EMERGENCY & COMMUNITY SERVICES COMMITTEE
REPORT 09-007
1:30 p.m.
Wednesday, April 22, 2009
Hamilton Convention Centre
1 Summers Lane
Room 207
Hamilton, Ontario

Present:
Councillors S. Duvall (Chair), R. Pasuta (1st Vice Chair),
T. Jackson, B. McHattie, and S. Merulla (2nd Vice Chair)

Absent with
Regrets:
Councillor B. Morelli – Other City Business
Councillor M. McCarthy – Illness

Also Present:
C. Murray, City Manager
J. Kay, General Manager / Chief, Hamilton Emergency Services
J. Priel, General Manager, Community Services
T. Tollis, Acting General Manager, Finance & Corporate Services
P. Thorburn, Assistant Deputy, Fire
C. Secore, Manager, Recreation
C. Bian, Senior Policy Analyst
K. Lubrick, Special Supports Program Manager
B. Kreps, Manager, Housing Policy and Programs
S. Paparella, Legislative Assistant, City Clerk’s Office

THE EMERGENCY & COMMUNITY SERVICES COMMITTEE PRESENTS REPORT 09-007 AND RESPECTFULLY RECOMMENDS:

1. Ancaster Little League - Hosting for 2010 Canadian Little League Championships (CS09034) (Ward 12) (Item 5.1)

That Report CS09034 – Ancaster Little League - Hosting for 2010 Canadian Little League Championships, be received.
2. **Costs Associated with Artificial Outdoor Ice Rinks (ECS07064(a)) (City Wide) (Item 5.2)**

   That Report ECS07064(a) – Costs Associated with Artificial Outdoor Ice Rinks, be received.

3. **Fee Waiver Policy – Golf / Charity Tournaments Chedoke Municipal Golf Course (CS09032) (City Wide) (Item 5.4)**

   That Report CS09032 – Golf / Charity Tournaments Chedoke Municipal Golf Course, be received.

4. **Approval for Alcohol as part of a Special Event (La Magia Del Carnevale) – Art Gallery of Hamilton (AGH), Commonwealth Square (CS09035) (Ward 2) (Item 5.6)**

   (a) That the Art Gallery of Hamilton (AHG) be granted permission to seek a temporary extension permit to their existing liquor license for La Magia Del Carnevale, an annual fundraising gala taking place on May 30, 2009.

   (b) That the Art Gallery of Hamilton (AGH) also be granted permission to serve alcohol at the above mentioned event.

   (c) That, if the request to serve alcohol is approved, the hosting organization must comply with:


      (ii) The conditions contained within the City of Hamilton’s Municipal Alcohol Guidelines, Appendix A of the Policy for Special Event Planning.

      (iii) The applicant must provide $5,000,000 comprehensive general liability insurance coverage (which shall include a host liquor liability endorsement), and that the City of Hamilton is named as an additional insured party to this Policy.

      (iv) The applicant must pay all City Service costs associated with the operation of this event.
5. **Expansion of the Affordable Transit Pass Pilot Program to those in Receipt of Ontario Works/Ontario Disability Support Program with Earnings (ECS08051(b)/PW09038) (City Wide) (Item 5.7)**

   (a) That the eligibility criteria for the Affordable Transit Pass Program Pilot be expanded to include those adults in receipt of Ontario Works and Ontario Disability Support Program, with earnings, as of June 1, 2009, and that those eligible as part of the program expansion be required to pay 50% of the current cost of an adult monthly transit pass.

   (b) That the General Manager of the Community Services Department be authorized to increase the staff complement by one full-time Case Aid within the Special Supports Section, on a temporary basis, from June 1 to December 31, 2009 for a total of $35,000 funded from the Social Services Initiatives Fund #112214.

   (c) That the Acting General Manager of the Public Works Department be authorized to increase staff complement by one full-time Ticket Agent within the Transit Division, on a temporary basis, from June 1 to December 31, 2009 for a total of $32,083 funded from the Social Services Initiatives Fund #112214.

6. **Blueprint for Emergency Shelter Services (CS09015) (City Wide) (Item 7.1)**

   (a) That the Blueprint for Emergency Shelter Services, which seeks to develop a sustainable system to better support homeless people as they move to permanent housing, attached as Appendix A to Report 09-007, be endorsed.

   (b) That staff be directed to report back with a detailed implementation plan for the implementation of Basic Emergency Shelter Services and Intensive Case Management as described in the Blueprint for Emergency Shelter Services.

   (c) That staff and the Hamilton Emergency Shelter Integration and Coordination Committee be directed to work with other Consolidated Municipal Service Managers; who provide emergency shelter services, to advocate to the Ministry of Community and Social Services to change from a per diem to sustainable funding formula for Emergency Shelters.

   (d) That a copy of the Blueprint for Emergency Shelter Services and the approved Council resolution be provided to the Federation of Canadian Municipalities, the Association of Municipalities of Ontario and all local MPs and MPPs for their information.
7. **Trunked Radio System Upgrade (HES08004(a)) (City Wide) (Item 8.1)**

That staff be authorized and directed to proceed with the proposal, provided by Motorola Canada Limited (summary attached as Appendix B to Report 09-007, for the upgrades to the Corporate Trunk Radio System, in an amount not to exceed $21.6 million.

8. **Sponsorship for Hamilton and Scourge 2009 Archaeological Survey (CS09037) (City Wide) (Item 8.2)**

   (a) That the Hamilton and Scourge 2009 Archaeological Survey and work plan, attached as Appendix C to Report 09-007, be approved in principal, subject to such technical changes as may be prudent or required by the Ontario Ministry of Culture.

   (b) That the Hamilton and Scourge 2009 Archaeological Survey Project be sponsored in full by YAP Productions.

   (c) That the General Manager of Community Services be authorized to execute any and all necessary documents (including agreements), in a form satisfactory to the City Solicitor, in order to facilitate the Project, and/or to otherwise deal with the data or other materials produced pursuant to the Project.

9. **Amendments to the Outstanding Business List (Item 11.2)**

That the following items be considered complete and removed from the Emergency & Community Services Committee’s Outstanding Business List:

   (a) Item “A” - Fee Waiver Policy – Golf
       (Was addressed as Item 3 above.)

   (b) Item “K” – Artificial Outdoor Ice Rinks
       (Was addressed as Item 2 above.)

   (c) Item “O” – Ancaster Little League Hosting for 2010 Canadian Little League Championships
       (Was addressed as Item 1 above.)

   (d) Item “Z” – Trunked Radio System Upgrade
       (Was addressed as Item 8 above.)
FOR THE INFORMATION OF COUNCIL:

(a) CHANGES TO THE AGENDA (Item 1)

The Committee Clerk advised of the following changes to the agenda:

(i) Added as Item 4.2 – A delegation request made by David Cherkewski respecting Item 5.7 - Expansion of the Affordable Transit Pilot Program to Those in Receipt of Ontario Works/Ontario Disability Support Program with Earnings (ECS08051(b)/PW09038). If approved, the delegation will appear as Item 6.2 on today’s agenda.

(ii) Item 5.6, as shown on the agenda face pages (Expansion of the Affordable Transit Pilot Program to Those in Receipt of Ontario Works/Ontario Disability Support Program with Earnings (ECS08051(b)/PW09038)) – will be renumbered as Item 5.7.

(iii) Item 5.6, (Approval of Alcohol as part of a Special Event (La Magia Del Carnevale – Art Gallery of Hamilton, Commonwealth Square (CS09035) – as contained in the agenda package, but not shown on the agenda face pages will be considered as same.

(iv) Item 6.1 – Sally Palmer will not be in attendance; however, Rosemarie Chapman is in attendance and will be speaking to Item 5.7 (rather than 5.6).

(v) Item 6.2 has been renumbered as Item 6.3.

(vi) Item 7.1 – Blueprint for Emergency Shelter Services (CS09015) has been amended by staff. A revised copy is contained in the Changes to the Agenda package for your consideration.

(vii) Added as Item 8.2 – Sponsorship of Hamilton and Scourge 2009 Archaeological Survey (CS09037) (City Wide)

(viii) Item 11.1(b) – Subsequent to the printing of the agenda, staff has requested that the due date for the Funeral Service Fee Increases report be changed to June 17, 2009 rather than June 3, 2009.

(ix) Item 5.5 – Report PW09037/ECS07092, Beasley Community Centre – Status Update/Approval of Agreements, has been pulled from the agenda and will be brought forward to the next Emergency & Community Services Committee meeting for consideration.

(x) Added as Item 4.3 – A delegation request made by Peter Hutton, on behalf of the Hamilton Transit Users Group and the Affordable Transit Pass Sub
Committee to the Roundtable on Poverty, respecting Item 5.7 – Expansion of the Affordable Transit Pilot Program to Those in Receipt of Ontario Works/Ontario Disability Support Program with Earnings (ECS08051(b)/PW09038).

The April 22, 2009 agenda of the Emergency & Community Services Committee was approved, as amended.

(b) DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST (Item 2)

There were none declared.

(c) APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING (Item 3)

The Minutes of the April 8, 2009 meeting of the Emergency & Community Services Committee were approved, as presented.

(d) DELEGATION REQUESTS (Item 4)

4.1 Julianne Burgess from LINC for Youth Video Project – a Mohawk College ESL program for newcomer youth aged 18 to 25, to raise awareness of issues that affect the lives of newcomer youth in Hamilton.

The delegation request, made by Julianne Burgess from LINC for Youth Video Project – a Mohawk College ESL program for newcomer youth aged 18 to 25, to raise awareness of issues that affect the lives of newcomer youth in Hamilton, was approved.

4.2 David Cherkewski respecting Item 5.7 – Expansion of the Affordable Transit Pilot Program to Those in Receipt of Ontario Works/Ontario Disability Support Program with Earnings (ECS08051(b)/PW09038)

The delegation request, made by David Cherkewski respecting Item 5.7 – Expansion of the Affordable Transit Pilot Program to those in Receipt of Ontario Works/Ontario Disability Support Program with Earnings (ECS08051(b)/PW09038), was approved.
4.3 Peter Hutton, on behalf of the Hamilton Transit Users Group and the Affordable Transit Pass Sub Committee to the Roundtable on Poverty, respecting Item 5.7 – Expansion of the Affordable Transit Pilot Program to Those in Receipt of Ontario Works/Ontario Disability Support Program with Earnings (ECS08051(b)/PW09038)

The delegation request, made by Peter Hutton on behalf of the Hamilton Transit Users Group and the Affordable Transit Pass Sub Committee to the Roundtable on Poverty, respecting Item 5.7 – Expansion of the Affordable Transit Pilot Program to Those in Receipt of Ontario Works/Ontario Disability Support Program with Earnings (ECS08051(b)/PW09038), was approved.

(e) Arts Advisory Commission Minutes of February 24, 2009 (Item 5.3)

The Minutes of the February 24, 2009 meeting of the Arts Advisory Commission were received.

(f) Beasley Community Centre – Status Update/Approval of Agreements (PW09037/ECS07092b) (Ward 2) (Item 5.5)

Item 5.5 was pulled from the agenda. Staff will be bringing forward an amended report to the May 20, 2009 meeting of the Emergency & Community Services Committee.

(g) Implications Associated with Providing Reduced Bus Pass Fees to Working Ontario Works and Ontario Disability Support Program Recipients, as well as Low Income Citizens

Staff be directed determine the implications associated with providing all working Ontario Works and Ontario Disability Support Program recipients, as well as low income citizens, with bus passes at a reduced rate of $25 per month, and report back to the Emergency & Community Services Committee.

(h) DELEGATIONS (Item 6)

6.1 Rosemarie Chapman on behalf of the Social Action Committee to the Ontario Association of Social Works respecting the issue of Extending the Pilot Transit Pass Program to Working People on Social Assistance
Ms. Chapman addressed Committee and advised that there are shortcomings in the existing program. The current program should be expanded to include ODSP/OW recipients who work and who currently do not medically qualify (under ODSP/OW) for subsidized bus passes.

The presentation made by Rosemarie Chapman, on behalf of the Social Action Committee to the Ontario Association of Social Works, respecting Item 5.7 – Expansion of the Affordable Transit Pilot Program to those in Receipt of Ontario Works/Ontario Disability Support Program with Earnings (ECS08051(b)/PW09038), was received.

6.2 David Cherkewski respecting Item 5.7 – Expansion of the Affordable Transit Pilot Program to Those in Receipt of Ontario Works/Ontario Disability Support Program with Earnings (ECS08051(b)/PW09038)

Mr. Cherkewski was not in attendance.

6.3 Peter Hutton, on behalf of the Hamilton Transit Users Group and the Affordable Transit Pass Sub Committee to the Roundtable on Poverty, respecting Item 5.7 – Expansion of the Affordable Transit Pilot Program to Those in Receipt of Ontario Works/Ontario Disability Support Program with Earnings (ECS08051(b)/PW09038)

Mr. Hutton, coordinator of the Hamilton Transit Users Group (TUG), advised Committee that the TUG is in full support of the recommendations contained within Report ECS08051(b)/PW09038. TUG also believes that the recommendations offer affordable solutions to the needs of some in the community.

Mr. Hutton noted that it important to TUG that steps be taken now to ensure the program continues to expand and flourish past the end of 2009.

On behalf of the Roundtable on Poverty Working Group, Mr. Hutton informed Committee that the report brings the Province into the picture in a manner that illustrates how they can assist in supporting the transportation needs of social assistance recipients; while assisting the community as well.

The presentation made by Peter Hutton, on behalf of the Hamilton Transit Users Group and the Affordable Transit Pass Sub Committee to the Roundtable on Poverty, respecting Item 5.7 – Expansion of the Affordable Transit Pilot Program to Those in Receipt of Ontario Works/Ontario Disability Support Program with Earnings (ECS08051(b)/PW09038), was received.
6.4 Paul Johnson, on behalf of the Emergency Shelter integration and Coordination Committee, respecting Item 7.1 – Blueprint for Emergency Shelter Services (CS09015) (City Wide)

Paul Johnson, on behalf of the Hamilton Emergency Shelter Integration and Coordination Committee, spoke in strong support of the Blueprint for Emergency Shelter Services.

Mr. Johnson, on behalf of the Hamilton Emergency Shelter Integration and Coordination Committee, requested the following:

- That Council support the Blueprint in the strongest possible manner. Having full support of City Council is critical to the success of the Blueprint;
- That a report be brought back to Committee as soon as possible with respect to the implementation plan for the Blueprint; and,
- That staff include members of the Hamilton Emergency Shelter Integration and Coordination Committee, and any other community organizations and groups, in the advocacy effort with the Ministry of Community and Social Services.

The presentation made by Paul Johnson, on behalf of the Emergency Shelter integration and Coordination Committee, respecting Item 7.1 – Blueprint for Emergency Shelter Services (C09015), was received.

(i) Outstanding Business List Items requiring Approval for Proposed New Due Dates (Item 11.1)

The proposed new due dates for the following Outstanding Business List items, were approved:

(a) Item “CC” – Feasibility of Bidding to Host the 2009/2010 Vanier Cup in Hamilton
   Current Due Date: April 22, 2009
   Proposed New Due Date: May 6, 2009

(b) Item “DD” – Funeral Service Fee Increases
   Current Due Date: April 22, 2009
   Proposed New Due Date: June 17, 2009
(j) ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the Emergency & Community Services Committee meeting adjourned at 3:25 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Councillor S. Duvall, Chair
Emergency & Community Services Committee

Stephanie Paparella
Legislative Assistant
April 22, 2009
PURPOSE AND PARAMETERS OF THE BLUEPRINT

The City of Hamilton’s Strategic Plan to Address Homelessness lays out a bold vision for Hamilton to become a community where everyone has a home. The City’s comprehensive Strategic Plan developed in 2007 includes five specific outcomes and associated strategies with many of those strategies relating directly to the emergency shelter system (Please see Appendix One for a Summary of Key Strategies).

Building on its commitment to achieve the outcomes identified within the Homelessness Strategic Plan, the City is creating a Blueprint to set out the specifications for the emergency shelter system. Not only will this Blueprint ensure that there is emergency shelter available for those who need it, but it will also help redesign the emergency shelter system to better support homeless people in obtaining and maintaining more permanent housing.

This Blueprint focuses on City of Hamilton funded emergency shelters that provide services to homeless individuals (youth, males and females) and families. These organizations include seven funded emergency shelter programs provided through four organizations. The organizations and their programs are:

1. Good Shepherd – Men’s Centre; Notre Dame; Family Shelter; Mary’s Place;
2. Mission Services – Men’s Residence;
3. Salvation Army – Booth Centre; and,

This Blueprint does not address the shelters providing services to meet the unique needs and concerns of women who have experienced or are experiencing issues relating to violence against women. Nor does it address shelters that have criteria for admission relating to specific clinical treatments such as alcohol or drug abuse. These programs are funded through the province and not directly through the City. Similarly, this plan will not focus on the Aboriginal-specific emergency shelter services. There is currently a planning process for Aboriginal services through the Federal Government Homelessness Partnership. Although all these programs play a vital role in the emergency services system, they require a more specialized planning approach and will not be the focus of this Blueprint.
THE BACKGROUND

For decades, service groups, churches and community organizations in Hamilton have found ways to provide care and support to people living in poverty, the homeless and the hungry. Each of the four organizations operating Hamilton’s seven emergency shelters has been serving the Hamilton community for over 50 years. Long before government programs and organized fundraising efforts existed, these mission-driven organizations identified a human need and responded, using whatever resources they could muster to support the most disadvantaged people in the community. Over time, as awareness and understanding about the needs of this population increased, social policy evolved and public funding became available to these service organizations to assist them in their work in providing food and shelter for the homeless.

Today, there is a broader understanding of the causes, implications and consequences of homelessness. These issues are being examined and addressed by many sectors and organizations in the community including the Poverty Roundtable, the mental health and health care system, social assistance and social housing programs. As society attempts to address the broader issues involving poverty and homelessness, this community must also grapple with the question of how best to address the immediate needs of people who require emergency shelter.

There is a better understanding about the homeless population; who uses the shelter system, for how long and why. There is emerging evidence that leads service providers and policy makers to better understand what is required to enable people to break the homelessness cycle. And there is growing understanding that emergency shelter service providers must work together and strengthen connections to the boarder range of homelessness programs and services in this community. However, the existing policies relating to planning, assessing and funding the emergency shelters provide minimum stability to the organizations and are not conducive to collaboration and system-wide planning.

The City of Hamilton is the Consolidated Municipal Service Manager (CMSM) for emergency shelter services responsible for funding and overseeing these services. The City receives 80% funding from the Ministry of Community and Social Services for emergency shelters. Funding is provided to the City on a per diem basis for each night a shelter bed is occupied. It is generally agreed that this arrangement needs to be changed to allow more flexibility in ensuring that emergency shelter services are available when needed and that the emergency shelter system can help people transition to more permanent housing.

The City of Hamilton engaged the four organizations providing emergency shelter, along with the Housing Help Centre and the Mental Health Outreach Team, in a planning process aimed at examining the current system and developing the emergency shelter services blueprint for the future. With the help and support of external consultants, the City initiated a planning process to develop the Blueprint
that is presented in this document. This process included reviewing the existing data; interviewing and conducting workshops with the Executive Directors of the aforementioned organizations as well as City staff. The Blueprint describes the existing system, assesses the need for change in the system and develops a plan for redesigning the emergency shelter system to better meet the needs of homeless people, now and in the future.

EMERGENCY SHELTER SERVICES AND THE NEED FOR CHANGE

A Description of the Current System

The seven emergency shelters funded by the City of Hamilton provide a total of 370 emergency shelter beds. This includes: 125 beds for men, 65 beds that could be used by men or women, 20 youth beds, 80 family beds and 10 designated women’s beds.

Each of the organizations provides basic emergency shelter for its designated population. They also provide a range of related and complementary services, such as supported housing, food programs and other health and social service endeavours, funded either through government programs or their own fundraising efforts.

These programs and services reflect each individual organization’s unique values and beliefs. Over the years, each has evolved a particular focus, a distinctive model of service delivery and special expertise.

Mission Services has an alcohol recovery and treatment focus with 20 specialized ‘addiction beds’ in a program called Discovery House.

Good Shepherd operates four programs: a shelter for men; a shelter for women; a shelter for families; and a shelter for youth. The organization has expertise in addressing issues of health and mental health across the lifespan. An additional 10 beds for women will be available in the near future.

Salvation Army serves a general male, homeless population. It has some private or fee-paying beds, as well as 19 hospital discharge beds.

Wesley Urban Ministries provides shelter accommodation in a large congregant setting. It serves men and women and is the only shelter that will take couples. It also provides service to people who are intoxicated, and accommodates people whose behaviour is disruptive or challenging. There is no arrival curfew and the shelter also provides 24/7 drop in.

Table One identifies the programs and the unique focus of each of the shelters.
TABLE ONE: Shelter Programs and Beds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Shelter</th>
<th># of Beds</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Other Related/Unique Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mission Services</td>
<td>Men’s Shelter</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>Males</td>
<td>Recovery and Substance Abuse focus Discovery House includes 20 specialized addiction beds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salvation Army</td>
<td>Booth Centre</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>Males</td>
<td>Serves the downtown core Primary Care Clinic and 19 Hospital Discharge Beds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wesley Urban Ministries</td>
<td>Wesley Centre</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>Males Females Couples</td>
<td>A harm reduction approach Open 24 hour Accommodates intoxicated individuals and those with difficult behaviours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good Shepherd</td>
<td>Men’s Shelter</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>Provides a continuum of housing, mental health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notre Dame</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Youth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary’s Place</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>To be expanded in the future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Shelter</td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
<td>Families</td>
<td>Serves families with children Opened in 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Organizations</td>
<td>7 Programs</td>
<td>370 Beds</td>
<td>Source: CMSM Billing Data and Interviews</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Over the past three years, the shelter system has been used by more than 3,000 people annually. In 2005 3,049 people used the shelters. In 2006 3,950 people used the shelters and in 2007 3,690 people used the shelters. The number of beds available for men in the system is significantly higher than the number of beds available for females. In 2006, the percentage of females increased to 22% from 14% in 2005. This percentage was maintained in 2007 even though the total number of people using the shelters decreased. Table Two depicts the number of shelter users by gender by year.

TABLE TWO: Use of Shelter by Gender by Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>2614</td>
<td>85.7%</td>
<td>3074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transgender</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3049</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>3950</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: HIFIS Data

In addition to the number of people using the system, it is also interesting to look at how much of the total capacity of the system is being used. This can be done by looking at the occupancy rate. The system would be at total capacity if 100% of the 370 beds were in use. During the past two years, the bed occupancy rate has been at 83% in 2006 and 82% in 2007. Table Three highlights occupancy rates for 2006 and 2007.
TABLE THREE: Occupancy 2006 and 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shelter</th>
<th>Target Population</th>
<th>Number of beds</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>Average Occupancy</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>Average Occupancy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good Shepherd Men's</td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>86.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td>89.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission Services</td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>93.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td>81.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salvation Army Booth</td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>81.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td>78.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wesley Centre</td>
<td>Men and Women</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>88.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td>81.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary's Place</td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>89.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td>81.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSFC</td>
<td>Families</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>75.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td>84.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notre Dame</td>
<td>Youth</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>69.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>86.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>370</td>
<td>83.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td>82.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: CMSM Hostile Occupancy Billing 2006 and 2007

It is also important to understand how long people use the emergency shelter system. Over the last three years, about 75% of the people used the shelter system for less than 42 days. The converse of this, of course, is that for the same time period 18% to 25% of people using shelters did so for a period greater than 42 days. These individuals would be considered long term or chronic users of the system. Table Four highlights length of stay.

TABLE FOUR: Length of Stay by Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 42 days</td>
<td>2387</td>
<td>78.3%</td>
<td>3042</td>
<td>77.01%</td>
<td>2762</td>
<td>74.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42-365 days</td>
<td>553</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
<td>835</td>
<td>21.14%</td>
<td>923</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error/missing</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>1.85%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3049</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>3950</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>3690</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Source: HIFIS Data

Several key factors influence the fluctuations in the number of people using the shelters, the occupancy rates and the lengths of stay.

Prior to 2005, there was not a common data system. The new Homeless Individuals and Families Information System (HIFIS) was introduced in 2005 and, as with any new information system, several data glitches were encountered. These are currently being worked out. With each year the system is in use, those using it become more comfortable and confident in the information it produces.

Data issues are further complicated by the fact that there are two data systems; one data system that collects information and describes who uses the shelters and another system for budgeting, billing and funding purposes. Once again, with
experience and usage, the discrepancies between the two systems are being resolved.

The past several years have seen many developments and new programs focusing on homelessness. Federal and provincial initiatives have been developed and implemented with the aim of providing more housing opportunities for poor and low income people. Several programs have focused specifically on addressing the needs of homeless people.

The following highlights some of these key changes that may be influencing who is using what emergency shelters, how long they stay and the occupancy rate.

- The Hamilton Out of the Cold program operated by local faith groups provides food and shelter to those who need it from November through March.

- In 2006, the Salvation Army Booth Centre began operating 19 beds to serve homeless people being discharged from the hospital. These speciality beds take some pressure off the rest of the shelters insofar as people receive more intensive medical support and care in these beds.

- In 2006, Claremount House was established, serving 16 chronically homeless people with alcohol addictions.

- In 2007, the third phase of the HOMES program, operated by Good Shepherd, was introduced, adding an additional 56 units of housing and related support services for people who were homeless and living with a mental illness.

- In 2006, the Good Shepherd also opened its Family Centre providing temporary emergency accommodation (80 beds) for families experiencing homelessness.

- In January 2005, the province consolidated five homelessness prevention programs; Provincial Homelessness Initiatives Fund (PHIF), Supports to Daily Living Fund (SDL), Community Partners Program (CPP), Emergency Hostel Redirection (HER) and Off the Streets into Shelter (OSIS). At the same time, the province developed new objectives, goals and performance measures. The objectives of CHPP includes enabling service system managers to consider and support the full range of programming to meet local needs and priorities through clear goals, streamlined administration and flexible funding. It allows the service managers to facilitate the development of a seamless program of support services to connect individuals and families to community resources and assist homeless people or people at risk of becoming homeless, to find and keep stable living arrangements. It recognizes the
need to change the culture and practice of service delivery to one focused on client outcomes, through increased flexibility in program delivery and funding mechanisms and the results-based performance measures. It allows for service system managers and service providers to develop, create innovative new approaches to homelessness prevention programming. Hamilton receives approximately $1,280,000 annually in CHPP funding.

- In May 2007, the City of Hamilton launched the Hostels to Homes Pilot (H2HP), a collaborative effort with existing emergency hostels to reinvest community resources to support chronic hostel residents to move along the housing continuum. Hamilton’s H2HP has the capacity to assist 80 individuals to find safe, affordable housing and to provide them with the supports necessary to sustain that housing.

These changes in the shelter system have taken place over the past several years and have undoubtedly had a significant impact in the community – and will continue to do so. There has been a significant expansion in homelessness prevention and programs aimed at supporting homeless people to maintain transitional or more permanent housing. However, even with these initiatives, the numbers of people using the seven shelters has been fairly consistent over the past three years; the numbers of females using the shelter has increased; about 25% of the people are chronic shelter users staying in the shelter system more than 42 days and the shelters are still operating at about 82% occupancy with peaks throughout the year. So, while some of the measures indicate that rates have gone down (occupancy and usage), one must take into account the injection of new programs and resources so caution must be used when considering this data for future planning and funding of the system.

**Funding the System**

At the present time, shelters are funded primarily on a per diem basis. Organizations receive a per diem amount of funding for every night a bed is occupied. Each year, the CMSM sets a budget based on an anticipated usage of the system. Table Five shows the total budgets for shelter programs, the actual expenditures and the difference between these figures.

**TABLE FIVE: Budget and Actual 2005, 2006 And 2007**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>$3,011,278</td>
<td>$5,483,030</td>
<td>$4,537,142</td>
<td>$945,888</td>
<td>$5,086,140</td>
<td>$4,447,733</td>
<td>$638,407</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: CMSM Billing Data
Table Six presents this data broken down for each shelter. Each of the programs received less funding than was actually budgeted for by the city and by the agency. In 2006 the variance between the budget and what was actually billed was $945,888 and in 2007 it was $638,407.

### TABLE SIX: Per Diem Budgeted & Actual Spending: 2005, 2006 & 2007 by Shelter

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good Shepherd - Men's Centre</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>$495,065</td>
<td>$582,870</td>
<td>$494,348</td>
<td>$88,522</td>
<td>$524,680</td>
<td>$522,503</td>
<td>$2,177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission Services</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>$771,412</td>
<td>$845,160</td>
<td>$771,045</td>
<td>$74,115</td>
<td>$760,790</td>
<td>$690,802</td>
<td>$69,988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salvation Army</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>$968,378</td>
<td>$1,359,220</td>
<td>$1,142,305</td>
<td>$216,915</td>
<td>$1,206,760</td>
<td>$1,107,899</td>
<td>$98,862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wesley Urban Ministries</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>$776,423</td>
<td>$947,170</td>
<td>$747,518</td>
<td>$199,652</td>
<td>$947,170</td>
<td>$773,215</td>
<td>$173,955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good Shepherd - Mary's Place</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$357,244*</td>
<td>$291,430</td>
<td>$183,733</td>
<td>$107,697</td>
<td>$218,650</td>
<td>$119,665</td>
<td>$98,985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good Shepherd - Notre Dame</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>$457,272*</td>
<td>$291,430</td>
<td>$255,793</td>
<td>$35,637</td>
<td>$262,340</td>
<td>$251,215</td>
<td>$11,125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good Shepherd - Family Shelter</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>$1,165,750</td>
<td>$942,400</td>
<td>$223,350</td>
<td>$1,165,750</td>
<td>$982,434</td>
<td>$183,316</td>
<td>$982,434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>$3,011,278</td>
<td>$5,483,030</td>
<td>$4,537,142</td>
<td>$945,888</td>
<td>$5,086,140</td>
<td>$4,447,733</td>
<td>$638,407</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: CMSM Billing Data

As discussed in the previous section, it is necessary also to consider the related initiative funding available for emergency shelter services. This includes some block program funding and the new CHPP funding that has been made available to address homelessness issues including legacy programs such as OSIS, Housing Help Centre, and some funding that goes to shelters. Table Seven presents a summary of the total shelter and related homelessness funding for 2007. For all related sources of funding in the shelters including the per diems and other community funding, there is a total budget of $6.6 million dollars.

### TABLE SEVEN: All Shelter Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL 2007</th>
<th>Budget per diem</th>
<th>Actual per diem</th>
<th>Block Funding</th>
<th>CHPP</th>
<th>Total Budget</th>
<th>Total Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$5,086,140</td>
<td>$4,447,733</td>
<td>$519,797</td>
<td>$1,048,106</td>
<td>$6,654,043</td>
<td>$6,015,636</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: CMSM Billing Data
The Need for Change

Data provides only part of the picture. It is also extremely important to listen to the voices of the people who know the system and work in it.

To this end, interviews, workshops and focus groups were conducted with the Executive Directors and senior staff from each of the shelters, the Directors of the Housing Help Centre and the Mental Health Outreach Team, as well as the CMSM staff. These provided a rich source of information.

These key stakeholders openly shared their experiences, their thoughts, their concerns and their vision for future of emergency shelter services in Hamilton. They provided a vivid description of the day-to-day workings of shelters and related services. They shared the history and value system that informs their work. They discussed the administrative complexities of operating a shelter and providing care and support to homeless people. They shared their concerns and aspirations for the people they serve, their staff and their organizations.

The shelter organizations readily acknowledged that they are mission-driven and that their programs reflect strong commitments to their organizations’ core values and beliefs. They are proud of the fact that their organizations provided a broad range of much needed community services and that they were able to respond to community needs. They viewed the shelters as the “flagship” or cornerstone of all the work they undertake in the community.

As proud as they are of their individual organization’s achievements and accomplishments over the years, each organization acknowledged the need for change. They agreed that the time had come to refocus emergency shelter services. They expressed a desire to develop opportunities for shelter service providers to work more closely together to create a true system of emergency shelter services. They also indicated that if this change is to take place, a new funding approach is absolutely essential to help stabilize the system and build the capacity for the future.

The organizations understand that the status quo is not an option. They realize that moving forward with a more integrated approach requires an assessment of the key trends and challenges facing the existing service system.

The key issues and challenges identified by the various shelter organizations are described as follows.

Service Trends: The most significant service trend facing the shelters is a decline in occupancy accompanied by an increase in the complexity of problems faced by people using the shelters. Many people who come to the shelters suffer from more than one disorder, typically both a mental health and an addiction issue. Shelter workers and support teams may be able to address some of the behaviours, but very little attention is being paid to the underlying mental health problems. Some
shelters indicated that they are seeing a different population using shelters - young people with no income and very few life skills. Some shelters are seeing a substantial increase in the number of homeless people who are refugees and newcomers to Canada. These shelters have little capacity to address the linguistic and cultural uniqueness of diverse populations. And, as described previously, almost 25% of the shelter users are long-term users who require considerable support if they are to move to more permanent housing arrangements.

**Funding and Staffing Issues:** By far the most pressing issue facing the shelters is the current model of funding. At present, each shelter is allotted a number of beds and paid a per diem for every night that a bed is occupied. This occupancy-based, per diem model provides very little stability to the shelters insofar as they have fixed costs regardless of the number of individuals that sleep in a bed on any particular evening.

This model inadvertently may provide shelters with an incentive to keep their beds filled and "work the system" to get the maximum allowable per diems. This model is administratively time consuming for both the organization and the funder. Not only does it require a daily count and calculation of the funds payable, but it also means that there can never be any certainty as to how much money each organization will receive. Furthermore, the per diem model does little to foster a cooperative "systems approach" amongst the shelters because in fact they secure their funding for keeping the person in their shelter rather than, perhaps, referring him or her to a more appropriate setting.

Stabilizing funding for the shelters was seen by all as the key priority for creating and maintaining a viable emergency shelter system in Hamilton.

The inadequate wages paid to shelter workers is another key funding issue that the shelter organizations are concerned about. The role the shelter worker plays is becoming even more crucial as the shelters provide care to people with more complex needs and difficult behaviours in a system with ever increasing expectations. The shelter workers' role is evolving from custodial care model to a more demanding role in which the worker needs to assist in making complex assessments and in supporting people through difficult transitions in the search for more permanent housing.

Directors acknowledge that there are inequities amongst the agencies with regards to pay scales, but they also all agree that the more pressing issue is the strikingly low wage rate for shelter workers as whole. If it is ultimately the goal to stabilize the system, it is critical that appropriate compensation be given to those individuals working directly with homeless individuals.

The increased complexity of problems, the wide variety of needs, and the necessity to quickly assess those needs, combined with a very restrictive funding approach, are putting increased pressure on emergency shelter staff and management.
Working as a System: The organizations acknowledge the unique contribution that each shelter brings to the community. This diversity is viewed as strength of the system. However, there are challenges within the system and there is a need to better understand these differences and the special contribution each organization makes now – and aspires to make in the future. Currently, all the shelters serve three distinct populations:

- Emergency situational – people who require emergency shelter;
- Transitional – people who require some support to enter other programs or be connected to other services and supports; and,
- Chronic – people who use the shelter system on an ongoing basis.

While all organizations indicated that they serve the three types of clients identified above, the organizations also acknowledged that they each have a different service model, focus and expertise.

As the system evolves, it is important that areas of specialization be respected and nurtured. It is not possible for each shelter to be an expert in each area and as, the disincentives to working together are removed or minimized, a more specialized emergency shelter system could be designed to respond effectively and efficiently to the many diverse needs of the homeless population.

There are several specific concerns about the specialization of services that need to be addressed. The first is regarding the lack of emergency shelter resources for people who are intoxicated and/or require a detoxification bed. There was general agreement that there is a need for more “detox” beds in the system, but that there is strong sentiment that such beds should be funded through Ministry of Health programs and not through emergency shelters funding.

The Wesley Centre plays a unique role in the system in this regard as well. Initially, designed as a ‘safe haven’, Wesley provides emergency shelter to individuals who are intoxicated and/or who are exhibiting difficult and disruptive behaviors. Wesley’s physical layout provides for an auditorium setting and mats are brought out each night to provide a place to sleep for those who show up. During the day, the same auditorium is used for the drop-in centre and various other programs.

When looking at reconfiguring the system, one of the challenges facing the community is whether or not the population that is currently served by Wesley could be accommodated in the other shelters. Most of shelters themselves indicated that, at this time, they would be unable to adequately and safely serve many of the people staying at Wesley. Most of the other shelters have rules about sobriety and removal polices that prohibit people who are inebriated from using their services. Furthermore, the dormitory settings are quite isolated and there are not sufficiently staffed to monitor for safety of the inebriated clients or others. In an environment where many of the clients are trying to “dry-out”, an inebriated person would be very disruptive and could be a potential “set back” to other clients.
Although there is concern about the clients sleeping on mats at the Wesley Centre, it was acknowledged that Wesley plays a critical role in serving a segment of the population that cannot be served by others shelters. This population includes men and women who are intoxicated, or refuse to “dry out”, or whose behaviors are so disruptive that they can not be safely cared for in a dorm-room setting because they could be a danger to themselves or others. The Wesley Centre is considering the possibility of providing beds instead of mats and may do this in future, if and when appropriate.

If additional resources for staffing were available, appropriate safety measures put in place and shelters redesigned for easier monitoring, there is the possibility that the other shelters could accommodate some of the people currently being served at Wesley. It was agreed however, that current planning should assume that Wesley will continue to provide this service.

When thinking about the system as a whole, the shelter organizations acknowledged that there are currently different service philosophies, different policies and different expectations among the service providers. This leads to confusion within the system about who does what. Each of the organizations identified numerous opportunities for the shelters to work together more effectively and to link more effectively with the health and social service system. They made the following suggestions:

- Standardize methods of case management;
- Share databases;
- Develop common practices and protocols;
- Create opportunities for common training and education of shelter workers; and,
- Develop system-wide outcomes.

Everyone agreed that there was much room for better linking and coordinating amongst the shelters. They also agreed that there was the opportunity to rethink the emergency shelter system together, as a group, in order to redesign the system in a way that respects the unique contribution that each shelter makes, while developing common approaches to solving problems and meeting the needs of the people they serve. The organizations identified several conditions that would be necessary to make change possible within the system and these include: the implementation of a new funding approach, the resources to address the staff compensation issues, and a strong partnership model amongst the CMSM staff and the emergency shelter services organizations.

Based on these findings, the following section of this Blueprint provides the City, the Province, and the organizations that deliver shelter and related services with a plan to reshape and refocus the emergency shelter system so that it can best and most appropriately meet the needs of those it is meant to serve.
THE BLUEPRINT

The following sections contain the essential specifications for the Blueprint for Emergency Shelter Services in Hamilton. These guidelines are based on the information, insight and deliberations of all those involved in this planning process.

The Vision:
A vision describes the preferred, future state that is better than what currently exists and motivates and inspires people. The vision for emergency shelter services in Hamilton is: Everyone has a right to a home.

The Mission:
Hamilton’s emergency shelter services manager, funders and service providers will work together to create and maintain a viable and sustainable system of emergency shelter services that provides shelter and access to support services, enabling individuals to find more permanent housing.

Guiding Principles:
- Abandon no one
- Ensure dignity and respect
- Do not discriminate

Functions / Components of the Emergency Shelter Services System:
The emergency shelter system includes:
- Support to those doing outreach;
- Basic Shelter – including case management, initial assessment and triage;
- Intensive case management and transitional support;
- Support to help secure more permanent housing; and,
- Emergency shelter services’ coordinating mechanism.

The following table displays the components of the Emergency Services System. Any individual in this community seeking emergency shelter can expect to receive basic shelter at one of the seven shelters. The other supports and services will be available to individuals as they need them. These may be delivered through shelters or by other providers. The specifics of who will deliver what services and where will be determined through the ongoing emergency shelter system planning process. Also depicted, at the bottom of the table, are some essential programs and services that touch upon the emergency shelter system in various ways and must be considered in developing the service-delivery model. These include mental health services, income support programs, police services, and housing referral and information services.
### TABLE EIGHT: The Hamilton Emergency Shelter System

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function:</th>
<th>Outreach</th>
<th>Basic Shelter</th>
<th>Intensive Case Management and System Navigation</th>
<th>Support to Maintain Housing</th>
<th>Shelter Integration and Coordination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>• Engaging individuals to assist them in receiving health, housing or social services</td>
<td>• Emergency Accommodation • Food and basic necessities • A safe environment • Standardized services: - Welcome and reception - Initial assessment / triage - Basic case management - Information and referral</td>
<td>• Intensive support to assist people to transition to appropriate programs or more permanent housing • Support people to navigate the system and minimize barriers that prevent them from finding and accessing more permanent housing</td>
<td>• Support to people leaving the shelter who have found more permanent housing • Available for up to 18 months, including after-care / housing support which is delivered in a manner that responds to where clients are at</td>
<td>A committee that meets • to ensure that people who need it get the type of intensive case management or support • to develop common protocols and data bases • monitor client outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who receives service</td>
<td>People on street</td>
<td>Any person seeking emergency shelter at any of the shelters</td>
<td>Identified at triage or during the initial assessment Anyone in any shelter for longer than 20 days Available to anyone in any of the shelters who needs it</td>
<td>People identified through the shelters and the intensive case managers who are deemed to require additional support to find an maintain permanent housing</td>
<td>Shelter providers and other key agencies the Housing Help Centre, the Mental Health Outreach team and the CMSM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who provides service</td>
<td>Health and social services agencies</td>
<td>The shelters</td>
<td>A specially trained team located in the shelters as required</td>
<td>A specially trained team closely connected to the shelters and the intensive case management team</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>Various models and sources</td>
<td>Base budget funded through CMSM on an annual basis for an agreed upon number of units of service / beds at an agreed upon cost</td>
<td>This could be funded in one of several ways: through all shelters or through a community program</td>
<td>Could be funded through one lead shelter or a community program</td>
<td>An expectation in the service contract Project funding as required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factors contributing to success</td>
<td>System-wide outcomes Others</td>
<td>Adequate staff salaries System-wide assessment protocol, staff training and understanding of case management and referral Common knowledge of community resources</td>
<td>Same as basic shelter Positions are system-wide and must be adequately funded People have access to this service from any of the shelters</td>
<td>Same as basic shelter and intensive case management</td>
<td>Organizations willingness to participate and commitment to the process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ongoing services and support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ontario Works
Ontario Disability Support Program
Housing Help Centre
Mental Health Outreach Team
Hamilton Police Services
COAST
The Size and Shape of the System

Currently, there are 370 emergency shelter beds in seven programs. The occupancy rate is 82%. However, it is the opinion of the service providers that the system as a whole needs to maintain the current capacity in terms of number of available shelter beds. This capacity is required to address the peaks that occur throughout the year, as well as to ensure that the system can respond to a downturn in the economy or other unforeseen situations.

Once the changes proposed in this Blueprint are implemented and the system has the capability to plan and monitor its outcomes, there will be better data to help assess the most appropriate number of beds required. Changes, if required, can be made at that time.

All shelters will continue to serve the three populations that are currently using the shelter system – those people who require shelter on an emergency situation basis; those who require some transitional support; and those who are chronic users. However, based on history and other factors, each of the organizations has evolved to develop somewhat of a specialty focus. Once the barriers to better coordinating and integrating the delivery of emergency shelters services are removed (i.e. new funding model and a system-wide planning approach), the way is paved for further fostering and encouraging the speciality expertise within each of the shelters.

For example, Mission Services could logically become the shelter that focuses on recovery and substance abuse. Salvation Army Booth Centre could develop the resources to be a large, generalist homeless shelter, including the possibility of expansion with 24-hour service. At present the Salvation Army is seeking funding to ensure the long-term sustainability of the 19 discharge beds it currently operates. Good Shepherd could expand its work with health and mental health issues, addressing the emergency shelter needs of people across the life cycle. Wesley could continue to serve the people who have difficulty fitting in to other shelters and could build on its open 24-hour policy by assuming a lead triage role to help people who show up at Wesley during the day but need to connect to the most appropriate shelters or programs in the community.

The following table depicts a future sample allocation of beds and possible specialty areas:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Shelter</th>
<th># of Proposed Future Beds</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Proposed Specialty Focus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mission Services</td>
<td>Men’s Shelter</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Males</td>
<td>Recovery and Substance abuse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recovery beds</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Males in Recovery</td>
<td>Discovery House 20 beds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salvation Army</td>
<td>Booth Centre</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>Males</td>
<td>Primary Care Clinic Discharge beds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21 rental transitional room when vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discharge beds</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17 Male 2 Female</td>
<td>Discharge (potential to move these with the expansion of other services within Booth Centre)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wesley Urban</td>
<td>Wesley</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Males</td>
<td>Hard-to-serve population, accessible 24-hours,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### The Proposed Funding Model

The redesign of the emergency shelter system is contingent upon a new approach to funding the shelters. The per diem occupancy model is not suitable and provides very little stability to the system. This model inadvertently provides the shelters with a potential disincentive to move individuals as “keeping beds filled” is the only way to be compensated and to ensure organizations are receiving their maximum allowable per diems. This funding model is administratively time-consuming for both the organization and the funder. Furthermore, the per diem model does little to foster a cooperative “systems approach” among the shelters because; in effect they are funded to keep an individual in one of their organization’s beds, as opposed to referring him or her to the most appropriate setting.

It is proposed that each shelter receive base funding to provide a contracted number of basic emergency shelter services that include the following:

- Emergency Accommodation: an agreed-upon number of emergency shelter beds;
- Food and basic necessities;
- Ensuring a safe environment for all; and,
- Standardized services including: welcome and reception, an initial assessment or triage, basic case management as well as information and referral.

Base funding would reflect an organization’s basic operational, staffing and administrative costs. It is anticipated that the CMSM would establish three-year contracts with each of the shelter providers. Budgets will be reviewed and approved annually. Upon the implementation of this model, it will be imperative that initial budget discussions reflect the issue of adequate staff compensation.

Funding for Intensive Case Management and Service to support people to find and maintain more permanent housing will also be provided on an annual budget basis. Depending of the model chosen. These services could be funded as enrichment to a shelter’s base budget or as a separate contract with a designated lead agency. This will be determined through the planning process.

### Table: Proposed Funding Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Shelter</th>
<th># of Proposed Future Beds</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Proposed Specialty Focus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ministries</td>
<td>Centre</td>
<td></td>
<td>Females</td>
<td>accommodates intoxicated, takes those others will not take, could provide triage service, shift beds to the new women’s shelter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good Shepherd</td>
<td>Men’s Shelter</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>Provides a continuum of housing, mental health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Notre Dame</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Youth</td>
<td>youth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mary’s Place</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Family Shelter</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New Women’s Beds</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Families</td>
<td>Opened in 2006</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4 Organizations 7 Programs 370 Beds
In 2007, there was a total $6,654,043 budgeted for emergency shelters, block funding, OSIS, Housing Help Centre, and CHPP. It is assumed that this amount, at a minimum, will be available in 2008 – although the shelter organizations maintain that significantly more funds are needed to truly serve Hamilton’s homeless population. In any event, it is proposed that a base funding model be adapted for organizations providing shelter services. There is reason to believe that many of the key elements of this model, as well as some of the priority areas identified within the redesigned shelter service system, can be implemented within currently allocated funding.

**System Planning and Integration**

With a clear vision, a new service delivery framework and a proposed funding model, many of the critical building blocks for a sound emergency shelter system are in place. What is needed is the mortar that holds these blocks together. The firm commitment and the consistency of a unifying systems-oriented group, is essential in order to create a strong and lasting structure.

The next element of the homelessness Blueprint, therefore, involves tapping into expertise and experience of all the various emergency shelter organizations which can provide a powerful mix of guidance and leadership to hold the system together.

A system-wide Emergency Shelter Services Planning and Integration Committee will plan and monitor the shelter services, creating opportunities for the shelters and related services to work together to achieve common goals. In the initial stages, this Committee will take the Blueprint from design through to implementation, developing an annual Emergency Shelter System Plan, setting and monitoring system-wide outcomes, and identifying accountabilities. This Committee will develop the strategies to address human resource inequities in the system and find ways to “raise the bar” of the system as a whole. This Committee will also oversee the development of common protocols and policies, refinement of information systems and data bases, communication mechanisms, and create opportunities for shelter/system staff to work and train together.

The membership will be comprised of the four organizations providing emergency shelter, Housing Help Centre, Mental Health Outreach and CMSM managers. Over time the membership may be expanded to include other service providers and key stakeholders on the community. The Committee will be chaired on a rotating basis by one of its members.

The CMSM will play a lead role in the overall management of the emergency shelter system, directly accountability to the Province for funding and agreed-upon outcomes.

Through service contracts with each shelter provider, the CMSM will indicate the individual service and funding details, as well as the system-wide expectations.
A System’s Charter will be developed to outline the roles and responsibilities of the CMSM and each organization in the emergency shelter services system with each organization expected to sign-on and adopt this Charter.

Implementation – Assembling the Blueprint

This Blueprint provides the key specifications for redesigning the emergency shelter system in Hamilton. This plan will be submitted for review and endorsement by the system’s funders, the City of Hamilton and the Ministry of Community and Social Services, as well as the Boards of Directors of each of the four organizations delivering shelter services.

Implementation of some of the elements of the Blueprint is outside the jurisdiction of the shelters and may require significant policy and procedural changes that could take some time for approval. Other elements of the Blueprint are well within the authority and jurisdiction of the services providers and could be implemented with the commitment and goodwill of the organizations. What is required is a detailed Project Implementation Workplan, which addresses each of the key approval processes, resources required, timelines and contingencies.

The following Table provides a Proposed Workplan relating to the critical functions, goals and outcomes and the key activities that are required over the next 12 months in order to bring this Blueprint to life. Activities are identified in terms of what can be accomplished and by whom, in the short-term (less than 90 days), the intermediate (3 – 6 months) and the long term (6 – 12 months).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functions</th>
<th>Goals and Outcomes</th>
<th>Key Activities Short term</th>
<th>Key Activities Intermediate</th>
<th>Key Activities Long term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Approval Process</td>
<td>GOAL: To have all key elements of the Blueprint endorsed by the organizations, the City of Hamilton and the Ministry of Community and Social Services</td>
<td>• Submit Blueprint to the City of Hamilton, the Province and the Boards of Directors of organizations (Lead: CMSM)</td>
<td>• Modify as required (Lead – CMSM)</td>
<td>• Implement model and strategies developed in short term and intermediate (Lead: CMSM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OUTCOME: An approved Blueprint for emergency shelter services in Hamilton</td>
<td>• Receive feedback and approval in principle from above groups (Lead: CMSM)</td>
<td>• Receive approval and endorsement (Lead: CMSM)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Emergency Shelter Service Model</td>
<td>GOAL: To further develop and implement the new emergency shelter system services model</td>
<td>• Establish task group to further develop the emergency shelter system service model (Lead: CMSM)</td>
<td>• Receive feedback on the model (Lead: Task Group)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OUTCOME: A well-coordinated system of emergency shelters simplified access to safe and appropriate emergency shelter services to people who need it supporting them</td>
<td>• Further develop and refine the model (Lead: Task Group)</td>
<td>• Develop an implementation strategy (Lead: Task Group)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Present model to key all partners (Lead: Task Group)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE TEN: Proposed Workplan
This Blueprint was endorsed unanimously by the four organizations that provide shelters. It was also supported by the directors of the Housing Help Centre, the Mental Health Outreach Team and CMSM staff. Now that it has this go-ahead, the shelters are eager to make an early start on construction of the new system.

Putting the system together involves all of the activities identified in the proposed work plan. CMSM staff will discuss this plan with Ministry of Community and Social Services representatives, as soon as possible. At the same time, the shelters and CMSM will immediately begin laying the foundation by working collectively to determine how best to budget and allocate resources to achieve the results specified in the Blueprint.

This plan for emergency shelters takes the bold vision articulated in the City of Hamilton’s Strategic Plan to Address Homelessness to the next stage of development. It reflects the collective wisdom, experience and insight of key
stakeholders, who have collaborated in setting common goals and addressing common issues, in order to lay the groundwork for a sustainable system-wide approach to building the capacity of the emergency shelter system.

The focus of this Blueprint is on city-of Hamilton funded emergency shelters. It is recognized that this is only one component of the overall homelessness strategy. It is, however, an important cornerstone of that strategy and needs to be reinforced. As the emergency shelter system evolves, it will be essential for the shelters to continue to engage the broader community in working together on a broader strategy that will ensure everyone has a home.

In creating the Blueprint, the stakeholders have set practical goals and agreed-upon ways of achieving them. The next steps are well laid-out and the stakeholders are anxious to move forward. With good-will, commitment and enthusiasm on the part of all concerned, the way ahead is clear.
Appendix One
Related Outcomes Related Key Strategies Everyone Has a Home
- A Strategic Plan to Address Homelessness

Entire community is engaged to address homelessness Strategies:
  √ The Community Services Department enhances collaboration with community organizations, providing appropriate timelines for planning and consultation and involving affected groups early in program planning.

A continuum of affordable housing that helps residents achieve their Potential:
  √ Hamilton City Council advocates with the federal and provincial governments regarding their critical role in funding programs to address homelessness at the municipal level.
  √ The Community Services Department and service providers help people move through the housing continuum by targeting interventions to specific groups and more intensively addressing their needs.
  √ The Community Services Department and community agencies develop and implement transitional housing for youth, women leaving abuse (second stage), as well as women and men leaving emergency shelter.

Increase supports to help people obtain and maintain housing:
  √ The Community Services Department collaborates with social housing providers and private sector landlords on the development and implementation of eviction prevention policies and practices.
  √ The Community Services Department and community partners identify people who are staying in emergency shelters for 42 days or more, and provide appropriate supports to help them find and maintain affordable housing.
  √ The Community Services Department collaborates with community partners to develop and implement a system of coordinated case management for people in emergency shelters.
  √ Public Health Services, other levels of government, and agencies increase availability and accessibility of mental health and addiction services, including harm reduction strategies, outreach and treatment.
  √ The Community Services Department collaborates with the Local Health Integration Network (LHIN), healthcare providers and agencies to increase coordination, and access to, healthcare for those with mental and/or physical health issues that could cause them to lose their housing or limit their ability to move along the housing continuum.

Efficient and effective use of community resources:
  √ The Community Services Department facilitates discussions with community funders regarding the coordination of funding for homelessness programs.
√ The Community Services Department works with other funders regarding sustainable funding to maintain key programs.
√ The Community Services Department and service agencies expand evaluation and monitoring efforts of homelessness programming to ensure that effective programs are funded.
Summary of Trunked Radio System Upgrade

The Corporate Trunk Radio System supplies mission critical communications to Police, Fire, Public Works and other City Departments. This system has been live since 1995 with virtual zero down-time. To continue to provide this level of service the radio infrastructure requires upgrading.

In October 2008, Council authorized staff to proceed ahead with single source negotiations with the current vendor (Motorola Canada Ltd.) for upgrading the system. This strategy allows for a phased-in approach to the upgrade, minimizes risks, allows for renewal of existing sites versus establishing new and the carrying forward of newer radios used by Police onto the upgraded infrastructure.

Proceeding ahead with the proposal received from Motorola will provide for:

1. An upgrade of to the aging Corporate Radio infrastructure and replacement of existing end-user equipment with zero (0) levy impact, as the project will be funded from within current Hamilton Emergency Services Operating Budget funding levels.

2. A reduction to the potential liability for the City, which could be incurred as a result of system failure of mission-critical communications equipment that have reached end-of-life.

3. Improved utilization of Police and Fire resources through the use of an integrated global positioning system / automatic vehicle location GPS/AVL solution(s), which will allow for real-time tracking.

4. Improved portable radio coverage throughout the City, which reduces risks for first responders and deals with areas of growth and existing poor coverage areas in the City since the current system was constructed in 1995.

5. Leverages the City’s investment in the Trunk Radio System by providing an integrated solution for voice and data communications in a mobile environment (GPS/AVL, mobile data terminal operations), which helps reduce monthly operating costs that would otherwise by incurred as a result of having to purchase mobile data services from a third party provider. This solution will also allow Fire access to data communications, which was originally a Police resource. In addition to being utilized by Fire, it sets in place a framework for later expansion to other City Departments should there be a match in business requirements and functionality.

This upgrade of the Corporate Radio System consists of:

1. Replacement of all transmitter / receive equipment at existing radio sites.

2. Replacement of all backhaul equipment which is used to connect the sites together into one system.
3. Addition of two (2) new radio sites at existing City properties to resolve legacy coverage issues and deal with growth that has occurred since 1995.

4. Replacement of all existing end-user equipment (i.e. portable radios, mobile radios, chargers and accessories).

5. Replacement of Police mobile data system (DATAC) with an integrated voice/data solution that will become a shared resource to be used by Police, Fire and other City Departments if business requirements align with the capabilities of the network.

The total cost of the upgrade project as outlined in the proposal is $21.6M. The project will be partially funded from existing Hamilton Police Services Capital Project ($3.2M) and the Corporate Radio Reserve ($5.4M). The balance of the funding ($13.0M) will be financed over 15 years and repaid through Debt Charges.

The Table below outlines the changes in the operating cost over the next five (5) years. Given that the current system infrastructure is leased, the finance costs will be covered off from the current Operating Budget for Corporate Radio, which will result in zero (0) impact on the levy in 2010.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRUNK RADIO OPERATING COSTS</th>
<th>STATUS QUO</th>
<th>PROPOSED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EMPLOYEE RELATED COST</td>
<td>183,019</td>
<td>188,509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VEHICLE EXPENSES</td>
<td>4,100</td>
<td>4,223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONTRACTUAL</td>
<td>353,450</td>
<td>302,230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONTRIBUTION TO RESERVES / DEBT</td>
<td>1,222,950</td>
<td>1,263,730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LICENSE FEES</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>77,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEASE RENTAL RECOVERY</td>
<td>(71,600)</td>
<td>(60,860)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GROSS OPERATING COST</td>
<td>2,151,039</td>
<td>2,170,726</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| DOLLAR CHANGE INCR / (DECR) | -          | (298.51)  | 100,290.08| 34,564.35| 26,710.41| 58,624.03|
| % CHANGE INCR / (DECR)      | -          | -0.01%    | 4.58%     | 1.56%    | 1.20%    | 2.60%    |
PROPOSED ROV DIVE PLAN

Drafted by: ASI Group Ltd. (Darren Keyes and Bob Clarke) & Parks Canada (Jon Moore)
Prepared for: City of Hamilton and YAP Films

HAMILTON SHIPWRECK
2 days, 3 ROV dives per day, 2-3 hours per ROV dive.
Day 1 (Hamilton)
Dive 1 - Inspection of mooring(s) if required. Conduct reconnaissance dive with ASI’s Seaeye Falcon ROV and minor external inspection checks (e.g., check rope attachment on pivot gun). Pre scout openings for internal hull entry. Possibly collect small artifact(s) for topside documentation and sampling.
Dive 2 - Conduct internal video inspection using ASI’s LBV ROV or unspecified micro-ROV with attempts to reach all corners of internal spaces from various access points (i.e., hatches, companionways, and stern galleries). Use the Seaeye Falcon to assist with internal hull inspection work and to video smaller ROV operations where possible.
Dive 3 - Same as Dive 2.

Day 2 (Hamilton)
Dive 1 - Complete supplemental dual-axis sonar coverage of the Hamilton to same detail level as for the Scourge site using the Seaeye Falcon reconfigured for dual-axis sonar profiling.
Dive 2 - Use the Seaeye Falcon to supplement still photo coverage of exterior surfaces with greater frequency of still photo taking versus 2008 Condition Survey. Collect mussel and algae samples for species determination. Collect other material condition samples and/or conduct non-destructive scientific tests.
Dive 3 - Use Seaeye Falcon to return recovered artifact(s) to site and assess condition of human remains if possible. Selected removal of polypropylene ropes.

SCOURGE SHIPWRECK
2 days, 3 ROV dives per day, 2-3 hours per ROV dive.

Day 1 (Scourge)
Dive 1 - Inspection of mooring(s) if required. Conduct reconnaissance dive with ASI’s Seaeye Falcon ROV and minor external inspection checks (close-up check for cutlass hilt on deck at gun S3, images of damaged starboard quarter from
various angles, check of lakebed for fallen structure below starboard quarter, check gun P5 for exact attachment point of polypropylene line, etc.). Pre-scout openings for internal hull entry. Possibly collect small artifact(s) for topside documentation and sampling

Dive 2 - Conduct internal video inspection using ASI’s LBV ROV or unspecified micro-ROV with attempts to reach all corners of internal spaces from various access points (i.e., hatches, companionways, and stern galleries). Use the Seaeye *Falcon* to assist with internal hull inspection work and to video smaller ROV operations where possible.

Dive 3 - Same as Dive 2.

Day 2 (*Scourge*)

Dive 1 - Use the Seaeye *Falcon* to supplement still photo coverage of exterior surfaces with greater frequency of still photo taking versus 2008 Condition Survey. Collect mussel and algae samples for species determination. Collect other material condition samples and/or conduct non-destructive scientific tests.

Dive 2 - Use Seaeye *Falcon* to return recovered artifact(s) to site and assess condition of human remains if possible. Selected removal of polypropylene ropes.

Dive 3 - If time permits, use Seaeye *Falcon* to carry-out additional dual-axis sonar coverage of the *Scourge* if time permits OR carry out other additional archaeological tasks (no specifics yet).

The proposed dive plan has created to set the tasks out from highest to lowest priority. ASI Group will carry out the dive plan and fulfill the project goals on a “best-effort” basis subject to time limitations and/or weather delays. The highest priority is the penetration of the ships’ interior spaces. Yap Films, in consultation with ASI Group, Jon Moore/Parks Canada and the City of Hamilton, has the right to ensure that its filming goals have been attained before moving on to other tasks. This includes the decision to move the area of study from the Hamilton to the Scourge.

We also are proposing to visit the Tiller wreck site for one 12-hour day. This will allow Mike and Warren Fletcher an opportunity to dive and document this wreck. Jon Moore (Parks Canada) and Nancy Binnie (Canadian Conservation Institute) are interested in participating with this diving as well.

Possible archaeological goals, drafted by Jon Moore of Parks Canada on February 7, 2009, for the proposed diving on the Tiller wreck are:

**TILLER WRECK**

1 day with diving only (i.e., no ROV work). Low impact diving practices to be employed.
• Overall HD video coverage of wreck with divers in shots to gain appreciation of relative size of the *Hamilton & Scourge* in comparison.

• Detailed HD video coverage of hull features for comparison and contrast with *Hamilton & Scourge*. (Question of wreck penetration needs to be discussed with the Ministry of Culture).

• Close-up video of mussel coverage with divers in frame.

• Collection of mussel samples for species determination from different parts of the hull and surrounding lakebed (Are there differences between the debris field and on-wreck mussel populations?).

• Detailed examination of mussel matt surrounding wreck to gain appreciation of its characteristics. (What can the Tiller wreck mat tell us about the mats surrounding the *Hamilton & Scourge*?).

• Deposit pig bone sample(s) at wreck for short to long term monitoring study of mussel attachment affects on bone (to be discussed with Nancy Binnie and might require follow-up by other partners).

In order for this project to move forward we are proposing as a minimum to use our Seaeye Falcon ROV with sonar, digital stills, and carrying an HD camera (to be supplied by YAP) for archaeological investigations exterior to the shipwreck’s hulls. ASI’s Falcon could be used for collecting dual-axis profile sonar data, collecting wood core and mussel samples, collecting small artifact(s), and polypropylene rope removal. For internal hull inspection work, we propose four possible options which each will have additional costs associated with them:

Option 1 – ASI will supply our Seabotics LBV ROV with sonar, standard video camera and 2000 foot umbilical. The LBV ROV will be able to navigate to the wrecks from the mooring locations because of the long umbilical. The activities of the LBV ROV can be filmed in HD using the Seaeye Falcon ROV.

Option 2 - ASI can operate a rented micro-ROV, like a VideoRay Explorer, (supplied by YAP) which comes standard with a 570 line/0.3 lux colour tilt camera, compass, depth sensor, and 500 ft umbilical or the VideoRay Pro3-GTO which comes standard with a 570 line/0.1 lux tilt camera, a rear facing black and white camera, a single function manipulator/gripper, and a 500 ft umbilical.

Option 3 - ASI can rent and supply a commercial off-the-shelf (COTS) HD camera and modify our Seaeye Falcon to fully integrate the HD camera. The cost to purchase and install two new electronics boards (2), required for full HD camera integration, for the ROV is $12,500.00 alone.

Option 4 - YAP Films continues to research and supply a small micro-ROV with integrated HD camera to employ on this project. Please call if you have any questions or would like to discuss this further.
Budget Estimates

Supply of CCGS Griffon by Canadian Coast Guard (CCG) for mooring installation and removal only  $ NIL
As a result of discussions between ASI and CCG, CCG has agreed to contribute the installation and recovery of the moorings required for this project at no cost.

Mobilization/Demobilization (ASI): $ 46,750.00
Includes:
• all preparation and transport costs for ASI equipment & ASI personnel.
• project management costs, mooring configuration planning and ASI’s participation with mooring installation and removal.

Field Operations – Hamilton & Scourge Inspection Work (ASI) – 12 hour days: $ 59,160.00
Includes:
• ASI equipment & ASI personnel (6)
• Project manager, project engineer, ROV pilot/technician, and an ROV pilot, dive boat captain, and transfer boat operator.
• Supply of ASI SeaEye Falcon ROV, ASI Dual-Axis Profiling Sonar, and all associated equipment. Also includes supply of 70 foot dive vessel (the ASI Clipper) and 25 foot survey boat (ASI Surveyor) for personnel transfers to/from shore and emergency standby.
Cost would be $ 14,790.00 per 12 hour work day. We propose 2 days of underwater survey work at the Hamilton site and 2 days of underwater inspection work at the Scourge site; 4 days in total. (4 days at $ 14,790.00/12 hr day)
Overtime Rate of $ 1,050/hr after 12 hours
Standby Rate of $3,500.00/day or $292.00/hr

Field Operations – Tiller Wreck Inspection Work (ASI) – 12 hour day: $ 6,800.00
Includes:
• ASI equipment & ASI personnel (3)
• Project manager, boat captain, dive supervisor/deckhand.
• Supply of 70 foot dive vessel (the ASI Clipper) and 25 foot survey boat (ASI Surveyor) for personnel transfers to/from shore and emergency standby. Cost would be $ 6,800.00 per 12 hour work day. We propose 1 day of diving
inspection work (to be conducted by YAP personnel using YAP’s dive equipment) at the Hamilton site. (1 day at $ 6,800.00/12 hr day)
Overtime Rate of $ 510.00/hr after 12 hours
Standby Rate of $1,700.00/day or $142.00/hr

Data Editing, Processing, and Final Report Preparation (ASI): $ 27,600.00
• Includes all data editing, processing, and preparation of a final report. Also includes reporting fee of $5,000.00 for Parks Canada which could be deducted and paid directly to Parks Canada if that is preferred.
• Three copies of the final report will be supplied. Submission of a detailed report will be a requirement of the archeological license. Copies will need to be provided to Ministry of Culture, Parks Canada, and City of Hamilton. Extra copies can be provided for an additional charge.

TOTAL ESTIMATED COST $ 140,310.00 *

OPTIONS

Option 1 - $1,250.00/day
ASI will supply our Seabotics LBV ROV with sonar, standard video camera and 2000 foot umbilical. The LBV ROV will be able to navigate to the wrecks from the mooring locations because of the long umbilical. The activities of the LBV ROV can be filmed in HD using the Seaeye Falcon ROV.

Option 2 - Approximately $500.00-750.00/day (door-to-door) plus shipping costs
ASI can operate a rented micro-ROV (supplied by YAP), like a VideoRay Explorer which comes standard with a 570 line/0.3 lux colour tilt camera, compass, depth sensor, and 500 ft umbilical, or the VideoRay Pro3-GTO which comes standard with a 570 line/0.1 lux tilt camera, a rear facing black and white camera, a single function manipulator/gripper, and a 500 ft umbilical.

Option 3 - TBD
ASI can rent and supply a commercial off-the-shelf (COTS) HD camera and modify our Seaeye Falcon to fully integrate the HD camera. The cost to purchase and install two new electronics boards (2), required for full HD camera integration, for the ROV is $12,500.00 alone.

Option 4 - TBD
YAP Films continues to research and supply a small micro-ROV with integrated HD camera to employ on this project.