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Fly-in/Fly-out Mobility (FIFO)

- Long-distance commuting arrangement involving work in remote areas¹
- Employees transported to and from the worksite by airplane
- Food and accommodations provided for workers at the worksite²
- Employees spend fixed periods of time at the worksite and home in rotation³
In the Literature
Defining Community Types

I. Host Communities (or Regions)
   • ‘Work’ communities, (e.g. Fort McMurray, Alberta)

II. Source Communities (or Regions)
   • ‘Home’ communities (e.g. Perth, Australia)

III. Source Hub Communities
   • Characteristics: Access to services, affordable housing, the
     presence of an airport facility\(^4\)

\(^4\) McKenzie et al., 2014
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In the Literature
Community Impacts of FIFO

Host Communities:
- Influx of skilled workers\(^5\)
- Lost potential economic benefits – the fly-over effect \(^6\)
- Crime, poor lifestyle choices \(^7\)
- Isolation of workers from communities \(^8\)

Source Communities:
- Economic opportunities
- Loss of skilled workers \(^9\)
- Separation of workers from family and communities \(^12\)
- Inflated expectations of FIFO spending \(^13\)

\(^{5-6}\) Storey, 2001, Finnegan, 2015
\(^7\) Haslam McKenzie, 2011
\(^8\) Storey, 2001; Storey 2010; Finnegan 2015
\(^9\) McKenzie et al, 2014
\(^10-11\) Haslam McKenzie, 2011
\(^12\) Sandow, 2011; Schmidt, 2014
\(^13\) McKenzie et al, 2014
Existing Literature suggests…

- Source hubs have qualities of both host and source communities\textsuperscript{16}
  - Permanent resident population + transient worker population
- May experience some social consequences of host communities\textsuperscript{17}
- May capture economic benefits as in source communities\textsuperscript{18}
- Some communities in Australia vying to become source hubs\textsuperscript{19}

\textsuperscript{16} McKenzie et al. 2014
\textsuperscript{17} Haslam, 2011
\textsuperscript{18} Haslam, 2011
\textsuperscript{19} Victoria Department of Transport, 2013
Source Hub Communities
A Strategy for Regional Sustainability?

“…the emergence of targeted source communities or natural hubs has, to a degree, effectively re-created one of the most significant disadvantages of the single-industry community”

20 Storey, 2016
Source Hub Communities
A Strategy for Regional Sustainability in NL?

- Historical engagement with employment-related geographic mobility (E-RGM)
- Engagement of residents with FIFO work (e.g. in Fort McMurray)\textsuperscript{14}
- ‘Rural decline’\textsuperscript{15}
- Source Hub Communities have yet to be identified in the Canadian context

\textsuperscript{14} Keough, 2013
\textsuperscript{15} Norman & Power, 2015
Proposed Research

Deer Lake – A Source Hub Community in NL?
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Deer Lake – A Source Hub Community in NL?

Objectives:

A) To determine whether Deer Lake NL may be considered a source hub community in the Canadian context,

B) To identify changes in built space, planning, and land-use in Deer Lake resulting from FIFO E-RGM, and

C) To identify resident perceptions of the built-space, planning, and land-use changes associated with FIFO to establish whether these might be indicative of socio-economic and/or environmental impacts experienced in Deer Lake as a result of FIFO
If source hub communities exist in NL, could this model contribute to policy and planning strategies for the sustaining of rural communities?
Thank you!