

CO-OPERATIVE INNOVATION PROJECT



Community Report

Clinton, High Bar First Nation, and Whispering Pine First Nation

Located in:
Census Consolidated Subdivision Thompson-Nicola E

CO-OPERATIVE INNOVATION PROJECT

The Co-operative Innovation Project (CIP), a two-year pilot project funded by Federated Co-operatives Limited, was created to examine two questions: is the co-op model feasible in rural and Aboriginal communities in western Canada, and if so, what is needed to inspire rural and Aboriginal communities to explore and create co-operatives that thrive?

The CIP found that yes, the co-op model remains feasible in rural and Aboriginal communities as a locally driven solution to address unmet needs. What is needed is a dual approach: vigorous co-op development activity at the community level; and focused effort at the pan-provincial level to leverage economies of scale and connect the western Canadian co-operative community. Our research results indicate that people will explore and create innovative and thriving co-operatives if they are inspired to do so, and supported throughout the process by connections and relationship-building activities that are aware of the politics that are inherent in co-op development.

The research for CIP was carried out by the Centre for the Study of Co-operatives at the University of Saskatchewan. For more than thirty years, the Centre has been a focal point and meeting place for those who believe that co-operative solutions can answer community needs in exciting ways. The Centre connects to a broad stakeholder base through its research partners, advisory board, and industry connections. Federated Co-operatives Limited (FCL) provided funding to the Co-operative Innovation Project as part of its mission to provide leadership and support for the benefit of its members, employees, and Canadian communities.

Centre for the Study of Co-operatives
University of Saskatchewan
February 2016



Centre for the Study of Co-ops
University of Saskatchewan
306-966-8502 / coop.innovation@usask.ca
coopinnovation.wordpress.com

CONTENTS

- Co-operative Innovation Project i**

- 1 What is Co-operative Innovation? 1**

 - 1.1 The Vision 1
 - 1.2 Why Co-ops? 1
 - 1.3 What We’re Looking At 2
 - 1.3.1 Community Need 2
 - 1.3.2 Knowledge of Co-operatives 2
 - 1.3.3 Business Capacity 2
 - 1.3.4 Social Capacity 2
 - 1.4 How We’re Doing It 3
 - 1.5 How to Read Your Report 3
 - 1.6 Are You Interested in a Co-op? 4
 - 1.7 Thanks and Acknowledgements 5
 - 1.8 The Final Report 6
 - 1.9 The Co-operative Innovation Project Team 6

- 2 Western Canada – What You Told Us 7**

 - 2.1 Social Capacity 7
 - 2.2 Business Capacity 9
 - 2.3 Needs 10
 - 2.3.1 Manitoba 12
 - 2.3.2 Saskatchewan 13
 - 2.3.3 Alberta 13
 - 2.3.4 British Columbia 14
 - 2.3.5 Western Canada Overall 14
 - 2.4 Solutions 14
 - 2.4.1 Role of Business or an Entrepreneur 14
 - 2.4.2 Role of Volunteers and Non-profits 15
 - 2.5 Role of Government 15
 - 2.5.1 Multiple Players 16
 - 2.6 Co-operative Solutions 16
 - 2.7 Needs and Social Capacity 17

- 3 Western Canada – By the Numbers 19**

 - 3.1 Location 19
 - 3.2 Demographics 20
 - 3.3 Education 23
 - 3.4 Housing 23
 - 3.5 Income 24
 - 3.6 Labour Activity 26
 - 3.7 Business 26

- 4 CCS Thompson-Nicola E – By the Numbers 29**

 - 4.1 Introduction – A Word About the Data 29
 - 4.2 Location 30
 - 4.3 Community Overview 30
 - 4.4 Demographics 30
 - 4.5 Education 31
 - 4.6 Housing 32
 - 4.7 Income 32
 - 4.8 Labour 33
 - 4.9 Business 33

- 5 Clinton, High Bar First Nation, and Whispering Pine First Nation – What You Told Us 36**

 - 5.1 Social Capacity 36
 - 5.2 Business Capacity 36
 - 5.3 Needs and Solutions 37
 - 5.4 Co-operative Solutions 38
 - 5.5 Needs and Social Capacity – A Summary in Pictures 38

- 6 Conclusion 40**

 - 6.1 Reference Material 40

- 7 Appendix Tables 41**

WHAT IS CO-OPERATIVE INNOVATION?

THE VISION

Community strength and resilience are key aspects of prosperity and well-being in western Canada, particularly in rural and Aboriginal communities. To be at its best, to withstand change, to identify and respond to local needs, and to shape its own future, a community needs to be able to take advantage of the best ideas and practices available. One such practice is harnessing community strength to build co-operative businesses that meet local needs. A co-operative rests on four pillars: a clearly identified need, innovative knowledge of the co-operative model, the business know-how to realistically address the need, and the social connections to build and help the co-operative thrive.

Co-operatives contribute to a community's quality of life, offering opportunities for economic and community development in areas citizens feel are important, such as housing, social services, retail, energy, recreation, and the sustainable management of natural resources and traditional economies. Perhaps more importantly, co-operatives develop and enhance a community's social capacity – relationships that support social interactions in a community. Today there are well-established co-operatives and credit unions that play key roles in the economy and in communities.

But what about the future? How will new co-operatives be organized and what will they focus on? Just as importantly, what is needed to help interested communities and individuals to move forward through co-operative enterprise? Co-operatives may or may not be the appropriate solution in every community. If all four pillars – clearly articulated need, innovative knowledge of the co-operative model, business capacity, and social capacity – are not met, can a co-operative still be successfully launched if there are strong local catalysts to drive development? These are the questions that drive the Co-operative Innovation Project.

WHY CO-OPS?

Co-operatives have a long history in western Canada, in large part because their structure provides an effective way for people in a community to meet a need or take advantage of an opportunity. A co-op is a business owned and controlled by its member-customers. Because the people that use the co-op have ownership and control, a co-operative can often be expected to better meet its members' needs than can other organizations. In today's environment, where people indicate growing concern over the lack of influence they have, co-operatives are an important locally-controlled business model that can leverage community strength. In rural and Aboriginal western Canada, co-ops offer communities the power to choose, and the power to act.

WHAT WE'RE LOOKING AT

Community Need

All communities have unmet needs. Some are small, others are large and/or complex. These needs can be a gap in service or a social network, or they can arise from a failure of investors, non-profit interests, or government to provide the goods and services that a community requires and desires. Typical examples include a lack of housing options, of child care, retail options or food services, a need for a local bank, a dry cleaner, or a community centre. Other communities, defined by common interests rather than place, could also have goods or services that they require. A group of farmers may need to band together to increase access to markets, or parents may need to create a nursery school. If a community can clearly articulate a defined unmet need, they are on their way to solving it.

Knowledge of Co-operatives

In order to be able to choose a co-operative as a way to fill a need, communities must be aware of what a co-operative is, and how it can be adapted to address the need. People can usually identify a co-operative retail store or gas station, but they often struggle when it comes to innovative applications to fill other needs. Local catalysts and leaders with the knowledge, passion, and skills to creatively apply the co-op model are required at the community level. These people need to see new ways of meeting identified needs and/or see novel ways in which the co-op structure can be altered.

Business Capacity

A co-operative is, at its heart, a business. Like all businesses, it provides a good or service that meets a need and for which people are willing to pay. Defining, planning, structuring, and running the business requires leadership, entrepreneurship, knowledge of market conditions and market structure, and an ability to organize. Lived experience, from education to workplace to volunteer work, contributes to any community's business capacity. Doing books for your local church is financial management; running a bake sale is marketing and sales; chairing a committee is administration and human resource management. All of these skills can be learned, and all become better with practice. When a community has a range of people with business experience that come together to solve problems, their business capacity is stronger. The co-operative model, which taps into knowledge and skills from across a broader range of people, multiplies and expands business capacity.

Social Capacity

Harnessing the collective energy necessary to operate a co-operative is easy when a community works together – it's much harder when there are barriers. A community works together better if it has a strong social capacity – those qualities that connect, unite, and join a group of people together. Key factors include trust, a sense of community connection, and an ability to navigate or remove community power structures and inequality. When co-operative activity lacks social sanction (shown through approval and encouragement), community building through co-operatives is more difficult. Communities with strong social capacity can use that energy and support to fuel co-operative business ideas. In addition, the co-operative model, which unites people in a group working together for a common goal, can contribute back to a community's social capacity.

HOW WE'RE DOING IT

The research presented in this report focuses on three of the four themes outlined above: community need, business capacity, and social capacity. To support the research, we undertook four main data collection efforts:

1. On-line research: helps us understand the building blocks of each community, such as geography, demographics, education, housing, health, income, and business. We use:
 - Statistics Canada data
 - Community Profiles 2011
 - National Health Survey 2011/2012
 - National Household Survey 2011
 - Agriculture Canada census
 - Community websites (if available)
2. Telephone survey: A random survey of rural and Aboriginal people in western Canada asked questions about the respondents' perceptions of their community. The survey results built a picture of the strength of social capacity and a picture of community needs across western Canada.
3. Web-based survey: Administrators in rural and Aboriginal communities across western Canada were surveyed about community business capacity, including community planning and vision, and social capacity, including how leadership is structured and the level of volunteerism in communities.
4. Community engagement meetings: Visits to a randomly selected group of communities created an opportunity for an open discussion with the participants about community needs, social capacity, and potential solutions.

HOW TO READ YOUR REPORT

Each community that hosted a community engagement meeting receives a report (like this one) that highlights the results of our research and presents the views and issues raised at their meeting. This report contains information at a western Canada level as well as at the provincial and community level.

Chapter 2 provides an aggregate view of the issues raised in the twenty-six community meetings held across western Canada. At these meetings, we explored three key issues for co-operative development: the presence and nature of social capacity in the community, the existence of the business capacity necessary to start and operate businesses, and the clear articulation of unmet community needs. The chapter also provides a discussion of the solutions to these needs that participants thought were possible in their communities.

Chapter 3 presents detailed statistical data on rural and Aboriginal communities in western Canada. The data covers demographics (e.g., age profiles), educational attainment, housing, income, labour activity, and business size and type. The data is split out by rural and Aboriginal communities, and by province, thus providing a picture of what is going on in these different groupings.

Chapter 4 presents similar data to that presented in chapter 3, but at a more local level – specifically at the census consolidated subdivision, or CCS level. A CCS is a group of adjacent rural municipalities, counties,

First Nation reserves, towns and villages. The CCSs that were chosen contain the communities in which community engagement events were held.

Chapter 5 provides an overview of the views expressed and the discussion that took place at the community engagement events. The communities identified in this chapter are the ones where the meeting took place and where invitations were specifically sent. It is important to note that while the information presented in this chapter does provide a sense of the issues that the participants are facing, it may not be totally accurate. The views that are reported depend on which community members chose to attend our meetings and which opinions they voiced while there. The more well-attended the meetings, with more diverse voices present from the community, the more robust and accurate is the community description. The accuracy of the views expressed are improved significantly at the western Canadian level (see chapter 2).

While there is a great amount of statistical information available, we have presented the information most relevant to co-operative development. It is important to point out that there are known problems with the information collected in the 2011 National Household Survey – given the way in which the survey was given, the numbers presented for 2011 may not be representative of the situation at the community level. These limitations must be considered when examining the data for 2011 and in making comparisons with the data from the 2006 census. We have noted where the results for your community seem to contain a problem. If you would like the full tables of information for your community, please contact our project team.

ARE YOU INTERESTED IN A CO-OP?

Western Canada has an array of groups, associations and ministries that have co-operative expertise on hand, and can direct you and your group to more resources. If you are interested in learning more about co-operatives and/or would like to speak to someone about co-operative development, the following organizations are good sources of information and contacts:

Co-operative Innovation Project
 Centre for the Study of Co-operatives
 196 Diefenbaker Building
 University of Saskatchewan
 Saskatoon SK S7N 0J6
 Phone (306) 966-8509
 Fax (306) 966-8517
 E-mail: coop.studies@usask.ca
 Online: <https://coopinnovation.wordpress.com/>

British Columbia Co-operative Association (BCCA)
 1737 West 3rd Avenue, Suite 212
 Vancouver BC V6J 1K7
 Tel: (604) 662-3906
 E-mail: general@bccacoop.ca
 Online: <http://www.bccacoop.ca/>

Upper Columbia Co-operative Council
 Box 66 Nelson, British Columbia V1L 5P7
 Phone: 250-354-5396
 Email: info@uccc.coop

Online: <http://uccc.coop/>

Alberta Community and Co-operative Association
#202, 5013 – 48 Street
Stony Plain, AB T7Z 1L8
Phone: (780) 963-3766
Fax: (780) 968-6733
E-mail: sleon@acca.coop
Online: <http://acca.coop/>

Saskatchewan Co-operative Association
1515–20th Street West
Saskatoon SK S7M 0Z5
Tel. (306) 244-3702
Fax. (306) 244-2165
Email: sca@sask.coop
Online: <http://www.sask.coop/index.html>

Manitoba Co-operative Association
400 - 317 Donald Street
Winnipeg MB R3B 2H6
P: (204) 989-5930
E-mail: info@manitoba.coop
Online: www.manitoba.coop

CDEM: (Serving Manitoba Bilingual Communities)
Suite 200 - 614 Des Meurons St.
Winnipeg, Manitoba
Canada, R2H 2P9
Phone: (204) 925-2320
Toll-free: (800) 990-2332
Online: <http://www.cdem.com/en/sectors/co-op-1>

Cooperative Development Services - Government of Manitoba
Housing and Community Development
400-352 Donald Street
Winnipeg, Manitoba, R3B 2H8
Phone: (204) 945-3379
Fax: (204) 948-1065
Toll-free: (866) 479-6155
E-mail: co-ops@gov.mb.ca
Online: http://www.gov.mb.ca/housing/coop/coop_overview.html

THANKS AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We would like to sincerely thank the communities, individuals, and organizations that have supported our work. The opportunity to travel through western Canada to learn from you about your communities, and to see first-hand the passion, hope, and drive that exists in rural and Aboriginal communities has been truly

inspiring. Many communities are tired of being researched, while others were happy for an opportunity they had not had before. Regardless of their histories with research, all of the communities we visited were thankful for the opportunity to have an open discussion about their community and were ready for action. We hope the material presented in this report helps continue the conversation, and fuels that action in your community. We look forward to maintaining a continued dialogue with you about your communities, and to exploring the opportunities for co-operatives to play a role going forward.

We would also like to thank Federated Co-operatives Limited for making it possible for us to undertake the research. It was a real pleasure to work with a group that was genuinely interested in the results of the report and committed to having the research carried out in a rigorous manner. While many of us on the research team had undertaken applied research before, the experience on this project was unique, partly because of the large scale of the project and partly because we all felt that the research could make a difference.

THE FINAL REPORT

The information provided in this community report is but a small subset of the information that was collected over the course of the research project. If you would like to see copies of the reports for the other communities, or if you would like to read the final report that looks more deeply at co-operative development and at the manner in which community needs, business capacity and social capacity are linked, please visit the CIP website at:

<https://coopinnovation.wordpress.com/final-report/>

THE CO-OPERATIVE INNOVATION PROJECT TEAM

Murray Fulton and Dionne Pohler — Professors, Centre for the Study of Co-operatives, Johnson-Shoyama Graduate School of Public Policy, University of Saskatchewan

Darcy Overland and Nicole McLaren — CIP Project Manager/Director

Rhiannon Klein and Dazawray Landrie-Parker — CIP Community Engagement Co-ordinators

Haotao Wu — CIP Data Analyst

Merle Massie and Bev Fairful — CIP Research Officers

Kyle White, Miranda Gouchie, and Paula Mowat — CIP Research Assistants

WESTERN CANADA – WHAT YOU TOLD US

From January through June 2015, the Co-operative Innovation Project held community engagement meetings across Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta, and British Columbia. We invited a total of thirteen Aboriginal and fifty rural communities to attend one of twenty-six meetings. In all, we had conversations with more than four hundred individuals in these communities, including youth, senior citizens, parents, business owners, public officials, community volunteers, community development workers, co-op sector representatives, and interested citizens. Figure 2.1 shows the locations we visited.

In the meetings, we explored three key issues for co-operative development: the presence and nature of social capacity in the community, the existence of the business capacity necessary to start and operate businesses, and the clear articulation of unmet community needs.




Figure 2.1. Community Engagement Locations in Western Canada

SOCIAL CAPACITY

Social capacity is one of the key components of problem solving as a group. We define social capacity as the ability of people in a community to work together, as well as the willingness of a community to *allow* people to work together. Social capacity extends beyond volunteerism, personal attributes, and networks to the dynamics of everyday life. The ability to work together on a collective project is particularly necessary in the co-operative model. People not only have to come together to create a co-operative, but they also have to support the co-operative business (be its members, owners, and customers) for it to thrive.

The majority of rural and Aboriginal communities we visited indicated that the social capacity of their community has diminished (somewhat or a lot) over time. While many communities identified healthy social capital, some have a hard time leveraging their strengths in a sustained and planned manner over time. During community meetings, the eighth most common word recorded was ‘busy.’ Service clubs are closing because they do not have adequate membership, and boards have a hard time recruiting members. The exodus of working-age people from rural areas (either by commuting or by outright moving) means that more community work falls to senior citizens. Working-age individuals in rural areas find themselves

Community barriers were another strong issue, with participants reporting feelings of non-representation either within local community politics or at other levels of government. A general lack of day-to-day involvement by community members in local decision making was also expressed in both rural and Aboriginal communities; however, it appears to have more of a direct impact and generated direct discussion in Aboriginal communities.

In rural communities, transportation received more discussion than seniors' services, support services, or accessing services; the reverse is true in Aboriginal communities. Rural residents feel confident using current transportation to acquire services when and where available, while Aboriginal communities check first to be sure those services are in place and operating well. The call for services (of all types) in Aboriginal communities reflects a desire to access culturally appropriate services within their own communities, not to rely on outside service providers.

Table 2.1. Top Needs in Rural and Aboriginal Communities in Western Canada

| Percentage of Discussion Time | Western Canada | Rural Communities | Aboriginal Communities |
|-------------------------------|--|---|--|
| > 7% | Health Care | Health Care Housing | Health Care Support Services Community Barriers |
| 5–7% | Housing Support Services Industry & Bus. Dev. Community Barriers Seniors' Services Transportation | Industry & Bus. Dev. Volunteerism Transportation Seniors' Services | Seniors' Services Accessing Services Transportation |
| 3–5% | Accessing Services Volunteerism Recreation Infrastructure Youth Retail | Infrastructure Recreation Youth Support Services Community Barriers | Housing Industry & Bus. Dev. Recreation Education Infrastructure Addictions |
| < 2% | 35 additional needs | 34 additional needs | 36 additional needs |

A similar difference can be seen in the ranking of industry and business development, which was the third most-mentioned need in rural communities, after health care and housing. Development is a driver to bring new residents to the area, to infuse money into the economy, and to diversify services and opportunities for residents. In Aboriginal communities, industry and business development falls after other community health, services, transportation, and housing needs. Aboriginal communities do not tie community population growth to development – there was no focus on bringing people to the community. Participants spoke instead of ensuring present community members are healthy and have opportunities.

There appears to be a fundamental difference in volunteerism in rural and Aboriginal communities; this difference also extends to how a community sets out the process around community involvement. Rural communities, on the whole, feel empowered to enact change for their communities, while Aboriginal community members feel doubly constrained by local band governance and the federal government. Rural communities noted a volunteer crisis, citing a high need for a new infusion of volunteers to drive community change and provide community services. In Aboriginal communities, volunteering barely registered as a local need, while the sorts of voluntary services provided by a rural community's volunteer base are often viewed as the local government's responsibility. Rural communities with an existing but stretched and

aging base wondered where start-up funding would come from to fuel change. Aboriginal communities doubted that they had the ability to make a change. Both groups wondered who would do the work.

Recreation was an important area, discussed in both Aboriginal and rural communities. Recreational pursuits support citizen health and help people engage in their communities. There is a real concern that community members do not know, understand, and help one another as much as they used to in the past. In rural communities, recreation was also tied to youth, and entertainment and culture, areas not present in the top list from Aboriginal communities.

Rural communities have a higher need for local retail and shopping opportunities, while Aboriginal community members did not feel this was as strong a priority. However, since transportation and accessing services were particularly important for Aboriginal communities, it is possible that Aboriginal respondents subsumed their retail needs into these larger areas.

Education was among the top needs in Aboriginal communities, but not in the rural communities. This difference could be reflective of both the younger population and a desire for culturally appropriate, high quality services to be offered in their own community. Both types of communities discussed the difficulty of their residents leaving for postsecondary education and then not returning.

Overall, the ten needs that coded high in both rural and Aboriginal communities were: health care, housing, support services, industry and business development, community barriers, seniors' services, transportation, accessing services, recreation, and infrastructure (see table 2.2). Volunteerism, youth services, retail, entertainment and culture, education, and addictions services were important in either rural or Aboriginal communities, but not both.

Table 2.2. Top Ten Needs in Rural and Aboriginal Communities in Western Canada

| |
|-----------------------------------|
| Health Care |
| Housing |
| Support Services |
| Industry and Business Development |
| Community Barriers |
| Seniors' Services |
| Transportation |
| Accessing Services |
| Recreation |
| Infrastructure |

Another way to look at the data from community meetings is to consider the impact of provincial boundaries. Are there differences in community needs if the responses are split out by province? Using the same criteria used above, there are thirteen needs across western Canada (only those needs discussed at least 3% of the time are included). By province, there were twelve top needs in Manitoba, eleven in Saskatchewan, thirteen in Alberta, and fourteen in British Columbia. Figure 2.3 presents the needs identified in each province.

Manitoba

Housing and health care topped the list of needs in Manitoba, with housing as the number one priority. Service concerns received less airtime. Industry and business development – to diversify communities and to generate greater resources for communities – was a strong component of the discussion. Volunteerism comprised a larger part of the discussion than in other provinces, as did community barriers and

Table 2.3. Top Needs in Western Canada by Province

| Percentage | Manitoba | Saskatchewan | Alberta | British Columbia |
|------------|---|---|---|---|
| > 7% | Housing Health Care Industry & Bus. Dev. | Health Care Support Services Accessing services Seniors' Services | Industry & Bus. Dev. | Housing Health Care |
| 5–7% | Volunteerism Community barriers Recreation | Transportation | Community barriers Infrastructure Health Care Housing Recreation Volunteerism Transportation Youth | Transportation Industry & Bus. Dev. Community barriers |
| 3–5% | Transportation Youth Retail Accessing services Support Services Infrastructure | Housing Community barriers Industry & Bus. Dev. Volunteerism Infrastructure Recreation | Seniors' Services Retail Support Services Education | Seniors' Services Recreation Infrastructure Youth Volunteerism Education Retail Support Services Food |
| < 3% | 35 additional needs | 37 additional needs | 35 additional needs | 34 additional needs |

recreational needs. Manitoba was the only province where seniors' services did not make the list of the top needs, perhaps due to the long history of having hub communities providing these services.

Saskatchewan

Health care is the number one priority of the participants we met with in Saskatchewan, followed closely by concern for both the provision of, and access to, services. Saskatchewan has a history of centralization, and both rural and Aboriginal communities are concerned that their access has eroded. As well, rural communities have an aging population, many of whom need increased health care. Transportation was a critical component of most Saskatchewan conversations; participants registered concern with current transportation policies and practices. A second set of community- and economic-based needs (housing, community barriers, industry and business development, volunteerism, infrastructure, recreation) appeared lower down. Compared to western Canada as a whole, youth and access to local retail received less attention, but the overall aging rural population, and the larger discussion around transportation, may account for this difference.

Alberta

Alberta communities placed the greatest emphasis on industry and business development. All other provinces placed health care either first or second, yet this comprised a somewhat smaller part of the conversation in Alberta. Seniors' services and support services also received less discussion, while access to services did

not make Alberta's top needs. Community barriers and infrastructure concerns ranked high. Housing also received less attention in Alberta in comparison to western Canada as a whole. Recreation, volunteerism, and youth issues were discussed more in Alberta than in the other provinces. Education, which was not on the top-needs list for western Canada, remained important to Alberta communities.

British Columbia

As in Manitoba, housing and health care topped the list in British Columbia. Transportation also rated high, which may be related to the remote and island communities we visited. Industry and business development, and removing community barriers were also important. British Columbia communities listed food among their top needs – a fact that might be related to the remoteness of some of the communities – and placed a larger emphasis on locally produced, organic foods. As in Saskatchewan, seniors' needs came up more than youth, although youth did make the top list.

Western Canada Overall

Both Manitoba and Alberta expressed concern for industry and business development, but interestingly, both also noted somewhat more trouble with volunteerism and community barriers. Saskatchewan and British Columbia both rated concerns with transportation somewhat higher than either Manitoba or Alberta, which could be attributed to distance, road conditions, or the centralization of services. While health care topped the list overall, Saskatchewan was the only province where it was the primary concern. Housing landed second on the overall list, despite being the top priority in two provinces. Although Alberta and British Columbia placed education within their top needs, education did not maintain that ranking in the overall western Canadian picture. Neither Alberta nor British Columbia were as worried about accessing services as the other two provinces; that category did not make their list of top needs. Saskatchewan's top needs did not include youth or retail; however, those at the community events may have been older than average and not as representative of a younger dynamic.

Further investigation may show that both rural communities and Aboriginal communities may also show interesting differences by province, or even by region (north or south, island/remote or central). However, with just 26 community visits, some of those comparisons may be less robust. Going forward, CIP recommends that this raw data be matched with other data points collected and rolled up into larger comparisons.

SOLUTIONS

In general, participants at our meetings were very concerned about the practicality and sustainability of any solutions that are proposed to address their needs. In some cases, communities and individuals within communities have been having these conversations for a long time and have tried various solutions, which in turn have provided knowledge of what may or may not work in their community. For most of the needs, people felt that few of the conventional actors, acting alone, would be able to provide a solution – at least, not in the short term.

Role of Business or an Entrepreneur

During the meetings, participants could readily identify needs that could be solved by business, or that could potentially provide a role for business. Many communities indicated that while there is potential for an entrepreneur to invest in their community, there hasn't been a rush to their door. The key word, used from Manitoba to British Columbia, was *attract*. "It came down to money: there is a real need to capture

local capital, or to attract capital, into the region.” Attracting new industry to open up a large-scale business – of whatever kind – in the region seemed the most exciting solution. The reality, though, fell short: “This seemed more like winning a lottery.”

Participants were not willing to open competing businesses – there are few enough differentiated businesses, let alone having enough clientele for two in competition. “Not financially feasible for an entrepreneur.” Others looked for regional development and co-operation with nearby communities to ensure all communities in their area had opportunity for growth. Participants noted the role and impact of ingrained community barriers on new development. When people do move into town to open or operate a business, there can be a disconnect between the expectations of residents and the new operators.

Communities with a larger current pool of business development were, overall, stronger proponents of the idea that business could play a role compared to communities with few to no local businesses. In general, people felt that the traditional business model could be the solution in some cases, but not all. “They had a great handle on business solutions; however most of the community’s needs were social; they were unable to connect business to a solution for the social needs.”

Role of Volunteers and Non-profits

In most communities, non-profits or the volunteer sector were viewed as the delivery arm to meet needs in the community, particularly for needs around recreation, culture and entertainment, or certain community-based services. In other cases, transportation and childcare solutions often came through family volunteerism. However, there is a general lack of volunteers, volunteer burn-out, and aging volunteer bases across western Canada, which participants clearly noted will hamper the ability of volunteers or formal volunteer groups to meet needs. Participants felt volunteers and non-profits had many of the skills to meet needs, but lacked the capacity or resources to do so.

ROLE OF GOVERNMENT

Participants clearly pointed to governments to provide funding and organization, and to create favourable regulatory environments for their communities to thrive. “Government needs to get involved.” Yet, there was skepticism: government, particularly federal and provincial level support, would not be forthcoming to address needs. “Government support in rural areas is virtually non-existent now.” Aboriginal communities are particularly frustrated by their experiences with the federal government and do not believe real action will come from that level. Rural communities feel forgotten in favour of urban hubs.

Participants mentioned other barriers besides lack of political voice to receiving government help: “Action on this would need to be government funded.” As most rural and Aboriginal support is perceived to be financial, the work associated with grant writing to access funds is viewed as a major barrier. Participants are aware of a double-edged sword for government funding – services and outcomes are tied to the governments’ requirements, which are often not what residents feel would be most effective in their community. However, if the grant application were successful, the money would allow the local government or non-profit (whichever entity applied for the grant) to provide something.

Meeting participants felt that communities need an expert to help them navigate through the complex regulatory systems they have to work with in order to meet their needs.

1. Federal Government – In Aboriginal communities, the link to the federal government is much stronger than that in rural communities, including the direct links to the top two needs: health care and housing. “There is a great distrust of the provincial and national level of governments to understand their

needs and communities.” The rocky relationship between the federal government and Aboriginal communities is well documented and need not be re-explained here except to say that there is great distrust as a result of long-standing colonial policies, including the Indian Act and residential school experiences. Participants in Aboriginal communities felt their hands were tied in what they could do; they did not trust that the federal government had their best interests at heart. Rural communities, on the other hand, viewed federal linkages mainly through funding possibilities and regulations, including policy environments.

2. Provincial Government – Communities looked to the provincial government primarily for funding, development of favourable regulations, and support of other development agencies that work in rural areas, including Community Futures and regional economic development agencies. Areas of particular concern include education, rural health regions, and services related to both of these. “Provincial government centralizes things into cities to save money.”
3. Local/Band Governments – Participants in the meetings saw local governments as having the most impact on their communities, and as important actors (either directly or through indirect support) in any movement for change. This level of government must build connections to and between other levels of government and look for opportunities; lobbying other levels of government is a central role. “Local leadership are trying hard to change the issues with housing and land. We’d be worse off if our leadership didn’t work so hard.” Rural communities feel that the provincial government is the most likely partner for funding and support, while Aboriginal communities look to the federal government.

Yet, local government was often cited as a community barrier. “The municipal government is inhibiting a builder from doing his work.” Because local governments are drawn directly from community members, politics always has an important impact on the activities that are carried out locally. Even so, participants clearly recognized the critical role of local government in addressing local needs and being part of any solutions process.

Multiple Players

The most exciting conversations occurred when participants started brainstorming how multiple actors could work together more effectively to meet needs. The focus groups during community meetings were often able to identify more than one player necessary in finding a solution (e.g., the local non-profit hospital foundation and government working together to find a health solution, or the voluntary Chamber of Commerce working with a local business) and displayed a greater ability to envision locally built solutions. They seemed less likely to wait for an outside entity to come into the community to solve problems. In other words, communities that could imagine a scenario where more than one group was leveraged and involved to create a solution showed greater community capacity for problem solving.

CO-OPERATIVE SOLUTIONS

After participants had considered conventional solutions to meeting community needs, they were asked to consider if alternative solutions using a co-operative business model might be successful in their community.

One of the main barriers to thinking about co-operatives as a solution is that while people know the most common forms of a co-operative, they are not able to apply the model to other types of businesses. “People have a limited understanding of what a co-op is. We know co-op groceries and gas, insurance, credit

unions, but applying it elsewhere may be difficult.” Most participants that could identify a co-operative did not know how it is different from other business models and what the pros and cons are. In each meeting, an explanation of the model was given and participants were asked to consider which of their needs might be met using this model. Facilitators would often work with participants to help them understand how a co-operative could be applied in different situations.

Once participants got started thinking about co-operatives as a potential solution to meeting their needs, there was excitement. “What would it take to get people going? Education, funding, people who start co-ops are people who believe in the model and have experience in it.” People intuitively understood that co-operatives offer a way for community members to come together to solve their own needs, to harness the knowledge of many people, to share risks and also the benefits. They felt co-operatives offered a potential way to reduce reliance on outside forces, such as the government, and put power and control in the community’s hands. “Using co-operatives to solve problems takes away relying on outside people/groups for help.”

Participants also know that many of their needs have been increasing over time. Some needs are a result of demographic, economic, or societal changes, but many are a result of government restructuring of funding or programs. There is a feeling that increased co-operation between members of communities and between communities is the only way to meet needs moving forward. “As the needs become greater, it will force greater co-operation between people. Economy of scale – how to get everyone together.”

Participants did identify some needs that could be solved using the co-operative model. For others, the model was not a natural fit. Participants tended to see co-ops quite quickly as a way to help with housing, various forms of retail, restaurants, daycares, artisan groups, catering, gardening, farm/food goods (meat, eggs, or farmers’ markets), transportation, and services. Participants had often heard of examples of these types of co-ops in other locations.

One of the ideas that piqued interest was the idea of a workers’ co-operative, where the co-operative is owned by the people who work there. In that instance, each worker would need less start-up financing than an individual owner. Participants suggested that worker co-operatives may be helpful in business succession planning, when existing owners would like to sell to retire, or in labour situations, with a group of tradespeople working together in a co-op.

Once participants started brainstorming co-operative solutions, notable creative applications came up for discussion. Attendees imagined a co-operative trailer court, a co-operative mobile funeral service and mobile crematorium, multi-service buildings as co-operative community-hub business incubators (coffee shop, hairdresser, laundromat, and so forth), seasonal meat outlets, educational co-operatives, and co-operative cultural services, to name but a few.

The common barriers to developing co-operatives included the need for project champions, broad and deep knowledge of the co-operative model, concerns about long-term sustainability, and the presence of community apathy.

NEEDS AND SOCIAL CAPACITY

At the end of each community meeting, participants were asked to indicate what they believed to be the level of need and the level of the social capacity in their community on a scale of 1–10. The request caused some consternation. Participants discussed the challenge of answering these questions, feeling that their perceptions would be different from others in their community. In addition, some needs would rank higher, others lower. Asking participants to translate all needs into one number might skew the results or present a picture that would not be sufficiently nuanced. Individuals recognized that their experience of their community depends on how strongly they feel the need.




Figure 2.5. Community Needs and Social Capacity in Western Canada, By Province

There was a similar finding for social capacity, but not quite as broad. In some cases, it depended on how well the respondent had overcome some of the challenges to social capacity, such as experience working with others or being included. Respondents were far more willing to articulate their perception of their community's social capacity than to express their views on community need.

Figure 2.5 summarizes the average of all the responses collected, by community. Each point in the figure is reflective of one community and combines their social capacity response with their needs. It is important to note that the range of responses in some meetings ran the spectrum from one to ten. This means that community members not only have vastly different opinions of their communities, but also that they feel the experiences of others may be vastly different from their own.

Social capacity is read vertically (up and down) and has a range of 3.5 – 7.5 on the scale from 1.0 to 10.0. Most of the communities felt that they had mid to good social capacity. There is growth to be achieved in all communities, and the needs as discussed provide ways to improve that social capacity. The level of need is read horizontally (left to right) and ranges from 2.75 to 8.5. All but one community felt they had mid to high levels of need in their community.

Participants in most of the meetings felt that their communities have lots of work to do to meet local needs. They also believed that, overall, communities have the necessary capacity to work together to overcome these challenges. Communities with high levels of need and lower levels of social capacity will have added challenges in meeting their needs.

The story that rang true at all community meetings is that people in rural and Aboriginal western Canada have pride in their communities, their history, and their resilience. They have realistic pictures of their futures, are not looking for hand-outs, but are hoping for a hand-up to examine innovative solutions to long-standing and emerging community problems.

WESTERN CANADA – BY THE NUMBERS

LOCATION

For the purposes of our study, we considered rural and Aboriginal communities in British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan, and Manitoba. We used census geographical boundaries to define our communities. We considered rural communities to be all census subdivisions (CSDs) outside of census metropolitan areas (CMAs are areas with core populations over 100,000) and census amalgamation areas (CAs are areas with core populations over 10,000), or areas where 30% or more of the population drives to work in one of these areas, and that are not designated as Aboriginal by Statistics Canada. Aboriginal communities are those outside the CMAs and CAs that are designated as Aboriginal by Statistics Canada. Although the data only allowed us to make the broad distinction discussed above, we recognize that there are all kinds of people living in all kinds of communities. On average in western Canada, for instance, almost 10% of the population of rural communities identify as Aboriginal.

Some of the data presented in this chapter, such as income and the value of housing, is expressed in dollar terms. It is important to note that all dollar figures presented are in current dollar (or nominal) amounts – i.e., they are expressed in terms of the prices that were in effect in the year in question (either 2006 or 2011). One of the consequences of using current dollar values is that some of the price or income increases might simply reflect the overall rise in prices – i.e., inflation – that occurred between 2006 and 2011. To give an idea of inflation during this five-year period, overall prices, as measured by the Consumer Price Index, rose by roughly 7.5% in British Columbia, 11.3% in Alberta, 11.2% in Saskatchewan, and 8.5% in Manitoba. If housing values, for instance, rose faster than these rates, then it can be concluded that housing prices rose faster than inflation. It could also be concluded that other factors besides those underlying basic inflation were at work in driving prices up.

A word is in order about the percentage change column. Regardless of the variable being considered, the percentage change column represents the increase or decrease in a given variable as a percentage of the original value of the variable. While this definition is straightforward in the case where the variable is expressed as a number, it can be a bit confusing when the variable is expressed as a percentage. To see how the percentage change is calculated when the variable is expressed as a percentage, consider an example that looks at the percentage of the population in a community that is Aboriginal. Suppose in 2006 that the Aboriginal population in a community of 200 is 50. Thus, the percentage of the population that is Aboriginal is 25% (50 out of 200). Suppose that between 2006 and 2011, 10 Aboriginal people left and were replaced by 10 non-Aboriginal people; the result is that in 2011, the Aboriginal population would be 40 out of 200, or 20% of the total. The percentage change in this case is the change between 25 and 20 expressed as a percentage of 25, which is a 20% decrease to the Aboriginal population. Note that in this case the 20% change is also the change in the actual population – i.e., the change from 50 to 40 expressed as a percentage of 50. Taking the simple difference between the two percentages – e.g., 25% minus 20%, or 5% – does not represent the percentage change in the population and thus is not used. Additionally, please note that while the numbers displayed in the tables do not have decimal points in them, for accuracy the calculations of the percent change column were performed using the full number where they were available.

In western Canada, there are more than 1,200 rural communities and almost 500 Aboriginal communities with a land area of over 2.3 million square kilometres. With less than one person for every square kilometre-

tre of land, these communities face unique pressures and have unique strengths compared to their urban counterparts. On average, residents of rural communities have to drive 131 kilometres to the nearest CA and 240 kilometres to the nearest CMA. Aboriginal communities, in contrast, have to drive an average of 310 kilometres to the nearest CA and 670 kilometres to the nearest CMA. Relying on services provided in central locations is not always realistic or desirable for these communities.

While each community has its own story to tell from its own numbers, there is power in seeing the story shared among all these communities.

DEMOGRAPHICS

The demographics of a community have a significant impact on its ability to create co-operatives. What type of people make up communities and how they interact affects their needs, their business capacity, and their social capacity. Young populations drive needs for education and daycare. Older populations drive needs for seniors' services. Having many people of working age may increase business capacity in a community, and having individuals who have lived together for a long time may increase social capacity. The presence of recent immigrants may indicate a healthy economy in a community, but may also indicate changing needs. Both strengths and challenges are inherent in most demographic information. Changes in any of these areas require communities to alter their services to meet the needs of their residents. Each community understands its demographics differently and can be more or less successful at leveraging their strengths to overcome their challenges.

We heard two common stories: the population of rural Canada is disappearing, and young populations are driving growth in Aboriginal communities. In our study population, however, the data tell a somewhat different tale. The following discussion is an overview of the data presented in tables 3.1 and 3.2. For data broken down to the provincial level, please see the tables in the Appendix.

Aboriginal communities continue to grow faster than their rural counterparts, but both types of communities saw increases in population between 2006 and 2011. While rural communities saw a population loss of 1% between 2001 and 2006, there was a 2.0% increase between 2006 and 2011, resulting in an overall population increase between 2001 and 2011. Aboriginal communities saw a 9% increase in population between 2001 and 2006, and an 11% increase between 2006 and 2011.

Young populations are holding relatively steady in both rural and Aboriginal communities, while the baby boom generation continues to age. The overall composition of population in Aboriginal communities is much younger than in rural communities, but individuals in both types of communities are getting older. Both rural and Aboriginal communities saw a growth in the proportion of their population in the 45-64 age group and in the 65-plus group. And both saw a loss in the proportion of their population in the under-15 age group, with a larger loss in Aboriginal communities.

The median age – the age at which half the population is older and half the population is younger – stayed constant at 42 in rural populations, and rose by 1 year to 24 in Aboriginal communities. Although Aboriginal communities are aging slightly faster than rural communities, they are still much younger overall.

In Manitoba, the number of children aged 14 and under rose, though this percentage declined in all three of the other western provinces. In Saskatchewan and Manitoba, the population over age 65 remained steady, but grew in Alberta and BC. All provinces saw increases in the percentage of the population between 45 and 64, indicating a healthy working population. Alberta has the youngest median age, at 38, while British Columbia, which saw the largest change in population for its over-65 population, is oldest, with a median age of 46.

These changes mean both Aboriginal and rural communities in western Canada will face increasing service requests (e.g., transportation for accessing goods and services) for their older populations, while still needing to address education, recreation, and infrastructure needs for families and younger people.

Another way to consider the impacts of demographics on co-operative development is to consider the pressure put on people in the working-age category. Since youth and seniors typically do not work, often have reduced access to resources, and may require greater service supports, a measure of the pressure placed on the working-age population can be obtained by looking at the number of *dependents* for every 100 potential *workers*. Specifically, the dependency ratio is the number of youth (0 to 19 years) and seniors (65 or older) relative to the number of people in the working-age population (20 to 64 years).

In rural communities across western Canada, the dependency ratio has fallen by 3%, and in Aboriginal communities it has fallen by 7%. At a provincial level, there were reductions in the dependency rates in Manitoba (2%), Saskatchewan (7%), and Alberta (3%). These changes reflect the growth in the percentage of the population in the 45-64 age group. British Columbia, in contrast, saw an increase in its dependency ratio, in part because of the growth in the 65-plus age category.

Table 3.1. Selected Demographic Variables for Western Canada, 2006 and 2011 – Part 1

| Variable | Rural | | Aboriginal | | % Change | |
|--|-----------|-----------|------------|---------|----------|-------|
| | 2006 | 2011 | 2006 | 2011 | Rural | Abor. |
| Total Population | 1,480,000 | 1,510,000 | 176,000 | 196,000 | 2 | 11 |
| Population (as a % of total) | | | | | | |
| 14 and under | 18 | 17 | 33 | 31 | -4 | -5 |
| 15-24 | 12 | 11 | 18 | 17 | -5 | -1 |
| 25-44 | 27 | 26 | 31 | 31 | -4 | -2 |
| 45-64 | 27 | 29 | 14 | 16 | 6 | 15 |
| 65 and over | 16 | 17 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 13 |
| Median Age | 42 | 42 | 23 | 24 | 0 | 7 |
| Dependency Ratio | 69 | 67 | 89 | 83 | -3 | -7 |
| Language spoken at home (as a % of total population) | | | | | | |
| English | 84 | 85 | 57 | 63 | 1 | 11 |
| French | 2 | 3 | <1 | <1 | 50 | 0 |
| Other (incl. Aboriginal) | 13 | 12 | 41 | 36 | -8 | -12 |
| Aboriginal Origins | | | | | | |
| 9 | 9 | 98 | 98 | 6 | 0 | |
| Generation within community (as a % of total population) | | | | | | |
| 1st | 9 | 9 | 1 | 0 | -4 | -49 |
| 2nd | 21 | 17 | 1 | 1 | -18 | -30 |
| 3rd | 70 | 74 | 98 | 98 | 6 | 1 |

One measure of social capacity (although not the only one, by any means) is the degree of homogeneity in a community. Speaking a unified language may help increase social capacity. In rural communities, the percentage of households where English was spoken as a first language increased by 1%, to 85%, while the percentage of households where French was spoken as a first language increased by 1%, to 3%. Somewhat troubling, Aboriginal communities saw a 12% decrease in the number of people who spoke other languages besides English and French (this includes Aboriginal languages), while the use of English increased by almost the same amount. In Aboriginal communities, use of Indigenous language is often associated with healthier community and cultural ties. It is unknown if this statistic is reflective of the problems with the 2011 National Household Survey or reflective of changing language patterns.

Table 3.2. Selected Demographic Variables for Western Canada, 2006 and 2011 – Part 2

| Variable | Rural | | Aboriginal | | % Change | |
|--|-------|------|------------|------|----------|-------|
| | 2006 | 2011 | 2006 | 2011 | Rural | Abor. |
| Migration in the last year (as a % of total migration) | | | | | | |
| Non-Movers | 87 | 89 | 90 | 92 | 2 | 3 |
| From out of Country | 4 | 3 | 1 | 0 | -25 | -100 |
| From out of Province | 13 | 11 | 6 | 4 | -25 | -35 |
| From within Province | 40 | 39 | 49 | 38 | -3 | -24 |
| From within Community | 43 | 50 | 44 | 58 | 16 | 33 |
| International immigrants by period of immigration (as a % of total immigrants) | | | | | | |
| Within the last 5 years | 12 | 18 | N/A | N/A | 50 | N/A |
| Within the last 6-10 years | 8 | 9 | N/A | N/A | 13 | N/A |
| Over 11 years ago | 80 | 67 | N/A | N/A | -16 | N/A |

British Columbia has the least linguistic diversity, with 96% of people speaking English as the main language at home. Manitoba has the most diversity, with 85% of people speaking English as a first language. Manitoba also has the highest concentration of French-speaking individuals in both rural and Aboriginal communities.

Communities that have people who have lived together for generations may interact differently than communities that are changing quickly. Communities build their stories, identity, and norms of interaction over decades. Entrepreneurial drive, the willingness to try new ideas, and a reduced interest in the old ways of doing things may be associated with changing populations.

In Aboriginal communities, there is little in-migration and the majority of the population has lived in the community for three generations or more. In rural communities, the picture is somewhat different. By 2011, across western Canada, 74% of the population had lived in the community for three generations, 17% for two generations, and almost 9% were the first generation in the community. British Columbia had the highest percentage of first-generation community members (12%) and Saskatchewan had the lowest (3%). Among third-generation community members, British Columbia had the lowest percentage (68%) and Saskatchewan had the highest (85%). And while Alberta and Manitoba had similar first-generation numbers, Alberta had higher second-generation and lower third-generation numbers than Manitoba.

Large numbers of citizens moving within and between communities can sometimes indicate reduced social capacity due to instability in living situations. In 2011, 89% of the rural population and 92% of the Aboriginal population did not change their place of residence (i.e., they were non-movers). These numbers reflect a 2% increase in rural communities and a 3% increase in Aboriginal communities. Of those who did move, roughly 50% moved from one location to another within the community (50% in rural communities; 58% in Aboriginal communities), making it easier to maintain higher social capacity.

Of international migrants to rural communities in Canada, 18% have come in the last 5 years, an increase of 50% from 2006. As recent immigrants, these groups may require greater settlement services, and depending on their fit within their new community, the influx may result in cultural differences arising within communities. These changes can affect both community needs and social capacity. Immigration does not play a significant role in Aboriginal communities.

EDUCATION

Although formal education is not the only indicator of business capacity, there are many business skills that require specialized knowledge. The more diverse a community's knowledge, the better prepared it may be to provide its own services from within its population. The data for the following discussion is found in table 3.3. For provincial level information please see the Appendix.

While the percentage of people with less than a high school education is still large (26% in rural communities and 61% in Aboriginal), there have been significant gains in reducing the percentage of people in this category. Aboriginal communities increased the number of people with at least a high school diploma by 36% over the 5 years between 2006 and 2011. At a provincial level, Manitoba has the highest percentage of the population with less than a high school education, while British Columbia has the lowest.

Rural communities saw gains in the percentage of the population that had achieved apprenticeship or university attainment, while Aboriginal communities saw a decline in university attainment. British Columbia has the highest levels of postsecondary study.

A notable difference between rural and Aboriginal communities in western Canada, one that is linked to the higher rates of postsecondary attainment in rural communities, is the proportion of the population with specific skills. In rural communities, the percentage of the population with business training is 4% higher than in Aboriginal communities. In the area of technological skills, the percentage is 8% higher, in health, 5% higher, and in education, 2% higher. In the community meetings, health and education were listed as important needs in Aboriginal communities. With fewer people in the communities trained to provide these services, the intensity of need is likely to be greater.

In terms of the diversity of post-secondary training, Saskatchewan has the least concentration in any one area; it also has less of a percentage of people trained in social/behaviour sciences and law than the other provinces. Alberta and British Columbia both have a somewhat higher percentage of individuals with math, computers and engineering training. British Columbia has a higher percentage than the other provinces with arts, communications technology and humanities training.

HOUSING

Housing came up as a top need in almost every community meeting. Needs were identified for all types of housing: rental housing, seniors' housing, and affordable housing are just a few. Housing is a basic need. Without housing, it is difficult if not impossible to focus on building the community in an entrepreneurial or social manner. At the same time, if there is too much vacant housing in a community, it may be indicative of a community in distress, either due to depopulation or poor housing conditions.

Table 3.4 presents data on housing in Aboriginal and rural communities in western Canada. Over the period 2006-2011, there was little change in the make-up of owned and rented housing. Aboriginal communities seem to have transitioned some rented accommodations to band-owned housing. Vacancy rates have remained constant.

The average value of the dwellings in rural communities increased by 52% in the period between 2006 and 2011 (recall that the values are in nominal terms). British Columbia had the smallest increase, at 28%; the average value of a dwelling was \$350,000 in 2011. Alberta and Manitoba both saw values increase by 55%; the average value of a house in Alberta in 2011 was \$300,000; in Manitoba, it was \$170,000. Saskatchewan housing values increased by 100% during the 2006-2011 period; in 2011, the average value was similar to that in Manitoba. The number of owners spending more than 30% of their income on hous-

Table 3.3. Selected Education Variables for Western Canada, 2006 and 2011

| Variable | Rural | | Aboriginal | | % Change | |
|---|-------|------|------------|------|----------|-------|
| | 2006 | 2011 | 2006 | 2011 | Rural | Abor. |
| Achievement (% of population 15 and over) | | | | | | |
| No certificate, diploma, degree | 37 | 26 | 67 | 61 | -29 | -9 |
| High school diploma | 25 | 28 | 13 | 18 | 13 | 36 |
| Apprenticeship or trade, college or other non-university | 27 | 31 | 14 | 16 | 18 | 15 |
| University certificate, diploma, bachelors degree | 9 | 11 | 5 | 4 | 22 | -9 |
| University above bachelor's | 2 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 31 | -27 |
| Major (% of population 15 and over) | | | | | | |
| No post-secondary Education | N/A | 55 | N/A | 80 | N/A | N/A |
| Arts, communications technology, humanities | N/A | 5 | N/A | 3 | N/A | N/A |
| Social/behaviour sciences, law | N/A | 2 | N/A | 1 | N/A | N/A |
| Business, public administration | N/A | 3 | N/A | 2 | N/A | N/A |
| Physical, life sciences, technology, agriculture, natural resources, conservation | N/A | 8 | N/A | 4 | N/A | N/A |
| Math, computer, information sciences, architecture, engineering, related technology | N/A | 3 | N/A | 0 | N/A | N/A |
| Health | N/A | 13 | N/A | 6 | N/A | N/A |
| Personal protection and transportation | N/A | 8 | N/A | 3 | N/A | N/A |
| | N/A | 3 | N/A | 3 | N/A | N/A |

ing did not change over the period, although the number of renters doing so increased by 9%. These numbers are fairly similar at the provincial level (see the Appendix for details).

INCOME

Table 3.5 presents data on income in rural and Aboriginal communities in western Canada (all figures in nominal terms). The income that individuals have access to directly affects their ability to support business through purchases or investment, or to donate to community initiatives.

Both Aboriginal and rural communities have seen an increase in their after-tax income over the 2006-2011 period. Individuals in Aboriginal communities earn less than their rural counterparts, a result that is consistent with the lower levels of education in Aboriginal communities. Since the proportion of wages in income is roughly the same between the two communities, it would appear that people in Aboriginal communities are working fewer hours, have lower wages, or both.

Self-employment makes up a sizable proportion of income in rural communities (7%); in Aboriginal communities, self-employment income is almost nonexistent. However, it was clear during the community meetings that individuals in Aboriginal communities have high levels of entrepreneurship, shown through a robust informal economy, although this informal experience may not translate into formal income. Co-operative development requires both the experience to identify entrepreneurial opportunities and the experience to act on them.

Table 3.4. Selected Housing Variables for Western Canada, 2006 and 2011

| Variable | Rural | | Aboriginal | | % Change | |
|--|-----------|-----------|------------|------|----------|-------|
| | 2006 | 2011 | 2006 | 2011 | Rural | Abor. |
| Dwellings (as a % of total dwellings) | | | | | | |
| Owned | 80 | 79 | 22 | 22 | -1 | 0 |
| Rented | 20 | 20 | 11 | 8 | 8 | -27 |
| Band Owned | 1 | 1 | 68 | 70 | 0 | 3 |
| Average value of dwellings | \$181,000 | \$275,000 | N/A | N/A | 52 | N/A |
| Vacancy Rate (%) | 17 | 18 | 11 | 12 | 6 | 9 |
| Spending over 30% of income on shelter (% of population) | | | | | | |
| Renters | 22 | 24 | N/A | N/A | 9 | N/A |
| Owners | 11 | 11 | N/A | N/A | 0 | N/A |

Rural residents earn a greater proportion of their income from investments, pensions, and other market income than do residents in Aboriginal communities. Due to their lower wage income, Aboriginal community residents do not have the same opportunity to contribute to the Canada Pension Plan, which means lower payments in old age and more reliance on things like the guaranteed income supplement.

Aboriginal communities derive a much higher percentage of their income from child payments and other forms of government assistance compared to their rural counterparts. At a community level, fewer sources of income mean a greater risk should one income source dry up. As well, a higher reliance on government payments means there is less opportunity to increase earnings to invest in other business opportunities, including co-operative development.

At the provincial level (see Appendix for details), all four provinces saw an increase in their after-tax income between 2005 and 2010, with Alberta and Saskatchewan having the greatest increases. Alberta has a higher median income (\$29,000) and a higher percentage of income from wages and salaries (71%) than do the other three provinces. Saskatchewan has the highest income from self employment (7%), British Columbia the highest from pensions (8%), and Manitoba the highest in child benefits (8%).

Table 3.5. Selected Income Variables for Western Canada, 2006 and 2011

| Variable | Rural | Aboriginal |
|--|----------|------------|
| Median individual after tax income | | |
| 2005 | \$22,000 | \$9,000 |
| 2010 | \$28,000 | \$11,000 |
| Income Composition (as a % of total income) | | |
| Wages & salaries | 64 | 62 |
| Self employment | 7 | < 1 |
| Investment income | 6 | < 1 |
| Pensions, superannuation, annuities | 6 | 1 |
| Other market income | 2 | 1 |
| Canada/Quebec Pension benefits | 5 | 2 |
| CPP, old age pension, guaranteed income supplement | 5 | 6 |
| Employment insurance benefits | 2 | 3 |
| Child benefits | 2 | 16 |
| Other government, including social assistance | 2 | 8 |

LABOUR ACTIVITY

How much time people spend working, and what type of work they do, affects both their availability for co-operative development and the skill sets they bring to the process. If most of the people in a community are engaged in paid employment, they may have less time available for volunteer work. People who are self-employed bring valuable skill sets to development processes. High numbers of unemployed people indicate untapped labour pools that can work in new endeavours. Table 3.6 presents data on labour activity in western Canada.

The participation rate shows the percentage of the population that are either working or looking for work. Both rural and Aboriginal communities saw a slight decrease in the participation rate over the period 2006 to 2011. There was a slight increase in the unemployment rate in rural communities during this time (in 2011, the unemployment rate sat at 6%). The unemployment rate in Aboriginal communities remained high, at 26%.

It is interesting to compare unemployment rates and the percentage of income from Employment Insurance. For a variety of reasons that have to do with the duration of work when it is available and the length of the unemployment periods, the percentage of income from Employment Insurance is less than the unemployment rate. In rural communities in 2011, Employment Insurance accounted for 2% of income, while 6% of individuals were unemployed. In Aboriginal communities, Employment Insurance makes up 3% of income, but 26% of individuals were unemployed. This differential coverage indicates that the period and intensity of unemployment for individuals in Aboriginal communities are greater than for their rural counterparts, and that periods of work may be insufficient to qualify for Employment Insurance.

The rate of self-employment in rural communities fell considerably between 2006 and 2011, from 24% to 18%. More analysis is required to determine the reasons for this drop. The rates of self-employment in Aboriginal communities is considerably less than that in rural communities.

The types of work that people are involved in is reflective of their education, the opportunities available in their community, and the needs of the larger economy. Rural communities saw a significant decrease in the percentage of people working in natural resources and agriculture, but an increase in the percentage of the workforce working in both management and education. In Aboriginal communities, there was a substantial decrease in the percentage of those working in the service industry and in the natural resources/agriculture area, while the percentage of those working in education/social services increased significantly. By combining the information on occupations with the types of needs that communities identify, it is possible to determine if there are people skilled in the areas in which gaps were identified.

Where people are working has changed slightly at the provincial level. All four provinces saw an increase in the percentage of people working in education, law, social service and in management. There were very large decreases in employment in natural resources and agriculture, and a slight decrease in sales and service. Both Alberta and Saskatchewan had a large increase in the percent of management occupations, and a large decrease in the natural resources/agriculture. Trades, transport and equipment operators, and sales and service make up the largest proportion of the occupations in all four provinces.

BUSINESS

The size and type of businesses in a community affect both the scope of skills and the availability of local industry to support new initiatives. Opportunities to partner with existing industry, utilize existing skill sets, and use the infrastructure already in place make co-operative development easier. Diverse businesses

Table 3.6. Selected Labour Variables for Western Canada, 2006 and 2011

| Variable | Rural | | Aboriginal | | % Change | |
|---|-------|------|------------|------|----------|-------|
| | 2006 | 2011 | 2006 | 2011 | Rural | Abor. |
| Participation rate (%) | 68 | 67 | 48 | 44 | -2 | -8 |
| Employment rate (%) | 95 | 94 | 73 | 74 | -1 | 2 |
| Unemployment rate (%) | 5 | 6 | 27 | 26 | 22 | -4 |
| Self-employed (%) | 24 | 18 | 3 | 2 | -25 | -33 |
| Occupations (as a % of all occupations) | | | | | | |
| Business, finance and administration | 12 | 12 | 11 | 11 | 1 | 0 |
| Art, culture, recreation, sport | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | -10 | -60 |
| Education, law, social service | 6 | 10 | 15 | 24 | 62 | 61 |
| Management | 8 | 15 | 7 | 7 | 91 | 6 |
| Manufacturing and utilities | 4 | 4 | 4 | 2 | -3 | -41 |
| Natural and applied sciences | 3 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 16 | -32 |
| Natural resources, agriculture | 18 | 7 | 10 | 7 | -63 | -26 |
| Sales and service | 21 | 20 | 28 | 22 | -5 | -21 |
| Trades, transport and equipment operators | 20 | 21 | 20 | 22 | 4 | 12 |
| Other | 1 | 1 | 12 | 13 | 10 | 11 |

operating in a community provide a variety of solutions to common problems in terms of economies of scale, transportation, and access to skilled workers.

Between 2006 and 2011, rural and Aboriginal communities saw a reduction in the percentage of businesses focused on agriculture, with Aboriginal communities shifting towards construction and mining, and rural communities shifting towards construction (see Figure 3.7).

The percent of businesses in agriculture/forestry/fishing/hunting has been decreasing in all four provinces. In Saskatchewan, however, these businesses still make up 54% of the businesses. In Manitoba the number is 43%, in Alberta 29%, and in British Columbia 12%. Given that few business categories make up more than 10% of the total, this category is still important in British Columbia despite its low level compared to the other provinces.

There has been an increase in the percentage of businesses in the construction area. British Columbia (15%) has the highest percentage in this category, and Saskatchewan (6%) the lowest. Real estate/rental/leasing has also increased in all four provinces. Alberta has the highest percentage of businesses in mining/oil/gas (6%), while the other provinces are in the 1% to 2% range.

In most communities, small businesses are by and far the most numerous. Owners and employees of small businesses tend to be less specialized and have wider skills sets to manage the multiple requirements of running a business. Since most co-operative development is in smaller-sized enterprises, the expertise necessary to run these enterprises may often be present in the community.

Table 3.7. Selected Business Variables for Western Canada, 2006 and 2011

| Variable | Rural | | Aboriginal | | % Change | |
|--|-------|------|------------|------|----------|-------|
| | 2006 | 2011 | 2006 | 2011 | Rural | Abor. |
| Business Size (as a % of all businesses) | | | | | | |
| Small (up to 49 employees) | 99 | 99 | 97 | 95 | 0 | -2 |
| Medium (50 to 99 employees) | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 50 |
| Large (100 + employees) | 1 | < 1 | 1 | 2 | < -1 | 100 |
| Business Type (as a % of all businesses) | | | | | | |
| Accommodation, food service | 4 | 4 | 5 | 5 | -1 | 4 |
| Admin. & support, waste mgmt. & remediation services | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 48 |
| Agriculture, forestry, fishing, hunting | 38 | 34 | 30 | 26 | -9 | -26 |
| Construction | 9 | 10 | 9 | 11 | 16 | 20 |
| Educational services | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | -2 | -51 |
| Entertainment & recreation | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | -8 | 1 |
| Finance and insurance | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 18 | 58 |
| Health care, social assistance | 2 | 3 | 6 | 5 | 18 | -19 |
| Information and culture | 1 | 1 | < 1 | 1 | 0 | 103 |
| Management of companies | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 45 | 51 |
| Manufacturing | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | -13 | 3 |
| Mining, oil and gas | 3 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 10 | 113 |
| Professional, scientific, technical services | 5 | 6 | 3 | 4 | 6 | 39 |
| Public administration | 1 | 1 | 6 | 5 | 0 | -19 |
| Real estate, rental and leasing | 4 | 5 | 3 | 4 | 21 | 54 |
| Retail | 7 | 7 | 12 | 10 | -6 | -16 |
| Transportation and warehousing | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | -6 | -6 |
| Wholesale trade | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | -10 | 0 |

CCS THOMPSON-NICOLA E – BY THE NUMBERS

INTRODUCTION – A WORD ABOUT THE DATA

This chapter presents statistical data for the census consolidated subdivision of Thompson-Nicola E. A census consolidated subdivision, or CCS, is a group of adjacent census subdivisions (these are typically rural municipalities, counties, First Nation reserves, towns and villages). As a result, the data presents a picture of what is going on over a fairly large geographical area, and may not capture what is going on in any particular part of that area (i.e., in a particular town or on a particular reserve).

The tables below contain information from the 2006 Census and the 2011 National Household Survey (NHS). The 2011 voluntary NHS replaced the mandatory long form census that had previously been used by Statistics Canada to collect demographic, family and family composition, dwellings, and language information. As the response rate for the NHS is much lower than the Census, not all of the communities had responses for the variables below and some of the data is suspected to be inaccurate.

Some of the data presented in this chapter, such as income and the value of housing, is expressed in dollar terms. It is important to note that all dollar figures presented are all in current dollar (or nominal) amounts – i.e., they are expressed in terms of the prices that were in effect in the year in question (either 2006 or 2011). One of the consequences of using current dollar values is that some of the price or income increases might just reflect the overall rise in prices – i.e., inflation – that occurred between 2006 and 2011. To give an idea of inflation during this five year period, overall prices, as measured by the Consumer Price Index, rose by roughly 7.5% in British Columbia, 11.3% in Alberta, 11.2% in Saskatchewan and 8.5% in Manitoba. If housing values, for instance, rose faster than these rates, then it can be concluded that housing prices rose faster than inflation. As well, it could be concluded that other factors besides those underlying basic inflation were at work in driving prices up.

It is also important to understand the way the percentage change column is calculated. Regardless of the variable being considered, the percentage change column represents the increase or decrease in a given variable as a percentage of the original value of the variable. While this definition is straightforward in the case where the variable is expressed as a number, it can be a bit confusing when the variable is expressed as a percentage. To see how the percentage change is calculated when the variable is expressed as a percentage, consider an example that looks at the percentage of the population in a community that is Aboriginal. Suppose in 2006 that the Aboriginal population in a community of 200 is 50. Thus, the percentage of the population that is Aboriginal is 25% (50 out of 200). Suppose that between 2006 and 2011, 10 Aboriginal people left and were replaced by 10 non-Aboriginal people; the result is that in 2011, the Aboriginal population would be 40 out of 200, or 20% of the total. The percentage change in this case is the change between 25 and 20 expressed as a percentage of 25, which is a 20% decrease to the Aboriginal population. Note that in this case the 20% change is also the change in the actual population – i.e., the change from 50 to 40 expressed as a percentage of 50. Taking the simple difference between the two percentages – e.g., 25% minus 20%, or 5% – does not represent the percentage change in the population and thus is not used. Additionally, please note that while the numbers displayed in the tables do not have decimal points in them, for accuracy the calculations of the percent change column were performed using the full number where they were available.

The tables in this chapter provide a comparison between the CCS and the province as a whole. It is important to note that the provincial data refers to all rural and Aboriginal communities within the province and does not incorporate data on urban centres. In other words, the data provides a comparison between the particular rural or Aboriginal community in question and all of the rural and Aboriginal communities in the province.

LOCATION

Census Consolidated Subdivision Thompson-Nicola E (CCS Thompson) is located in south-central British Columbia.

CCS Thompson contains amalgamated data for the village of Clinton, the High Bar First Nation and Whispering Pine First Nation.

The largest community within the CCS, Clinton is located along highway 97, approximately 125 km northwest of Kamloops, and 400 km south of Prince George.

Elevation within CCS Thompson ranges around 3,000 feet above sea level, while the terrain is part of the south B.C. Mountains.

COMMUNITY OVERVIEW

The sections below provide detailed statistics on CCS Thompson. It should be noted that much of the data is unavailable for the CCS and the results below may be inaccurate. Taken together the results indicate that CCS Thompson has been in decline over the period 2006-2011. It has seen a decrease in the population, and an increase in the median age. Virtually everyone has lived in the community for three generations or more, and there are relatively low levels of in-migration. CCS Thompson has low levels of educational achievement and relies heavily on the trades and apprenticeships for formal training. The businesses in the CCS are concentrated in the accommodation and food service, and agriculture, forestry, fishing, and hunting categories.

DEMOGRAPHICS

Compared to B.C. as a whole, CCS Thompson has an older population, with a much lower percentage of youth and a higher percentage of seniors. As a result, the median age for CCS Thompson is older than that of the province – in 2011, half the population in CCS Thompson was over 55 years of age, while in B.C. half the population was over 46 years of age.

The dependency ratio is the number of youth (0 to 19 years) and seniors (65 or older) relative to the number of people in the working-age population (20 to 64 years). Since the youth and seniors typically do not work, the dependency ratio provides an estimate of the number of “dependents” for every 100 potential “workers.” The higher dependency ratio in CCS Thompson compared to B.C. as a whole suggests higher demands on social services such as health care. The increase in the dependency ratio from 61% in 2006 to 69% in 2011 is the result of an increase in the percentage of population over 65 years of age.

The primary language spoken at home in the CCS is English. Although not directly linked to co-op development or success, additional languages can be an important skill set depending on your client base and type of co-operative.

The percentage of people with Aboriginal origin living in the CCS was reported as 11% in 2006 and 100% in 2011. However, one or both of these figures is likely inaccurate, making it difficult to draw any kind of conclusions.

Virtually 100% of the population in the CCS has lived in the community for three or more generations. The result is a population that has a high level of understanding of community needs, experience with combining skills and abilities to meet these needs, and a potentially high level of social capacity. At the same time, the lack of newcomers to the community may slow the introduction of new ideas.

Table 4.1. Selected Demographic Variables for CCS Thompson, 2006 and 2011

| Variable | British Columbia | | CCS Thompson | | % Change | |
|--|------------------|---------|--------------|------|----------|------|
| | 2006 | 2011 | 2006 | 2011 | BC | CCS |
| Total Population | 439,000 | 446,000 | 2000 | 1800 | 2 | - 10 |
| Population (as a % of total) | | | | | | |
| 14 and under | 16 | 15 | 11 | 9 | -7 | -18 |
| 15-44 | 38 | 36 | 28 | 25 | -6 | -12 |
| 45-64 | 31 | 32 | 39 | 39 | 4 | -1 |
| 65 and over | 15 | 17 | 22 | 28 | 14 | 27 |
| Median Age | 44 | 46 | 51 | 55 | 5 | 8 |
| Dependency Ratio | 60 | 61 | 61 | 69 | 2 | 13 |
| Language spoken at home (as a % of total population) | | | | | | |
| English | 96 | 96 | 95 | 98 | 0 | 3 |
| French | < 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | >1 | n.c. |
| Other | 2 | 1 | 6 | 1 | -50 | -83 |
| Migration into the community in the last year | | | | | | |
| Total # | 37,000 | 21,000 | 170 | 15 | - 43 | - 91 |
| As a % of the total population | 9 | 6 | 8 | 16 | -33 | 100 |
| Aboriginal Origins | 12 | 15 | 11 | 100 | 25 | 809 |
| Generation within community (as a % of total population) | | | | | | |
| 1st | N/A | 12 | N/A | 0 | N/A | N/A |
| 2nd | N/A | 19 | N/A | 0 | N/A | N/A |
| 3rd | N/A | 68 | N/A | 100 | N/A | N/A |

n.c. – Not calculated.

Note: There was no data available in 2011 for the village of Clinton, or in 2006 and 2011 for High Bar First Nation. As a result the information for these variables is not a true reflection of the CCS.

EDUCATION

Educational achievement was lower in CCS Thompson than in the province in 2006 (this lower achievement is shown by a higher percentage of the population 15 years and older that does not have a certificate, degree or diploma), and lower yet again in 2011 – 50% of the population within the CCS did not have a certificate, diploma, or degree. The magnitude of this change, however, suggests that the data is likely inaccurate. In fact, the education data in both table 4.2 and table 4.3 are inaccurate given the lack of data for certain communities in certain years.

Table 4.2. Selected Education Variables for CCS Thompson, 2006 and 2011

| Variable | British Columbia | | CCS Thompson | | % Change | |
|--|------------------|------|--------------|------|----------|------|
| | 2006 | 2011 | 2006 | 2011 | BC | CCS |
| Achievement (% of population 15 and over) | | | | | | |
| No certificate, diploma, degree | 29 | 22 | 40 | 50 | -26 | 24 |
| High school diploma | 27 | 28 | 24 | 25 | 6 | 5 |
| Apprenticeship or trade, college or other non-university | 29 | 32 | 26 | 25 | 9 | -5 |
| University certificate, diploma, bachelors degree | 11 | 13 | 5 | 0 | 18 | -100 |
| University above bachelors | 4 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 29 | -100 |

Note: Educational achievement data for High Bar was unavailable in 2006 and 2011, and in Clinton in 2011. Neither High Bar nor Clinton had data for education major. The data for the education major variable was deemed unreliable and is therefore not used in this report.

Table 4.3. Selected Education Variables for CCS Thompson, 2011

| Variable | British Columbia | CCS Thompson |
|---|------------------|--------------|
| Major (% of population 15 and over) | | |
| Education | 5 | 0 |
| Arts, communications technology, humanities | 4 | 0 |
| Social/behaviour sciences, law | 4 | 0 |
| Business, public administration | 8 | 14 |
| Physical, life sciences, technology, agriculture, natural resources, conservation | 4 | 0 |
| Math, computer, information sciences, architecture, engineering, related technology | 14 | 0 |
| Health | 8 | 0 |
| Personal protection and transportation | 4 | 0 |

Note: Educational achievement data for High Bar was unavailable in 2006 and 2011, and in Clinton in 2011. Neither High Bar nor Clinton had data for education major. The data for the education major variable was deemed unreliable and is therefore not used in this report.

HOUSING

Housing was one of the top ten needs identified in the community meetings held across western Canada. Many participants noted a need for more housing and a greater variety of housing types, in particular rental and affordable housing.

Compared to the province of B.C., CCS Thompson has a much higher percentage of housing that is owned and a lower percentage that is rented. The vacancy rate for the CCS was much higher than the provincial average in 2006. However, the dramatic changes in the values between 2006 and 2011 suggests the data is likely inaccurate.

INCOME

A lack of data for the variables relating to income in the CCS prevents analysis of this topic.

Table 4.4. Selected Housing Variables for CCS Thompson, 2006 and 2011

| Variable | British Columbia | | CCS Thompson | | % Change | |
|--|------------------|-----------|--------------|------|----------|------|
| | 2006 | 2011 | 2006 | 2011 | BC | CCS |
| Dwellings (as a % of total dwellings) | | | | | | |
| Owned | 78 | 78 | 82 | 80 | 0 | -2 |
| Rented | 21 | 20 | 18 | 0 | - 5 | -100 |
| Band Owned | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 100 | -100 |
| Average value of dwellings | \$275,000 | \$351,000 | N/A | N/A | 28 | N/A |
| Spending over 30% on shelter (% of population) | 20 | 23 | 22 | N/A | 15 | N/A |
| Vacancy Rate (%) | 20 | 23 | 44 | 51 | 15 | 16 |

Note: Much of the data on housing was unavailable. No data was available for High Bar in 2006 or 2011, or for Clinton in 2011 for the variables housing ownership, spending 30% or more on shelter, and median value. There was also a lack of data on vacancy in High Bar in 2006. As a result the information for these variables is not a true reflection of the CCS.

LABOUR

The occupation data for the CCS is unavailable for 2011. In 2006 the major occupations in terms of employment were the trades, transport, and equipment operators field, followed by sales and services, and natural resources and agriculture.

BUSINESS

The vast majority of businesses in both B.C. and CCS Thompson have less than 50 employees and are considered small. This is to be expected given this is true of western Canada in general.

Business activity in the CCS is concentrated in the accommodation and food service, and the agriculture, forestry, fishing, and hunting categories.

Table 4.5. Selected Income Variables for CCS Thompson, 2005 and 2010

| Variable | British Columbia | CCS Thompson |
|---|------------------|--------------|
| Median individual after tax income | | |
| 2005 | \$22,000 | N/A |
| 2010 | \$26,000 | N/A |
| % Change | 21 | N/A |
| Income Composition (as a % of total income) | | |
| Wages and salaries | 64 | N/A |
| Self employment | 3 | N/A |
| Investment income | 4 | N/A |
| Pensions, superannuation, annuities | 8 | N/A |
| Other market income | 2 | N/A |
| Canada/Quebec Pension benefits | N/A | N/A |
| CPP, old age pension, guaranteed income | 5 | N/A |
| Employment insurance benefits | 2 | N/A |
| Child benefits | 3 | N/A |
| Other government, including social assistance | 4 | N/A |

Note: The income data was unavailable for CCS Thompson.

Table 4.6. Selected Labour Variables for CCS Thompson, 2006 and 2011

| Variable | British Columbia | | CCS Thompson | | % Change | |
|---|------------------|------|--------------|------|----------|-----|
| | 2006 | 2011 | 2006 | 2011 | BC | CCS |
| Participation rate (%) | 64 | 61 | 58 | 71 | -4 | 21 |
| Employment rate (%) | 92 | 90 | 87 | 30 | - 2 | -65 |
| Unemployment rate (%) | 8 | 10 | 13 | 70 | 28 | 425 |
| Self-employed (%) | 19 | 16 | 16 | N/A | -16 | N/A |
| Occupations (as a % of all occupations) | | | | | | |
| Business, finance and administration | 12 | 12 | 12 | N/A | 3 | N/A |
| Education, law, social service | 7 | 11 | 10 | N/A | 55 | N/A |
| Management | 9 | 11 | 12 | N/A | 19 | N/A |
| Natural resources, agriculture | 9 | 6 | 15 | N/A | - 39 | N/A |
| Sales and service | 24 | 22 | 17 | N/A | -5 | N/A |
| Trades, transport and equipment operators | 21 | 20 | 24 | N/A | -5 | N/A |

Note: For many of the variables in this table, data was available for High Bar for either year, or for Clinton for 2011. As a result the information in this table is not a true reflection of the CCS.

Table 4.7. Selected Business Variables for CCS Thompson, 2006 and 2011

| Variable | British Columbia | | CCS Thompson | | % Change | |
|--|------------------|------|--------------|------|----------|------|
| | 2006 | 2011 | 2006 | 2011 | BC | CCS |
| Business Size (as a % of all businesses) | | | | | | |
| Small (up to 50 employees) | 98 | 98 | 99 | 100 | 0 | 1 |
| Medium (50 to 100 employees) | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | -100 |
| Large (101 + employees) | 1 | 1 | 0 | <1 | 0 | n.c. |
| Business Type (as a % of all businesses) | | | | | | |
| Accommodation, food service | 7 | 7 | 11 | 17 | 0 | 55 |
| Administrative support, waste management, and remediation services | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| Agriculture, forestry, fishing, hunting | 14 | 11 | 26 | 17 | - 21 | -35 |
| Construction | 14 | 15 | 13 | 11 | 7 | -15 |
| Finance and insurance | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 50 |
| Other services | 7 | 7 | 8 | 6 | 0 | -25 |
| Professional, scientific, technical services | 7 | 7 | 4 | 5 | 0 | 25 |
| Real estate, rental and leasing | 7 | 9 | 7 | 7 | 29 | 0 |
| Retail | 10 | 9 | 10 | 9 | -10 | -10 |
| Transportation and warehousing | 5 | 5 | 7 | 8 | 0 | 14 |

n.c. – Not calculated.

Note: The data for business size and type were not available for High Bar. As a result the data presented above for these variables is not a true reflection of the CCS.

CLINTON, HIGH BAR FIRST NATION, AND WHISPERING PINE FIRST NATION – WHAT YOU TOLD US

We formed two groups from the approximately thirty-five participants in attendance in order to brainstorm as many community needs as possible. From the group discussions, we created a master list of common needs and used it to explore conventional solutions to problems, including business creation, volunteerism, and government intervention, as well as alternative solutions such as the formation of a co-operative.

SOCIAL CAPACITY

Social capacity is one of the factors required for co-operative development. Social capacity is the ability of people in a community to work together, as well as the willingness of the community to allow people to work together. It extends beyond volunteerism to the dynamics of everyday life in an area.

Participants indicated that people in the community work well together overcoming obstacles and meeting needs. They stated that volunteerism in the community has been instrumental in providing services such as seniors housing and recreation. There are a number of service clubs in the community organized by volunteers, which creates strong social capacity. Participants raised some concerns related to the community's social capacity and volunteerism in the long run. It was noted that those who attended the meeting served multiple roles in the community as volunteers in addition to their regular positions. Many stated that they were overburdened and indicated there was a level of volunteer burnout that may become problematic if new solutions cannot be found.

Participants also discussed the absence of youth in volunteerism or community-based initiatives. This is a result of an outmigration of young people from the community and a lack of participation from those who remain. Participants expressed concern regarding who would continue to move current initiatives forward if people were not involved.

BUSINESS CAPACITY

Business capacity represents the business skills and capabilities in the community that are available for new business start-ups or for business expansion. Business know-how can come from a variety of sources: education and training, employment, current businesses in a community, and volunteering. For economic development to occur in a community, business capacity must either be present or it must be developed. While business capacity is required for co-operative development to occur, the mere presence of business capacity is not sufficient – communities also need social capacity and innovative ideas regarding how to use existing resources to meet unmet needs.

Participants explained that the business community in Clinton has decreased over the years as industry has moved outward; this has had an impact on the local job market and the youth population. According to participants, the remaining businesses have become somewhat complacent and are not actively pursuing practices that will facilitate sustainability. Many were concerned, as the remaining businesses were seen as an essential part of the community and provide important services. Participants stated that many in the com-

munity had useful skills that could support further development but appeared unsure about how to achieve these goals.

NEEDS AND SOLUTIONS

Co-operatives are almost always developed in response to unmet needs. A “need” is anything that a community believes is missing or inadequate. Filling that need would make life better. But there are differences among needs. Some can be big and even undefined, such as “more jobs” or “less crime.” Other needs are well defined, sharp, somewhat more urgent, and potentially solvable, such as a local grocery store, a day-care, a farmers’ market, or an oilseed crushing plant. Only a community can decide which needs can and must be addressed, when, and how.

Table 5.1 presents the top ten needs that came up in discussion at the meeting.

Table 5.1. Top Ten Needs in Clinton, High Bar First Nation, and Whispering Pine First Nation

| |
|-----------------------------------|
| Industry and Business Development |
| Housing |
| Health Care |
| Volunteerism |
| Youth |
| Infrastructure |
| People |
| Accessing Services |
| Jobs |
| Retail |

Participants were asked to identify the needs within their community, what services could be improved upon, and what they felt would improve life in Clinton. The first identified need was for more people, especially families that could ensure the sustainability of the community. This led to a broader discussion about why young people were leaving the community. Participants explained that a loss of industry in the forestry sector led to a serious lack of quality jobs, causing many young people to leave the area in search of other employment opportunities. Their departure caused not only a decline in population but also a decline in services. Participants thought that increasing the level of business activity in the community would attract new people and lead to some growth.

Most people expected industrial expansion to come from the private sector, but were unclear how this might develop. Without significant potential for resource exploitation or existing infrastructure for processing, Clinton may not be a feasible site for new industrial development. Participants did outline several opportunities for small business development that could increase the appeal of the community and also create employment. Some ideas were a coffee shop, a laundromat, and a grocery store.

Clinton’s population is approximately 650 people, which is too small to maintain some of the services desired by the residents. For example, people must travel to larger centres such as Kamloops or Williams Lake to access seniors’ services, health care (physicians and specialists), and retail options. Participants indicated that many people actually prefer to travel to access services, thus limiting the opportunity for local businesses to survive. It was also noted that a lack of facilities and housing options may limit the expansion of the business community.

Many thought that the Economic Development Society, which is comprised of volunteers, could lead a rental housing development, since it is currently working towards developing a seniors’ facility. This could

be done with some support from Opportunities BC and the Thompson-Nicola Regional District. The availability of rental housing could attract health care professionals, although it was recognized that this would require significant collaboration with the Interior Health Authority and the Clinton Health Auxiliary.

Participants indicated that volunteer burnout is a growing problem as many of the people engaged in community affairs are overburdened. A lack of participation by young people contributes to the problem. Several social clubs and service groups have dwindling memberships and face challenges getting young people involved. If this persists, senior members of volunteer groups may have to recruit new members and encourage young people to get involved.

Participants also cited infrastructure as an issue in the community, including roads, sidewalks, housing, and new developments. Many noted that the local roads and sidewalks are aging and need to be replaced. Most people agreed that the municipality was responsible for these repairs but were unsure if they would happen in the near future. Further, existing housing infrastructure needs to be upgraded and expanded to support investment in the housing market. Participants also expressed an interest in investing in tourism infrastructure as a means to create new local opportunities for industry and recreation. Representatives from the Caribou Chilcotin Trail indicated that they could work with local firms in this capacity to enhance local tourism activity.

CO-OPERATIVE SOLUTIONS

Many participants were knowledgeable about the different types of co-operatives and some were members of co-ops in the area (e.g., a grocery store and credit union). These people explained the structure of a co-operative to the group and identified the role of memberships and collectivity inherent in the model. The facilitators then asked the participants if any of the needs that had been identified could be solved by creating a co-operative.

Participants suggested several types of co-operatives that could work in the community to help meet some of the needs, including a housing co-op, a retail co-op, a seniors' co-op facility, and a co-op laundromat. Each would require some support from the community and people would require encouragement to participate and move the initiative forward.

Some expressed concern regarding the establishment of a co-operative and were unsure of the support available. The facilitators discussed the role of the British Columbia Co-operative Association in fostering co-operative development, as well as the funding supports provided by the provincial government.

NEEDS AND SOCIAL CAPACITY – A SUMMARY IN PICTURES

Participants were asked to indicate what they believed to be the level of need and social capacity in their community. Based on the results presented in figure 5.1, the majority of participants believe that their community has many needs and high social capacity. Many participants recognized gaps in their community, such as good food and employment opportunities, as well as some difficulties accessing required services such as health care. However, many also believed that the community had the necessary capacity to overcome these challenges if they worked together. The presence of this capacity was evident in the level of commitment provided by the many volunteers who are dedicated to making things work in the community. Several participants discussed possible opportunities immediately following the event, including the formation of a co-operative to repurpose an empty building into a laundry facility.




Figure 5.1. Community Needs and Social Capacity in Clinton, High Bar First Nation, and Whispering Pine First Nation

CONCLUSION

Co-operatives have a long and rich history. Various forms of co-operation and mutual enterprise among people have existed for thousands of years. Formal co-operative businesses, with legal structures and written bylaws, emerged about two hundred years ago. Since then, co-operatives have spread to all parts of the world. Virtually every activity imaginable has the potential to use the co-operative business model to harness more of the decision-making power, spread the risk and reward, and build back into communities. Co-ops can be found in the marketing of everything from milk to fish to art; in the purchase of goods for life, work and play; and in the provision of co-operative housing, recreation, day care, funeral services, insurance, health care, transportation, restaurants and pubs, and jobs, to name just a few. A co-op can be built by a group of people, or by, for example, a group of businesses or band councils or municipalities.

Co-operatives are an important part of western Canada, and have allowed communities – through local ownership and control – to develop and sustain themselves. Co-ops, however, do not just materialize when needed. They require a great deal of work – both by the members of the co-operative and by those that are called upon to support the co-op, whether it is in the early stages of development or later on when the co-op is operational. The research presented in this report outlines some of the things that need to be considered when forming a co-operative.

If you are interested in learning more about co-operatives, ideas for kinds of co-ops, and the process by which they are developed, the following websites have excellent resources. As well, the Centre for the Study of Co-operatives, or your provincial co-op association, would be delighted to point you in the right direction.

REFERENCE MATERIAL

- What is a Co-op?
<http://www.uwcc.wisc.edu/whatisacoop/>
- Co-op Development Steps
http://www.sask.coop/co-op_development_steps.html
- Co-operative Innovation Project
<https://coopinnovation.wordpress.com/>
- Co-op Legislation in Canada
<http://usaskstudies.coop/publications/co-op-legislation-in-canada.php>
- Books and Booklets
<http://usaskstudies.coop/publications/books,-booklets,-proceedings/index.php>
- Co-operatives Mutuals Canada
<http://canada.coop/>
- International Co-operative Alliance
<http://ica.coop/>

APPENDIX TABLES

Table 7.1. Selected Demographic Variables for Western Canada — Part I, 2006 and 2011

| Variable | British Columbia | | Alberta | | Saskatchewan | | Manitoba | |
|--|------------------|---------|---------|---------|--------------|---------|----------|---------|
| | 2006 | 2011 | 2006 | 2011 | 2006 | 2011 | 2006 | 2011 |
| Total Population | 439,000 | 446,000 | 550,000 | 570,000 | 360,000 | 376,000 | 302,000 | 314,000 |
| Population (as a % of total) | | | | | | | | |
| 14 and under | 16 | 15 | 21 | 20 | 20 | 19 | 22 | 21 |
| 15-44 | 38 | 36 | 43 | 41 | 38 | 37 | 40 | 39 |
| 45-64 | 31 | 32 | 24 | 26 | 25 | 27 | 23 | 25 |
| 65 and over | 15 | 17 | 12 | 13 | 17 | 17 | 15 | 15 |
| Median Age | 44 | 46 | 37 | 38 | 41 | 42 | 38 | 39 |
| Dependency Ratio | 60 | 61 | 68 | 66 | 81 | 75 | 79 | 77 |
| Language spoken at home (as a % of total population) | | | | | | | | |
| English | 96 | 96 | 91 | 91 | 92 | 92 | 86 | 85 |
| French | < 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | <1 | <1 | 2 | 1 |
| Other | 2 | 1 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 6 | 12 | 12 |
| Migration into the community in the last year | | | | | | | | |
| Total # | 37,000 | 21,000 | 46,000 | 26,000 | 35,000 | 20,000 | 16,000 | 10,000 |
| As a % of the total population | 9 | 6 | 9 | 6 | 10 | 9 | 6 | 4 |
| Aboriginal Origins | 12 | 15 | 14 | 18 | 21 | 30 | 29 | 37 |
| Generation within community (as a % of total population) | | | | | | | | |
| 1st | N/A | 12 | N/A | 7 | N/A | 3 | N/A | 7 |
| 2nd | N/A | 19 | N/A | 14 | N/A | 12 | N/A | 11 |
| 3rd | N/A | 68 | N/A | 79 | N/A | 85 | N/A | 82 |

Table 7.2. Selected Demographic Variables for Western Canada — Part II, 2006 and 2011

| Variable | British Columbia | | Alberta | | Saskatchewan | | Manitoba | |
|--|------------------|------|---------|------|--------------|------|----------|------|
| | 2006 | 2011 | 2006 | 2011 | 2006 | 2011 | 2006 | 2011 |
| Migration in the last year (as a % of total migration) | | | | | | | | |
| Non-movers | 84 | 87 | 85 | 88 | 90 | 91 | 90 | 91 |
| From out of Country | 4 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 5 |
| From out of Province | 12 | 10 | 15 | 10 | 13 | 10 | 9 | 7 |
| From within Province | 41 | 36 | 39 | 36 | 43 | 33 | 41 | 35 |
| From within Community | 43 | 49 | 42 | 50 | 42 | 46 | 45 | 49 |
| International immigrants by period of immigration (as a % of total immigrants) | | | | | | | | |
| Within the last 5 years | 7 | 8 | 14 | 21 | 11 | 38 | 22 | 30 |
| Within the last 6-10 years | 7 | 5 | 9 | 11 | 7 | 7 | 10 | 12 |
| Over 10 years ago | 86 | 83 | 75 | 61 | 80 | 27 | 67 | 47 |

Table 7.3. Selected Education Variables for Western Canada, 2006 and 2011

| Variable | British Columbia | | Alberta | | Saskatchewan | | Manitoba | |
|---|------------------|------|---------|------|--------------|------|----------|------|
| | 2006 | 2011 | 2006 | 2011 | 2006 | 2011 | 2006 | 2011 |
| Achievement (% of population 15 and over) | | | | | | | | |
| No certificate, diploma, degree | 29 | 22 | 40 | 30 | 44 | 36 | 49 | 41 |
| High school diploma | 27 | 28 | 24 | 27 | 23 | 27 | 21 | 24 |
| Apprenticeship or college | 29 | 32 | 27 | 32 | 23 | 26 | 23 | 23 |
| University | 11 | 13 | 8 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 |
| University above bachelor's | 4 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 |
| Major (% of population 15 and over) | | | | | | | | |
| No post-secondary | N/A | 50 | N/A | 56 | N/A | 62 | N/A | 65 |
| Education | N/A | 5 | N/A | 4 | N/A | 5 | N/A | 5 |
| Arts, communications technology, humanities | N/A | 4 | N/A | 2 | N/A | <1 | N/A | 2 |
| Social/behaviour sciences, law | N/A | 4 | N/A | 2 | N/A | 1 | N/A | 2 |
| Business, public administration | N/A | 8 | N/A | 7 | N/A | 6 | N/A | 6 |
| Life sciences; agriculture | N/A | 4 | N/A | 3 | N/A | 2 | N/A | 2 |
| Math, computers & engineering | N/A | 14 | N/A | 14 | N/A | 9 | N/A | 8 |
| Health | N/A | 8 | N/A | 7 | N/A | 6 | N/A | 7 |
| Personal protection and transportation | N/A | 4 | N/A | 3 | N/A | 2 | N/A | 2 |

Note: Life Sciences: Physical, life sciences, technology, agriculture, natural resources, conservation; Math and engineering: Math, computer, information sciences, architecture, engineering, related technology; Apprenticeship or college: Apprenticeship or trade, college or other non-university.

Table 7.4. Selected Housing Variables for Western Canada, 2006 and 2011

| Variable | British Columbia | | Alberta | | Saskatchewan | | Manitoba | |
|--|------------------|---------|---------|---------|--------------|---------|----------|---------|
| | 2006 | 2011 | 2006 | 2011 | 2006 | 2011 | 2006 | 2011 |
| Dwellings (as a % of total dwellings) | | | | | | | | |
| Owned | 78 | 78 | 77 | 76 | 76 | 70 | 72 | 67 |
| Rented | 21 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 17 | 16 | 19 | 18 |
| Band Owned | 1 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 7 | 12 | 10 | 15 |
| Average value of dwellings (\$) | 275,000 | 351,000 | 189,000 | 293,000 | 88,000 | 176,000 | 110,000 | 172,000 |
| Vacancy Rate (%) | 20 | 23 | 10 | 12 | 18 | 17 | 20 | 19 |
| Spending over 30% of income on shelter (% of population) | | | | | | | | |
| Renters | 39 | 41 | 29 | 32 | 28 | 29 | 28 | 28 |
| Owners | 17 | 17 | 14 | 16 | 11 | 9 | 11 | 11 |

Table 7.5. Selected Income Variables for Western Canada, 2006 and 2011

| Variable | British Columbia | Alberta | Saskatchewan | Manitoba |
|--|------------------|---------|--------------|----------|
| Median individual after tax income | | | | |
| 2005 | 22,000 | 23,000 | 18,000 | 18,000 |
| 2010 | 26,000 | 29,000 | 24,000 | 21,000 |
| Income Composition (as a % of total income) | | | | |
| Wages and salaries | 64 | 71 | 60 | 62 |
| Self employment | 3 | 3 | 7 | 5 |
| Investment income | 4 | 5 | 6 | 3 |
| Pensions, superannuation, annuities | 8 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Other market income | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| Canada/Quebec Pension benefits | N/A | 3 | 4 | 4 |
| CPP, old age pension, guaranteed income supplement | 5 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Employment insurance benefits | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Child benefits | 3 | 5 | 6 | 8 |
| Other government, including social assistance | 4 | 3 | 4 | 4 |

Table 7.6. Selected Labour Variables for Western Canada, 2006 and 2011

| Variable | British Columbia | | Alberta | | Saskatchewan | | Manitoba | |
|---|------------------|------|---------|------|--------------|------|----------|------|
| | 2006 | 2011 | 2006 | 2011 | 2006 | 2011 | 2006 | 2011 |
| Participation rate (%) | 64 | 61 | 72 | 70 | 66 | 61 | 62 | 60 |
| Employment rate (%) | 92 | 90 | 95 | 94 | 94 | 93 | 93 | 91 |
| Unemployment rate (%) | 8 | 10 | 5 | 6 | 6 | 7 | 7 | 8 |
| Self-employed (%) | 19 | 16 | 22 | 17 | 28 | 20 | 21 | 14 |
| Occupations (as a % of all occupations) | | | | | | | | |
| Business, finance and administration | 12 | 12 | 13 | 13 | 11 | 11 | 12 | 11 |
| Art, culture, recreation, sport | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Education, law, social service | 7 | 11 | 6 | 10 | 7 | 11 | 8 | 15 |
| Health occupations | 4 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| Management | 9 | 11 | 8 | 14 | 6 | 21 | 7 | 14 |
| Manufacturing and utilities | 6 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 4 |
| Natural and applied sciences | 5 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Natural resources, agriculture | 9 | 6 | 18 | 7 | 28 | 8 | 19 | 6 |
| Sales and service | 24 | 22 | 21 | 19 | 19 | 20 | 23 | 21 |
| Trades, transport and equipment operators | 21 | 20 | 22 | 23 | 17 | 19 | 17 | 18 |
| Other | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 |

Table 7.7. Selected Business Variables for Western Canada, 2006 and 2011

| Variable | British Columbia | | Alberta | | Saskatchewan | | Manitoba | |
|---|------------------|------|---------|------|--------------|------|----------|------|
| | 2006 | 2011 | 2006 | 2011 | 2006 | 2011 | 2006 | 2011 |
| Business Size (as a % of all businesses) | | | | | | | | |
| Small (up to 50 employees) | 98 | 98 | 99 | 99 | 99 | 99 | 99 | 99 |
| Medium (50 to 100 employees) | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | <1 | <1 | 1 | 1 |
| Large (101 + employees) | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | <1 | <1 | 1 | 1 |
| Business Type (as a % of all businesses) | | | | | | | | |
| Accommodation, food service | 7 | 8 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3 |
| Admin./support/waste mgmt./remed. services | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 |
| Agriculture, forestry, fishing, hunting | 14 | 12 | 32 | 29 | 58 | 54 | 47 | 43 |
| Construction | 14 | 15 | 10 | 12 | 4 | 6 | 7 | 9 |
| Educational services | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | <1 | <1 | 1 | 1 |
| Entertainment and recreation | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| Finance and insurance | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 |
| Health care, social assistance | 4 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Information and culture | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | <1 | <1 | 1 | 1 |
| Management of companies | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 |
| Manufacturing | 4 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 2 |
| Mining, oil and gas | 1 | 1 | 5 | 6 | 2 | 2 | <1 | 1 |
| Professional, scientific, technical services | 8 | 8 | 7 | 7 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| Public administration | 1 | 1 | <1 | <1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| Real estate, rental and leasing | 8 | 9 | 4 | 5 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 4 |
| Retail | 10 | 9 | 6 | 6 | 5 | 5 | 8 | 7 |
| Transportation and warehousing | 6 | 5 | 8 | 7 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 5 |
| Utilities | <1 | <1 | <1 | <1 | <1 | <1 | <1 | <1 |
| Wholesale trade | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 |