

# CITY COUNCIL AGENDA



**Council Chambers, Guelph City Hall, 1 Carden Street**

**DATE Monday, November 30, 2015 – 6:00 p.m.**

Please turn off or place on non-audible all cell phones, PDAs, Blackberrys and pagers during the meeting.

## **Disclosure of Pecuniary Interest and General Nature Thereof**

### **2016 Tax Supported Operating & Capital Budgets**

#### **Delegations**

- Brad Howcroft, Chair, Accessibility Advisory Committee
- Julia Phillips, Vice-Chair, Accessibility Advisory Committee
- Joseph St. Denis
- Ted Pritchard
- Jakki Prince
- Sian Matwey
- Thomas Goettler
- Paul Mahony
- John Milan
- Lise Rodgers
- Kithio Mwanzia, President & CEO of Guelph Chamber of Commerce
- Ross Kirkconnell
- Jennifer Mackie
- Constable Chris Probst
- Dominique O'Rourke
- Nicole Abouhalka
- Sandy Nicholls
- Susan Ratcliffe
- Bruce Ryan

#### **Correspondence**

- Sandy Nicholls
- Nicole Abouhalka
- John Morton
- Thomas Goettler
- Alpa Jani
- Shelly Morrison
- Sandra Parmegiani
- Janet Dalglish

- 
- Mike Goostrey
  - Scott Frederick

## **ADJOURNMENT**

**From:** S Snickels  
**Sent:** October 28, 2015 10:33 AM  
**To:** Mayors Office; Clerks  
**Subject:** BUDGET

2015 October 28

Hi Mr. Mayor,

I respectfully request that you and City Council remove all money (3 million dollars) in the budget to replace the Bailey bridge with an undesirable two lane bridge.

There are many other issues within the city that deserve to be looked at with higher priority such as hiring more police officers, the many roads that are in disrepair that require repaving, much needed crosswalks throughout the city (especially around schools), installing bicycle lanes where needed as well as much needed bus shelters for those who take public transportation.

Thank you for your consideration,

Sandy Nicholls

P.S. Clerks, please distribute this email to all City Councillors. Thank you.

---

**Re : Removal from this year's Budget the Niska Rd Bridge**

Good day Mr. Mayor,  
Ladies and Gentlemen Councillors,

Hope you are doing well, enjoying the Fall amazing colours and you had the opportunity on sunny and windy days to take inner roads and experience the exhilarating feeling of being under a "rain of falling foliage"

I would like to ask you to "Please remove from the upcoming budget the money for a two lane bridge on Niska Road" as many aspects for its implementation are still missing.

Thank you for your cooperation. Sincerely,

*Nicole Abouhalka*

## **Capital Budget December 3.2015 and Niska bridge**

Thank you Messrs. Wettstein and MacKinnon for organizing the town hall meeting for Ward 6 on November 5.2015 and Mr. Mayor for your presence.

You had all invited us to share with you our opinions. You know by now my position to protect the Hanlon Creek Conservation area:

"Repair and Keep the 1 Lane Bailey courtesy bridge on Niska Rd, with the addition of

- a pedestrian and cyclist path and, of course,
- traffic calming measures.

"Repair the historic abutment to prevent them from falling into the river and protect the fish habitat.

Couldn't the City, in its upcoming budget for 2016, save "the 2millions+" to turn this bridge into a 2 lane to accommodate a traffic flow, that will be detrimental to humans and Nature's health and that will become obsolete once the interchanges are built by the province on the Hanlon ?

- When millions of dollars are needed only for the proposed South end rec. center ?

- Couldn't the City spend a million dollars on preserving a God or Nature gift decor (whatever you like it to be) that every season brings us wonderful ever changing sceneries that engulf us by its mere presence when we go through it?

- When millions are constantly spent to protect and restore man made immovable, lifeless stone structures that one must know about its existence and really stop to notice?

Allow me to quickly enumerate a few of the reasons behind my position, beside

-the importance of the environment and the mounting evidence of health benefits of trees and natural spaces, instrumental for healthier residents and communities which will alleviate the burden on the province health bill, to name but Mr. Woods in 1972 and last September our City own Forestry department,

-benefits of horticulture (in use at Homewood and St. Joseph) ,

-the guidance of the RSAC committee,

-the protective role of the GRCA for maintaining a healthy Heritage Grand with its habitats for fish, other animals and migration routes for birds and butterflies, the most renowned being the Monarch,

-maybe solving partially the geese problem.....etc.

- After, adjusting to today's values, millions had been spent in 1948 by Horace Mack and in 1977 by then Mayor Norm Jary and Council to protect this area,

- The Heritage Committee meeting members, on November 9.2015, have chosen by 7 votes to protect the whole area surrounding the Niska Bailey 1 lane bridge from

- the Bailey bridge itself as one of its basic components,
- to the North and South City limits
- extending East to Ptarmigan road,

- (some Kortright Hills residents, supporters and myself have witnessed the writing, word by word and sentence by sentence, of its final decision).

## Capital Budget 2016 and Niska Bridge- p.2

When on October 29.2015 the City embraced the Blue Dot movement, although "not legally binding, but rather a statement of principle" according to the official statement,

When Canada is back on the world stage to fight climate change and tackle environmental issues,

-Wouldn't Guelph, that was proud to be an environmental leader, regain its place by proving once more its efficient presence ?

### A few references :

Guelph's policies and municipal legislation, notably, the Official Plan, Natural Heritage Strategy which states in section 6A:

"A diverse and well-connected natural heritage system contributes to the city's environmental, social, cultural and economic values.

The wide range of ecological services provided by the natural heritage system includes, but is not limited to,

- the protection of natural heritage features and areas,
  - and ecological functions,
  - biodiversity and water resources,
  - reduced need for engineered stormwater management,
  - attenuation of air and water pollutants,
  - moderation of the urban heat island effect,
  - the provision for natural and open spaces for leisure activities and esthetic enjoyment,
- and opportunities for residents and visitors to experience nature in the city."

### In the Hanlon Creek Conservation Area Master Plan of 1982 under Conceptual Plan

"The basic concept for the HCCA is for nature-based recreation. A 1971 sociological study conducted as part of the Hanlon Creek Ecological Study identified two major recreational needs from survey responses from Guelph residents.

- The first was for accessible open space areas with diverse opportunity for recreation that involved the enjoyment of natural settings.
- The second was for facilities that involved organized and individually-guided water-based activities.

Since the Guelph Lake Conservation Area will satisfy most of the needs of the second type,

**- The HCCA is being planned to provide a natural-setting open space for a diverse range nature-based activities that include walking, cycling, bird-watching and picnicking.**

**Capital Budget 2016 and Niska Bridge - p3**

The North-East has the Guelph Lake  
The South-West needs a Park

New-York has the Central Park  
London, Hyde Park  
Paris, the Bois de Boulogne.

WHAT ABOUT GUELPH ?

In conclusion, as in my verbal message to the Heritage Committee on November 9.2015:

*"I suggest and wholeheartedly wish that this heritage area be named after Lt. Colonel Dr. John McRae, who must have walked, fished in this part of the Speed river and enjoyed the whole view.*

*That way, the Poppies associated with the Bailey bridge will be a tribute and a reminder of all our Canadian war heroes."*

And I add all the Canadians who fought different wars as regular armies or peace-keeping forces.

In the Hanlon Creek  
The Poppies grow,  
Eternal reminder  
Of our John McRae  
And every life  
Ransomed for  
Freedom and Peace.

Thank you for you attention

*Nicole Abouhalka*

Guelph, November 11.2015

70, Downey Rd  
Guelph,  
Phone 519.837.3648

From: John Morton  
Sent: November 10, 2015 9:26 PM  
To: Clerks; Mayors Office  
Cc: Ruth Morton  
Subject: transit comments

Hello,

I'd like to express my opinion on the proposed Guelph transit budget. This email can be shared as you see fit.

I think the planned rate increases and the reduction of service is the wrong option.

There are two groups of people in Guelph who use public transit. The first group does so because they have no other transportation option available. Work is too far away to walk or bike or owning a car is beyond their means. This group depends on the transit system. Ticket prices can go up, service can be degraded - both to a point - and this group will continue to use the service. While you don't lose these riders you also do not gain any extra riders from this group - since they are already using the system. So if you want to increase the use of public transit you need to look to the second group.

The second group are people in Guelph who choose to take the bus. This group has other options be it taxi, their own car or otherwise. But since this group has alternatives you can lose these riders. If the service becomes too inconvenient or too expensive then they will stop using Guelph transit. But, you can also gain riders from this group - make the service compare more favourably to their alternatives and they will ride the bus.

I've been blessed to be in the second group. I ride the bus not because I have to but because I choose to. There is a route that is convenient for me and the cost is reasonable. I have considered my options and even though the bus is a little less convenient I choose to leave our second car at home most days and take the bus to work.

It is obvious by all the cars on the road that there are others in Guelph who have done the same evaluation and found the transit system lacking. Many instead choose to drive. Free parking at work, the bus takes twice as long or more, whatever their reason they drive. If transit was a better option - measured by time, money or whatever metric they hold important - they would use it. The problem is that for most in the second group transit as it is right now simply isn't convenient or cheap enough.

If you choose to increase fares and degrade service it won't personally affect me. I will choose to no longer use the service as I have other options



available to me. The change will really only affect the first group. Increasing their travel time to work and decreasing their disposable income.

I do not know what impact keeping the same fares and service - or even increasing the service - would have on my property tax. The online tool reports that an increase of \$10 / household in this area "could result in an enhancement of service levels". I would suggest that an enhancement of service will lead to more riders and fewer cars on the road. I suspect most people in Guelph would gladly pay \$1 / month to have a couple less cars to fight with on the way to work.

--

John Morton

**From:** Thomas Goettler  
**Sent:** November 12, 2015 2:00 PM  
**To:** Clerks  
**Cc:** leannewarren@guelph.ca; Phil Allt; guelphtransit@guelph.ca; ':leanne.piper@guelph.ca';  
Mayors Office  
**Subject:** FW: Guelph Transit's proposals to increase transit fares

Wednesday, November 11, 2015

Dear Councillor Phil Allt,

The transit fare increase and proposal to reduce service for Guelph Transit busses was the focus of a rumble among community passengers on the number twelve bus last Monday, November 9, 2015. I think the intensity and vigor of these riders is worth noting. I would classify the dialogue as collective distain; it was obvious that readers were following the Mercury's reporting of the proposed increase and reduction in services.

The changes to Guelph's Transit would violate both the Charter of Right as well as the founding principles of the Ontarians with Disabilities Act. From the perspective of these Federal and Provincial Acts, systemic initiatives or innovations include voices of persons with disabilities. As well, the needs of citizens must be respected.

I assume that accessible and affordable transportation is a right. Transportation to education, workplace and community gatherings are being threatened Budget allocation and budget restraint. The price of a bus fare is proposed to increase to four dollars. A number of disconcerted passengers mentioned Persons with disabilities in the number twelve bus.

People with disabilities already struggle with physical organization issues A disability might prevent getting licensed to drive. Another disabling condition might be addressed with a wheelchair or a walker. The physical restraints are one level of barriers encountered by persons managing disabilities. Barriers to organizing competent habits, Routines and schedules will be socially constructed by the Guelph Transit proposals because these proposals are neither legal nor consultative.

More rumbles and community rumbles are sure to erupt with Guelph Transit's rate and schedule proposals because basic rights and essential needs are threatened. The Guelph Mercury is also voicing shock appal and disgust with the short sightedness of rate increases and service cuts. On Thursday, November 12, 2015 an editorial reminded its readers that Mayor Guthrie had promised transit services which considered the needs of citizens who require transit services to participate in Guelph society.

Mayor Guthrie and members of the Guelph Transit administration might develop renewed visions of rate increases and schedule cutbacks if they followed the examples of Leanne Piper and Councillor Phil Allt who rode transit and talked to riders about the experiences of riding Guelph Transit so as to manage their daily lives in Guelph. Further dialogue needs to precede the Budget vote on December 9/15.

Respectfully,

---

Tom Goettler MSW, PhD (ABD) Sociology and Disability Studies OISE/UT  
Six year Member Accessibility Advisory & Barrier Free Committees, Guelph, ON

**From:** [alpa.jani](mailto:alpa.jani)

**Sent:** November 15, 2015 10:09 PM

**To:** Dana Keller

**Subject:** Bus shelter request

Hello Ms. Keller,

There is an urgent need for a bus shelter at Gordon and Landsdowne heading to the university especially with impending winter. Lot of university students would appreciate it. Hope this issue can be raised in this council meeting and shelter installed before end of year. As the students bring economic growth for Guelph, it will be much appreciated by all the parents and students.

Thank you

Alpa Jani

From: Shelly Morrison  
Sent: November 12, 2015 5:31 PM  
To: Clerks  
Subject: Proposed bus changes

I got asked on Twitter to write in so here's my say. With the 333 m that the ont government is dishing out instead of raising fees and cutting back more hours on Sunday. For years the factory workers have asked for better hours on Sunday and for years I never thought anything of it until my kids started working the factories. Now they can use the bus any other day of the week to get back and forth. The reason Sunday's are so bad. Because I drive them on Sunday's So do slot of others. But we shouldn't have to but I tell ya raise the fares and I buy them a car. At that dare they could upkeep their own vehicles ... But no worries you raise this after word gets out about the chuck out city gets ... And to compare out bus ours to to Toronto? Really Cam? Let me tell u go out for a night in Guelph you take a can home or get a ride. There's no buses in Guelph but in Toronto you can .... And they have more than just a bus service that you can transport around on ... We got buses ... That you walk and wait for both for long times...

Instead let's try increasing the hours at least Sunday mornings and see if there's an actually user increase.. I bet you there is ...

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** Sandra Parmegiani  
**Sent:** November 13, 2015 11:38 PM  
**To:** Clerks  
**Subject:** bus fare raise

Bus service is one of the primary services that the city should offer. It is irresponsible to impose a \$4 tickets to Guelph transit riders and in addition to cut Sunday and holidays service.

This city needs more extended and affordable busses and it especially needs to build a culture of public transit instead of car users. Why, I ask, try to save 1.5 millions and disadvantage all those who need to use public transit and then spend 1.2 millions on redoing Lyon's Park? Was it really necessary? No. Is it necessary to keep bus services affordable and reliable? Yes.

Please do reconsider this fare increase and service reduction. It is the wrong approach to an already lacking transit system.

Sandra Parmegiani

**From:** Janet Dalglish

**Sent:** November 13, 2015 1:57 PM

**To:** Coxson, Doug; Bob Bell; Mayors Office; Cathy Downer; Christine Billings; James Gordon; June Hofland; Leanne Piper; Mark MacKinnon; Mike Salisbury; Phil Allt

**Subject:** Budget questions

I would like to share this letter with our elected city council and also the wider Guelph community through the Tribune letters page

It relates to city priorities relating to potential spending cuts on transit as opposed to approval for the unnecessary EA to upgrade Niska Road and bridge

Sincerely

Janet Dalglish

### To Guelph Tribune editor: Doug Coxson, and Guelph City Mayor and Councillors.

Our council is being asked to agree to proposals in the Operating Budget that will not only cut our city bus service but will also significantly increase fares in an attempt to reduce the budget increase to 1.58%. Without the service cuts, the proposed budget will have to increase by 0.57% and without the fare increase a further 0.15% will need to be added to the budget. Your report later states that the draft budget includes increases of 1.96% for city departments and a whopping 7.4% in general expenditures, grant and capital financing....why?

Is there any connection between the 7.4% increase and the \$2.9 million allocated in the capital budget to replace the Niska Bridge?

Where do our city's priorities lie? Motor cars or improved public transportation? Good public transit exists where there has been significant investment in frequency and direct routes and also disincentives to drive, whereas Guelph encourages driving and is planning to penalise those who can ill-afford to or are unable to drive....the very people we should be supporting.

Many thousands of dollars of tax money have already been spent on an Environmental Assessment for the nearly \$3 million proposal to build a new 2-lane bridge over the Speed River at Niska Road, which with the road upgrade, will result in inevitable environmental damage. This has raised concerns for Heritage Guelph, and they have recently recommended to Council that the GRCA lands on either side of Niska road be designated under the Ontario Heritage Act. (This now also becomes a provincial matter as these areas to be protected are now governed by the Provincial Policy Statement). But before city staff are likely to bring the Cultural Heritage designation to Council for approval, Council are to meet on December 3<sup>rd</sup> to approve the Environmental Assessment which will give the green light to the unnecessary Niska upgrade.

No one denies that both bridge & road are in need of repair, but the current proposals go far beyond what is needed, given that there are no plans to upgrade the country road beyond the bridge and for most of the day, except during morning & evening commute, traffic is light and most drivers respect priority on the one-lane bridge. The money saved should go to IMPROVE public transport and other essential services!!

Janet Dalglish



Nov 6, 2015, at 10:35 AM, Mike Goostrey

Good morning gentlemen,

My family and I live on Geddes crescent - near the Rickson Ridge Public School - which, I understand, makes you our city councillors.

First of all, congratulations on your elections and thank you for standing up and offering to serve your community - municipal politics often disappears in the shadow of the province or federal versions...

I am writing to let you know that - like many other Ontarians - I have reservations about the (partial) privatization of Hydro One.

My concerns include the possible impact of the single-minded nature (profit and income focus) of institutional and corporate investors on:

1. the cost of electrical power service for residents;
2. the level and reliability of same;
3. the nature of future generation sources (ie, renewable forms(?), the least expensive forms(?) or the forms which provide larger private shareholders better investment returns from their broader portfolios - which may include potential generation suppliers);
4. and the ability of Ontario consumers to have a say (ie. a 'vote') on the operation of our electricity generating and distribution systems.

While I am somewhat heartened by the increase in the amount of shares set aside by Premier Wynne for 'retail investors', I suspect that this offer may not be fully leveraged by the public, leaving any leftover available for institutional clients.

I have expressed my concerns to our MPP - Liz Sandals - along with a few suggestions (which I will re-iterate below), but received the 'party line' in response: ...'we're raising money now to pay off debt and build infrastructure; don't worry about Hydro One'.

For the record, I suggested employing other methods of financing those objectives: ie. use part of Hydro One as collateral for a loan while interest rates are low - this should leave the provincial credit rating unaffected; alternately, issue Hydro One bonds so that the company would not only remain in public hands, but government could plan for and defer the cost of borrowing. Additionally, each of these methods would retain the income generated annually for government coffers. So far, there has been no reply as to why these would not work.

This brings me to you guys. I have just reviewed part of the 2016 budget presentation for the city and appreciate that some sacrifices have been made in order to hold tax increases to 1.58%; i'm sure that - though we always complain about taxes - most Guelphites will thank you.

However, my proposal is for the city to consider setting aside some monies for the purchase of Hydro One shares either from the market or during future offerings as planned by the provincial government. Such purchase(s) would help minimize the impact of private investor organizations on hydro delivery, provide the city with an (albeit modest) source of revenue, and ensure the residents of Guelph have a substantive collective vote in the operation of our electrical generating utility.

Further, I would like to suggest that this concept for municipal investment in Hydro One be carried up to the Ontario Municipal Board for consideration by either the OMB itself or, at least by other member municipalities. Should every municipality in the province participate with a modest financial participation, it is likely that the majority of Hydro One would remain in public hands, ensuring that it continues to remain accountable to all residents of the province.

I will be researching how to officially present this proposal to Council, but any assistance you can provide would be most helpful. Please also note that I will not be able to attend the public delegation meeting on Nov. 30th due to work commitments.

Many thanks,

Mike Goostrey

**From:** Scott Frederick  
**Sent:** November 16, 2015 9:16 PM  
**To:** Clerks  
**Subject:** Loose leaf pickup

City Budget - Service rationalization - Loose leaf pickup

At budget time we get to look at taxpayer funded services that we may not need in the future. At the top of my list for elimination is the loose leaf pickup. Every fall the city asks residents to make sure that gutters and storm drains are kept clear to avoid flooding. About a week later comes the announcement that loose leaves are to be raked into the gutters for pickup by the city at some future date. These instructions contradict each other. The windrows of leaves then block the curb lane, are mashed into a pulp and/or washed into the storm drains.

The responsible and economic thing to do is to follow the cities first recommendation. Keep gutters and storm drains free of debris and snow year round.

The city should discontinue loose leaf pickup. Loose leaves should be composted on site, as recommended by the cities own Healthy Landscapes office. Collection of loose leaves is a useless service, a waste of a valuable resource, and a waste of taxpayer dollars. If services are to be cut, loose leaf collection should be at the top of the list.

Scott Frederick