted? Will City of Victoria citizens be surveyed and how will that be done? – *Councillor Isitt*

*Answer:*

1. The population based survey, done by phone, will include a question on residents. If people being surveyed live outside the study area they will be excluded from further

questions. We can set the study are to be only the City of Victoria. Alternately, we have considered using Victoria and adjacent municipalities with >50% of surveys from Victoria and other municipalities represented relative to the proportion of residents. We are keen to get feedback from City of Victoria staff on this and a few other aspects of the survey design to ensure it meets the City's information needs. If the preference is only to survey City of Victoria residents that can be accommodated.

#### **24. The Victoria Gilbert and Sullivan Society**

*No questions.*

#### **25. Theatre SKAM Association**

*No questions.*

#### **26. Threshold Housing Society**

*No questions.*

#### **27. Together Against Poverty Society**

*Question:*

1. Is this program an expansion or new aspect of the current ongoing program, and is there any duplication in this program with what other agencies are doing? –  
*Councillor Thornton-Joe*
2. Is there an overlap or similar programs offered?

*Answer:*

1. TAPS Vital Health and Benefits (VHAB) project is both an expansion AND a new aspect of the current programming available at TAPS.

TAPS Volunteer Disability Advocacy Project (VDAP) has been training volunteers to help low-income marginalized low-income citizens in Victoria to apply for provincial persons with disabilities benefits for more than a decade. It is highly successful and has resulted in 1000's of people living with disabilities in our community to access the benefits to which they are entitled and has trained 100's of volunteers to assist marginalized people with the PWD application.

Over the many years of providing assistance to people applying for provincial disabilities benefits, TAPS clients have consistently been asking for help with federal disabilities benefits and appeals, as there is no other organization in the community providing that assistance on a reliable basis. However, until two years ago, we simply did not have the resources to meet the constant and growing demand. In the summer of 2014, with the help of the Victoria Foundation, TAPS was able to establish the Federal Disability Advocacy Project (FDAP). This project helps marginalized people with disabilities to apply for and appeal decisions on the Canadian Pension Plan Disability (CCPD), Disability Tax Credit (DTC) and the Registered Disability Savings Plan (RDSP). In its first year of inception it served 852

- people, and the waitlist and requests for service continue to greatly outpace TAPS' capacity. A key piece of learning that occurred through the delivery of the FDAP project was how inextricably linked, complicated and confusing the two application processes are. TAPS proposed VHAB project seeks to combine the two projects, adding a completely new component to the FDAP project - trained volunteers, but also training VDAP and the new FDAP volunteers in the key aspects and differences in both applications. This will take significant work and investment by one specialized disabilities benefits expert, but is the next logical step to ensuring marginalized people with disabilities in Victoria are getting access to ALL of the Vital Health and Benefits to which they are entitled.
2. While the program areas being addressed as part of this application are not ones that City staff have specific experience with, a search for similar programs within the south Island has not generated any other agencies currently undertaking this type of work. It is likely that this type of service application support is provided to clients within homeless and or other outreach programs, though it would appear that this program is broader helping those within the City not currently served by other outreach programs to access disability health and income services.

## **28. Victoria Attractions Association**

*Question:*

1. Was the Harbour Authority approached to participate in funding? – *Councillor Madoff*

*Answer:*

1. The answer to your question is that we have not approached the Harbour Authority for any additional funding. The reason being, this has always been a "fee for service program" through the City of Victoria. We did not look to the Harbour Authority for funding when we expanded the program as the expansion was not at the request of the Harbour Authority. Attractions Victoria felt that it would be a good fit to add in the Ambassador presence at Ogden Point, if we could manage the resources without extra cost and that is what we have done.

## **29. Victoria Brain Injury Society**

*No questions.*

## **30. Victoria Innovation, Advanced Technology, and Entrepreneurship Council**

*No questions.*

## **31. Victoria Native Friendship Centre - Not present.**

*No questions.*

## **32. Victoria Pretty Good Society**

*No questions.*

### **33. Victoria Sexual Assault Centre**

*Questions:*

1. As this is a regional issue, is funding being requested from other municipalities? – *Councillor Thornton-Joe*
2. Does the program work with other police departments, other than just the Victoria Police Department? – *Mayor Helps*

*Answers:*

1. Due to multiple staffing changes in the months of February and March our capacity to apply for funding in multiple municipalities was limited at that time (most of these applications are due in March). As a result, based on our capacity, we made a strategic decision to apply for funding from the City of Victoria as the majority of clients currently accessing our clinic services are located in that geographical area (though our catchment area is regional). We are planning to apply for funding from the Districts of Saanich and Esquimalt in time for the next funding cycle, to support our operations in the following year.
2. Yes we do. In addition to the Victoria Police Department, we also work with: Saanich Police, Central Saanich Police, Oak Bay Police, West Shore RCMP, Sidney / North Saanich RCMP, Sooke RCMP, Military Police Unit Esquimalt, Canadian Forces National Investigation Service Pacific Region

### **34. Victoria Youth Empowerment Society**

*No questions.*

### **35. Volunteer Victoria**

*No questions.*