

CITY HALL COUNCIL AGENDA



Consolidated as of March 20, 2015

Council Chambers, Guelph City Hall, 1 Carden Street

DATE Wednesday, March 25, 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

2015 TAX SUPPORTED OPERATING AND CAPITAL BUDGETS

RECOMMENDATION

1. That the 2015 Tax Supported Capital Budget in the gross amount of \$50,867,900 be approved.
2. That the 2016 – 2017 Tax Supported Capital Forecast in the gross amount of \$90,566,000 be received for information.
3. That all Committee of Adjustment fees be included in the 2015 City of Guelph User Fees By-law and that By-law (2004)-17330 being a by-law to amend By-law (2003)-17045 to update fees for the processing of Development Applications pursuant to the Planning Act, be amended by deleting all reference to Committee of Adjustment Fees.
4. That the proposed increases to user fees as **amended** (Tab 30) incorporated in the 2015 budget be approved.
5. That the 2015 Downtown Guelph Business Association budget with gross expenditures of \$491,075 be approved.
6. That the proposed transfers to/from reserves and reserve funds **(Appendix 1)** incorporated in the 2015 budget be approved.
7. That the 2015 Tax Supported Operating Budget with a net levy and payment in lieu of taxes requirement of \$206,303,226 or 3.05% above the 2014 tax levy and payment in lieu of taxes be approved.

Correspondence:

- Vince Hanson
- Avalon Shields
- John McMurtry
- Andy Best
- Bob Webb

- Simone Holligan
- Bryan McPherson
- Brad Van Horne

“THAT By-law Numbers (2015)-19881 to (2015)-19882, inclusive, are hereby passed.” (Councillor MacKinnon)

<p>By-law Number (2015)-19881 A by-law to impose user fees or charges for services or activities relating to Public Services, Infrastructure, Development and Enterprise Services, Corporate Services and the Office of the Chief Administrative Officer, and to adopt Municipal Code Amendment #522 which amends Chapter #303 to the City of Guelph Municipal Code.</p>	<p>To impose user fees or charges as approved by Council.</p>
<p>By-law Number (2015)-19882 A by-law to confirm the proceedings of a meeting of Guelph City Council held March 25, 2015.</p>	<p>To confirm the proceedings of a meeting of Guelph City Council held March 25, 2015.</p>

ADJOURNMENT

STAFF REPORT



TO City Council

SERVICE AREA Corporate Services, Finance

DATE March 25, 2015

SUBJECT 2015 Tax Supported Operating & Capital Budgets

REPORT NUMBER CS-2015-17

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

PURPOSE OF REPORT

To present for Council deliberation and approval the 2015 Tax Supported Operating and Capital budgets.

KEY FINDINGS

During departmental presentations to Council and public delegation nights recurring themes were raised by Council and members of the public. The main themes were; affordable housing, transit Sunday service, shared rental housing, front-end collection at condominiums, active transportation and Niska bridge community concerns.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

The net operating requirements identified in the budget document are funded through the municipal tax levy, various user fees and subsidies. If approved as recommended, the 2015 Tax Supported Operating Budget would increase the tax levy and payment in lieu of taxes requirement by \$6,113,147 or 3.05% to \$206,303,226 including \$5,124,447 for base requirements or 2.56% and an additional \$988,700 for service and strategic investments or 0.49%. Capital requirements would include \$50,867,900 for approval in 2015 and \$90,566,000 for receipt related to the 2016 – 2017 Capital Plan.

ACTION REQUIRED

Council approve the 2015 Tax Supported Operating and Capital budgets, including budgets for local boards, shared services and the Downtown Guelph Business Association.

STAFF REPORT



RECOMMENDATION

1. That the 2015 Tax Supported Capital Budget in the gross amount of \$50,867,900 be approved;
2. That the 2016 – 2017 Tax Supported Capital Forecast in the gross amount of \$90,566,000 be received for information;
3. That all Committee of Adjustment fees be included in the 2015 City of Guelph User Fees By-law and that By-law (2004)-17330 being a by-law to amend By-law (2003)-17045 to update fees for the processing of Development Applications pursuant to the Planning Act, be amended by deleting all reference to Committee of Adjustment Fees;
4. That the proposed increases to user fees as amended (Tab 30) incorporated in the 2015 budget be approved;
5. That the 2015 Downtown Guelph Business Association budget with gross expenditures of \$491,075 be approved.
6. That the proposed transfers to/from reserves and reserve funds (Appendix 1) incorporated in the 2015 budget be approved; and
7. That the 2015 Tax Supported Operating Budget with a net levy and payment in lieu of taxes requirement of \$206,303,226 or 3.05% above the 2014 tax levy and payment in lieu of taxes be approved.

BACKGROUND

The 2015 operating and capital budgets were developed following a collaborative and cross departmental approach. The proposed budget has been prepared taking into account;

- the Council approved budget model
- reasonable and effective financial policies
- approved levels of service
- input from community
- legislated requirements

In 2013, Council approved a predictable budget guideline model aimed at providing the tax payer and Council a certain degree of predictability. The model utilizes a formula that considers inflation (CPI), increases due to volume or growth within the City and a factor to support investments in new strategies.

STAFF REPORT



Model	Predictable Formula
Base (includes prior year assessment growth and efficiencies)	1.68% (CPI) + 1.53% (Volume) =3.21%
Recommended Investments	0.50%
<i>Strategic investments</i>	
<i>Service Investments</i>	
Total Investments	
Total	3.71%
<i>CPI - Consumer Price Index</i>	

Staff presented the 2015 Tax Supported Operating, Capital, and Local Boards and Shared Services budgets on separate nights and two separate opportunities were provided for the public to address Council at Public Delegation nights. This format facilitated greater distinction between operating and capital costs and controllable and uncontrollable costs and provided the opportunity for a greater degree of input from staff, Council and the public. This input was further supplemented by use of a corporate question and answer system (“ERNIE”) that allowed Mayor and Council to submit questions and receive information related to the recommended operating and capital budgets. A copy of the questions and answers asked during the budget process has been posted on the City’s website.

The March 25, 2015 Council meeting marks the final stage of the 2015 budget process. At this meeting, Council will deliberate and may increase or reduce the budgets presented within their legislative authority. At this meeting final approval of the 2015 Tax Supported Operating and Capital budgets is sought.

REPORT

2015 Tax Supported Operating Budget

On March 5, 2015 City staff presented the 2015 Tax Supported Operating budget. At this time, staff brought forward a budget reflecting a net tax levy increase equal to 3.05% for Council’s consideration.

Base Budget Changes

The City’s base budget is comprised of the following components:

- Funding needed to continue to provide existing services
- Impacts from Capital

STAFF REPORT



The 2015 base budget reflects a 2.56% or \$5,124,447 increase over 2014 Budget to continue to provide existing services. This reflects the additions and reductions to revenues and expenditures that were made during budget development.

The 2.56% base budget increase includes the impact from capital cost of \$480,100 or 0.24% on the City's 2015 budget. Impact from capital costs reflect the additional operating costs incurred by the City as a result of the completion of an approved capital project. If approved the impact from capital cost would result in additional 4 FTEs. Details on these items can be found on Tab 2, page 2-1 of the Council binder.

Service Investments

The 2015 tax supported operating budget presented on March 5, 2015 reflected service investments amounting to a \$891,700 or 0.44% impact on the net tax levy. If approved, these investments would result in an additional 14.80 FTEs. Details on the City's service investments can be found on Tab 2, pages 2-4 to 2-9 of the Council binder.

Strategic Investments

The 2015 tax supported operating budget presented on March 5, 2015 reflected strategic investments amounting to \$97,000 or 0.05% impact on the net tax levy. If approved, these investments would result in an additional 2.00 FTEs. Details on the City's strategic investments can be found on Tab 2, pages 4-5 of the Council binder.

2015 Tax Supported Capital Budget & 2016 – 2017 Capital Forecast

Prior to presenting the 2015 Tax Supported Operating budget, the City's 3-year capital budget was provided to Council and the public. Similar to the operating budget, the capital budget focuses on affordability and commits to maintaining the City's existing assets, addressing debt, and enhancing Guelph's quality of life.

In developing the 3-year Capital Budget and Forecast, a set of guiding principles centering on community sustainability and affordability were developed while ensuring that core elements of the corporate strategic plan are included. These principles are:

- Balance
- Building Fiscal Capacity
- Accountability and Transparency

The result of staff's work was the development of a fully funded 3-year capital budget funded at 16.08% of the prior year's net tax levy. This is within the Council approved guideline of 20% of the previous year's net tax levy.

STAFF REPORT



Public Delegation Nights

Public delegation nights provided staff and Council with the opportunity to hear community concerns about the budget.

During these evenings, some of the main concerns raised were:

- Affordable housing – the community wants the City to make contributions to the affordable housing reserve.
- Niska Road Bridge – the community is against the two lane bridge. A budget of \$200,000 has been proposed to fund the environmental assessment study and detailed design work for the bridge. Staff are recommending that the environmental assessment be completed in order for all alternatives to be fully evaluated.
- Front-end collection at multi-residential housing – condominium owners are asking the City to consider providing waste collection services to condominiums that are currently not able to participate in the three stream pick-up. The expansion was not recommended by staff for funding because residential collection service will be undergoing an operational audit in 2015. Until the results of this operational audit are known, staff felt it prudent not to include a potential new service with financial payback tied to an existing service that may not be provided in the same way in 2016.
- Shared rental housing – delegates are urging Council to consider the expansion packages for the education program and zoning inspector.
- Transit – the community is urging Council to reconsider Sunday and statutory holiday service adjustments. Since the approval of the Council approved transit route system in 2013, ridership growth and revenues have been lower than anticipated, resulting in revenue projections not being realized. Guelph Transit has assessed ridership volumes and determined that a reduction in Sunday and holiday service frequency would have the least impact on transit riders. Routes and hours of service will remain; however frequency will be reduced from 30 minutes to 60 minutes.

Active Transportation – the community is concerned that there is no funding for this project in 2015. Funds in this project are to be used to expand the network of sidewalks, trails, bike paths and other active transportation infrastructure within the City. The initial funding will be used to construct sidewalks/bike paths along Woodlawn Road. Phase 1 is Nicklin to Silvercreek, approximately 1.5km, with a cost of \$900,000. When this project was introduced to the budget in 2014 it was forecasted to receive \$300,000 in funding in 2014, 2015 and 2016 respectively, allowing the initial section to be constructed in 2016. The community is concerned that the removal of funding in 2015 will jeopardize this time frame. The current conditions along Woodlawn make it difficult for individuals using Transit, walking or biking to get to and from the businesses along the western end of the road.

STAFF REPORT



CORPORATE STRATEGIC PLAN

1.2 Develop collaborative work teams and apply whole systems thinking to deliver creative solutions

2.3 Ensure accountability, transparency and engagement

3.2 Be economically viable, resilient, diverse and attractive for business

DEPARTMENTAL CONSULTATION

Budget development was a coordinated effort by City Departments, Boards and Shared Services.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

The net operating requirements identified in the budget document are funded through the municipal tax levy, various user fees and subsidies. If approved as recommended, the 2015 Tax Supported Operating Budget would increase the tax levy by \$6,113,147 or 3.05% to \$206,303,226 including \$5,124,447 for base requirements or 2.56% and an additional \$988,700 for service and strategic investments or 0.49%. Capital requirements would include \$50,867,900 for approval in 2015 and \$90,566,000 for receipt related to the 2016 – 2017 Capital Plan.

COMMUNICATIONS

Public meeting notification was placed on the City's web page. Draft versions of the City budgets are also available at all City Library branches and are posted on the City's website.

ATTACHMENTS

Appendix 1: Transfers to/from Reserves

Appendix 2: Committee of adjustment memo to Council

Appendix 3: Questions and Answers (to follow under a separate cover)

STAFF REPORT



Report Author

Ron Maeresera

Senior Corporate Analyst, Financial Planning

Original signed by Sarah Purton

original signed by Al Horsman

Approved By

Sarah Purton

Manager of Financial Planning
& Budgets

519-822-1260, ext. 2325

sarah.purton@guelph.ca

Recommended By

Al Horsman

Deputy CAO
Infrastructure, Development
and Enterprise/CFO

519-822-1260, ext. 5606

al.horsman@guelph.ca

Appendix 1: Summary of Transfers to Reserves & Reserve Funds

Description	2015 Contribution	Purpose
Department Reserve Funds	3,722,000	Fund non-vehicle and equipment related capital projects in either the current or future years.
Vehicle & Equipment Reserve Funds	8,536,000	Fund the replacement of vehicles and equipment within the City's existing inventory.
Capital Tax Reserve Fund	2,819,000	Provide a contingency for projects that have unanticipated cost overruns or emergency situations that occur during the year
DC Exemption Reserve Fund	350,000	Fund growth related costs that are not eligible under the Development Charges Act and to fund exemptions that have been made by Council in the prior budget year.
Road Infrastructure Reserve Funds	1,385,000	Fund on-going road rehabilitation capital projects
Building Lifecycle & Accessibility Reserve Fund	1,201,700	Fund on-going capital works at City facilities, including regular capital upgrades and replacements and accessibility projects
Sleeman Naming Rights and Capital Reserve Fund	90,000	Fund on-going capital works at the Sleeman Centre. Funds received as part of the Sleeman Naming Rights agreement.
Information Technology Reserve	152,000	Fund the purchase of IT software that was previously licensed
Tax Supported Capital Reserve Funds	18,255,700	
Tax Increment Based Grant (TIBG) Financing	1,638,750	Annual contribution to provide funding for the Council approved TIBG program
Tax Rate Stabilization Reserve	100,000	Annual Contribution to provide funding for the tax rate stabilization reserve to build to targeted levels equal to 8-10% of gross operating expenditures
Building Maintenance (non-capital) Reserve	100,000	Annual contribution to provide funding for emergency, non-capital, repairs that need to be undertaken at City facilities
Election Reserve	131,000	Annual contribution to help offset the cost of the municipal election
River Run Reserve	65,000	Funds collected from ticket surcharge used to pay for River Run capital repairs and maintenance
Gas and Hydro Reserve	51,580	Contributions to payback loan related to Energy retrofit projects.
HR Reserves	60,200	Annual contribution to Human Resources reserves for contingency and job evaluations
Library Reserve	50,000	Contributions to Library innovation
Tax Supported Operating Reserves	2,196,530	
Total Transfers to Reserves & Reserve Funds	\$ 20,452,230	

Summary of Transfers from Reserves and Reserve Funds

Description	2015 Contribution	Purpose
Dedicated Provincial Gas Tax Reserve Fund	2,724,590	Fund conventional and mobility transit operations
Police Sick Leave Reserve	335,000	Fund the current year sick leave expense for eligible Police staff
Sleeman Naming Rights Reserve	32,265	Fund expenditures related to suite rental and advertising costs.
Strategic Initiatives Reserve	157,000	To fund one-time strategic initiatives for work to be carried out in 2015.
HR Reserves	520,550	Fund HR activities related to staffing, employee recognition & wellness
Employee Benefit Stabilization Reserve	250,000	To fund benefit costs when there is a short fall in recoveries.
Court Services Capital Reserve	397,075	Fund debt charges related to the POA facility. Funds are transferred to the reserve from the Enterprise fund.
Total Transfers from Reserves/Reserve Funds	\$ 4,416,480	

INTERNAL MEMO



DATE March 25, 2015

TO **Council**

FROM Stephen O'Brien

DIVISION City Clerk's Office

DEPARTMENT Corporate Services

SUBJECT Appendix 2: Committee of Adjustment 2015 Proposed Application Fees

In 2014 the City Clerk's Office assumed responsibility for the management and administration of the Committee of Adjustment including the facilitation of the processing of applications for minor variance and consents (severances). A review of comparators and a cost analysis indicates that the current fees being charged do not cover the costs of applications, and consequently the costs are being borne by the tax base. A recommendation to include the approval of these fees in the General User Fee by-law along with all other City Clerk's Office fees is being proposed.

Current Fees

The current application fees for minor variances and consents (severances) are among the lowest among comparator municipalities. They were last reviewed in 2004 and are currently listed in By-law Number (2004)-17330, as amended, being a By-law regarding development application pursuant to the Planning Act. It is proposed that all committee of Adjustment fees be adopted in the General Fees By-law and removed from the Planning Fees By-law.

When compared against labour and administrative costs for a typical application, current application fees for minor variances cover 43% of estimated labour and administrative costs, and consent application fees cover 71% of estimated labour and administrative costs.

Proposed Fees

The proposed Committee of Adjustment application fees are listed below:

Fee Type	Existing	Proposed
Consent Application Fee	\$1,243.00	\$1,500.00
Minor Variance Application Fee:		
• Single/Semi-detached/on-street townhouse unit	\$465.00	\$750.00
Minor Variance Application Fee:	\$729.00	\$900.00
• Other uses		

Staff is not currently proposing any changes to administrative fees associated with Committee of Adjustment applications.

The following table lists Committee of Adjustment fees from comparator municipalities, as of 2014:

	Minor Variances	Consents
Guelph	\$597.00*	\$1,243.00
Cambridge	\$900.00	\$1,100.00
Thunder Bay	\$1,000.00	\$1,000.00

Kitchener	\$1,082.00	\$1,285.00
Hamilton	\$1,257.50	\$2,632.50
Brantford	\$1,419.00	\$2,169.00
Barrie	\$1,750.00	\$2,100.00
Kingston	\$1,975.00	\$1,922.00
Burlington	\$2,317.00	\$4,230.00
Oakville	\$1,917.00	\$5,542.00
Average	\$1,421.45**	\$2,322.35

*This represents the average of the \$465.00 and \$729.00 application fees.

**If comparators have a range of fees, the average was included for the purpose of comparison

The current fees for Committee of Adjustment applications are substantially lower than our municipal comparators and without an increase, these fees will not be in the range of comparator levels or recover actual costs for processing of fees. As such, the tax base currently bears the costs for the difference of the actual fees paid and the actual costs associated to process applications. The Proposed application fees are in keeping with strategic planning initiative 2.1 – Build and adaptive environment for government innovation to ensure fiscal and service sustainability.

Actual Costs

The actual labour cost breakdown for processing Committee of Adjustment applications is attached (see ATT-1). The breakdown for administrative costs is also attached (ATT-2). These breakdowns have revealed that the City would need to charge the following application fees in order to provide for cost recovery:

Application Type	Cost Recovery	Existing Fee
Minor Variance	\$1,378.09	\$597.00*
Consent	\$1,751.83	\$1,243.00

Note: Calculations are based on 2014 labour and administrative costs. Labour includes salary and benefits. Administrative costs include, but are not limited to, signs, postage, courier, training and development. This data was collected in cooperation with the following service areas: Building, Engineering, Legal and Planning Services.

Application fees do not comprise 100% of Committee of Adjustment revenues as there are other fees required once the application is approved such as Validation of Title, Change of Conditions or a request for deferral fee. In addition, 100% of labour for the Secretary Treasurer of the Committee of Adjustment is not apportioned to application fees alone as this staff allocates time to other responsibilities, such as citizen inquiries that do not lead to the submission of applications, and preparation of documents for Ontario Municipal Board (OMB) appeals.

Comparison to Other Planning Fees

When compared to other planning applications for the City of Guelph, the administration to process some Committee of Adjustment application fees may be as complex as Minor Zoning By-law Amendments. Many Committee of Adjustment applications require a great degree of staff review, yet the difference in application fees between Committee of Adjustment and other planning application fees is substantial.

The following table illustrates the current fee amounts amongst these types of planning applications:

Fee	Description	Amount
Minor Zoning By-law Amendment	Adding uses to an existing zone, temporary use, zone changes involving single or semi-detached dwellings, no change in zoning category	\$3,776.00
Plan of Subdivision	Creation of multiple building lots	\$7,567.00 + \$406/ha
Minor Variance	Small variation from the requirements of the zoning by-law (eg. reducing building setbacks)	\$465.00
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Single/Semi-detached/on-street townhouse unit • Other uses 		\$729.00
Consent (Severance)	Creation of new lots, easements, and lot additions	\$1,243.00

Should Council approve the proposed 2015 Committee of Adjustment application fees staff will include them in the 2015 General User Fees By-law to be brought forward to Council and the By-law Number (2004)-17330, as amended, being a By-law regarding development application pursuant to the Planning Act, will be amended to remove the current fees.

Financial Implications

In 2014, a total of 155 Committee of Adjustment applications were received, including 31 consent applications and 124 minor variances. The revenue from application fees in 2014 was \$107,767.00. If the proposed updates in fees are adopted, the potential revenue collected in 2015 (if the same number and types of applications are received) is \$147,000.00. Please note that these amounts take into consideration application fees only, and do not include other administrative fees such as deferral fees, administration fees, special meetings fees, validation of title/power of sale, and change of condition fees.

Current application fees for minor variances and consents do not cover the anticipated cost of processing these types of applications. The proposed updates are designed to help sustain the anticipated cost of processing Committee of Adjustment applications. If there is no increase in application fees, the tax base will continue to bear the majority of the costs associated with Committee of Adjustment application fees.

ATTACHMENTS

- ATT-1 Labour Costs for Processing of Committee of Adjustment Applications
- ATT-2 Administrative Costs for Processing of Committee of Adjustment Applications

Stephen O'Brien

Clerk's Office,
 Corporate Services

Stephen O'Brien
 City Clerk
 519 822-1260 x5644
 stephen.obrien@guelph.ca

Mark Amorosi
 Deputy CAO Corporate Services
 519 822-1260 x2281
 mark.amorosi@guelph.ca

ATT-1

LABOUR COSTS FOR PROCESSING OF COMMITTEE OF ADJUSTMENT APPLICATIONS
CITY OF GUELPH

Based on Job Rates & Benefits from October 2014

Dept. Involved	Staff Duty	Time (Average in Hours)	Cost (=Job Rate + Benefits)
Building	Pre-consultation	1	
Clerk's	Pre-consultation/Receive Application	1	
	Review/Open File/Enter into Amanda	2	
	Prepare Notice/Sign/Mailing Lists	1.5	
	Mailings	0.5	
	Compile All Staff/Agency/Public Comments	1	
	Attendance at Meeting	0.15	
	Minutes/Decision	1	
	Notice of Decision	0.5	
	Notice of No Appeals/Close File	0.25	
	Review of File to Satisfy Conditions	1	
Committee Members	Attendance at Meeting	Honourarium	
Engineering	Research, Site Visits & Prepare comments	2.5	
Planning	Pre-consultation	1	
	Research, Site Visits & Prepare comments	5	
	Attendance at Meeting	0.15	
	Review of File to Satisfy Conditions	0.5	
ServiceGuelph	Receive fee	0.15	
Zoning	Preliminary Zoning Review	0.5	
	Research, Site Visits & Prepare comments	2.5	
Sub Total (Minor Variances)		22.2	\$1,275.21
Clerk's	Agreement Review and Registration	1	
	Satisfaction of Conditions	3	
	Reference Plan Review	0.25	
	Deed Review and Endorsation*	1	
Engineering	Reference Plan Review	0.25	
Legal	Agreement Preperation	1	
	Search Time	0.5	
	Agreement Review and Registration	1	
Sub Total (Consents)		30.2	\$1,648.95

*Note: Administration Fee of \$548 for new lots and \$233 for all other consents is currently charged to cover these expenses.

ATT-2

**ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS
FOR PROCESSING COMMITTEE OF ADJUSTMENT APPLICATIONS**

Figures based on 155 applications/year and 12 meetings per year

	Expense/Year	Cost per Application
Photocopying	\$1,260.00	\$8.13
Signs	\$1,068.00	\$6.89
Staff & Member Education/Conferences	\$1,400.00	\$9.03
Memberships	\$350.00	\$2.26
Catering	\$800.00	\$5.16
Honorariums	\$7,320.00	\$47.23
Mailing	\$3,748.28	\$24.18
Total	\$15,946.28	\$102.88

From: Vince Hanson
Sent: March 12, 2015 8:31 AM
To: Mayors Office
Subject: A Thank you and an Oops!

Good Morning Mayor Guthrie. *It must have been a long evening for you...*

Thank you for giving me the opportunity to speak last night. Attached is a copy of my slides only

Unused to the Elmo projector, I ended up missing critical slide and not including one at the end...With my heartfelt apology, please read on..

Here are the four slides I wanted to show – they are very easy and quick to review:

After saying the RSAC and Heritage Guelph struggle valiantly to do the right thing but do not have all the information,

1. I wanted to quote RSAC's Eric Wilson's – because it truly does come down to what the City's Values are – traffic or the community residents:
2. The Burnside quote illustrated it is very difficult to interpret slides shown quickly
3. The Oops! The third slide that I mislaid and did not show demonstrates what the Burnside slide reflects, shown a very different way.
 - Please, please have a look at this slide; it clearly tells a very different story
4. The fourth slide shows the door-to-door community results – 95% are against a two lane bridge; only 5% are for it.
5. More work clearly needs to be done before we get to the design phase... Please consider one fact:

It's a \$2,000,000⁺ project that:

- the community doesn't want
- bisects a conservation area
- the City can't afford
- will contribute to the projected Capital Budget increases of over 5% and 4% in the next two fiscal years

Preserve and protect the conservation area for future generations

Please do the right thing – stop the two lane bridge.

Thank you.

I would welcome any questions or comments. Thanks again. Vince Hanson

From: Avalon Shields
Sent: March 12, 2015 9:51 PM
To: Clerks
Subject: sunday buses

Hello,

Regarding you wanting to make the time between buses every hour instead of half hour, I advise you do not do this. The 30 minute wait is already too long. Also, sunday buses end way too early, so please don't worsen it by shortening the time that buses run on sunday.

Thanks,

Avalon

Mayor and City Council

Re. 2015 Budget

The City of Guelph has announced that it is planning to “add 20 new full-time equivalent positions to the payroll”. No indication is given of why this major new contingent to an already out-sized City Hall bureaucracy is needed to serve the citizens of Guelph. The new budget costs are a million dollars plus for the first year. But what about every year after that of 20 more full-time equivalent salaries? Once they are built into the budget, the next years’ salary costs will be at least another one-million dollars more again, and the next years will triple it and more, and so on, indefinitely expanding new City Staff costs by countless millions of dollars over time.

We know that bureaucracies multiply themselves unless strictly subordinated to the mission of the institution they serve. The mission of the City and its administration is to sustain and develop the built and environmental heritage of Guelph and the community facilities and programs without which citizens will be reduced or harmed in their lives. Every new and existing position and salary serves the governing mission, or it is bureaucracy building and waste. We have no reliable evidence to show which it is here.

The unhappy fact today is that bureaucratic planning from the top increases the salaries at the top and the subordinates, perquisites and empires serving them, while cutting back everywhere else. Until the positions at the top are made strictly accountable, they go on growing themselves at the expense of the mission and the citizens they are intended to serve (as has cumulatively occurred at the University of Guelph and other places with uncontrolled spending by senior administrations). Here it is revealing to observe that Guelph City Staff already has 84 salary positions above \$100,000 costing many millions of dollars a year for the management hierarchy of the City. Kingston the closest in type of city and population has 50 such positions, and there is no evidence it is a lesser city for it.

Consider too that the more management salaries rise with the more subordinates they have, along with larger raises every year than anyone else by percentage boosts worth far more because of the much higher salaries. For example, even a 2% raise for the sunshine club will spend far more City money than on yard waste collection or proper main-street sidewalk clearing which they keep dumping on the citizens of Guelph. When do you ever see apical City bureaucrats stand for the ground-level services? They prefer to hire very costly developer consultants to plan for them and, for example, follow their expensive directions to force-spend spend two-million dollars on a new double-lane Nisca bridge that 95% of citizens in the area oppose and which will destroy the river life habitat there. Or the sunshine club turns back a long-overdue pathway for human walking or biking along the dangerous Woodlawn Avenue as in the new budget. Even clear hazard to citizens is overlooked – as with all these cases - as long as the idea of cutting back on them is never raised in City Hall.

So, 20 full-time equivalent positions are on their way to being instituted into the City Staff budget with ever more money funnelling towards top salaries, underlings and private consultants with no stop. This is how administrator control of the purse strings works until checked. Until then, no service or facility – except for Administration and the Police – is likely safe from cut back or defunding.

Low-paid City Council and the Mayor, in contrast, are best positioned to reclaim taxpayers' money to life-serving allocations only, not self-serving bureaucratic bloat, negligence of ecological systems and new developer schemes.

faithfully yours,



John McMurtry FRSC

From: Andy Best
Sent: March 18, 2015 9:34 PM
To: Clerks
Subject: Submission for March 26 council agenda

Dear clerks,

I am submitting the below written statement for inclusion in the council agenda for the meeting on Wednesday, March 25. My comments relate to the request to create a 1 FTE position for an open government program manager.

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Thank you,
Andy Best

I am writing to share my strong support for the proposed funding item related to hiring an open government program manager, to report to the office of the CAO.

It is remarkable what has been achieved so far on the open government file in Guelph. Passionate city staff have nurtured this from an vague idea into an action plan which received unanimous support from the previous term of council.

The Open Government Action Plan has the potential to impact all aspects of city business for the better. This applies not only to how services are delivered but to the City's long-term financial health and to the culture within City Hall. Perhaps most excitingly, it can reinvigorate the relationship between the City of Guelph and its citizens.

Despite the commendable progress to date, a dedicated internal champion is now needed to propel this initiative forward. You have a unique opportunity to create and empower that champion in this budget. This decision will have an impact far beyond the surface-level dollar figure attached to this request from staff.

The seeds have been planted for the decade-long cultural change that is open government. They now need sunlight and water to take root and grow.

I respectfully urge you to support this budget item.

Thank you,

Andy Best
Ward 3
Editor, guelphcitizen.ca
Co-Chair, Open Government Leadership Task Force

From: Bob Webb

Sent: 18-Mar-15 9:47 PM

To: mark.amorosi@guelph.ca

Cc: june.hofland@guelph.ca; BLAIR.LABELLE@guelph.ca; maggie.laidlaw@guelph.ca; Bob Webb

Subject: Re: Imminent Council Budget review - Support for funding Guelph Open Government Action Plan

Good morning

I am writing to ask Council to support the proposed budget funding for the Open Guelph and Open Data Action plan. As 30 year resident in Guelph and business owner I believe that the Open Government program not only offers a significant opportunity for citizens to collaborate with City staff in the creation and provision of more efficient and responsive government but there is also the promise of an appreciable return on any investment. By enabling individual Guelph citizens and businesses to work with the City to share, and combine data that already exists to create new insights and economies, Guelph as a community stands to gain enormously.

As one member of the Open Government leadership group (some 25 people) I have seen the commitment and dedication of City staff to this program as well as the growing volunteer commitment from numerous citizens to work on task groups to advance the Open Government action plan and the philosophy it represents. We are now at the point of organizing ourselves into task groups to work on the different elements of this comprehensive Action plan already approved by Council.

I believe the City should not hesitate to provide the funding for a full time position to coordinate and support the implementation this action plus the necessary technology support and by doing so show support and give us a much better chance of making government in Guelph more participative, effective and efficient. Something we all desire.

Thank you

Bob Webb

Thursday, March 19th 2015

Guelph City Council
1 Carden Street
Guelph, ON
N1H 3A1

To Whom It May Concern:

This letter is in support of the Open Guelph initiative as a way to bridge communication between the residents of the city (city) and the City of Guelph (City). As a visible minority and a member of the university community residing within the city, I see the Open Guelph initiative as providing a voice to the underrepresented within the city, and providing a way to harness skills and tools needed to solve challenges the city will face in the years to come.

One initiative currently under development is the MyGuelph portal. This portal will allow underrepresented persons, whether differently abled, of lower social standing, refugee status, LGBTQ, or people of colour, to have a say in the design and development involved in management of the city's resources. This inclusion into shaping the vision of the city will go hand-in-hand with another planned initiative – the Guelph Civics School - which will itself encourage and enable residents to take ownership of these resources and seek ways to maintain these responsibly. For example, a proposed re-zoning and development can be posted on MyGuelph, which would allow residents to voice their reasoned opinions on the matter. Through the Civics School, a roundtable could also be established for residents to voice hopes or concerns for the development which could then be forwarded to council.

Open Guelph will also enhance collaboration between the City and the University of Guelph. It's perhaps time we moved away from viewing students as simply encroaching upon neighbourhoods. The wealth of knowledge and expertise that flows into the university and the city each year should be viewed opportunistically. A possible section of the MyGuelph portal could be targeted to students and used to gain their insight on the challenges the city may be facing. Events such as the annual Hackathon could be segmented in such a way so that students may work on projects as part of a final term or final year project. Additionally, sharing of data with leaders in various fields could aid the City in their projections and planning on several fronts. This would also satisfy researchers' aims for knowledge mobilization and transfer in their respective areas. The potential benefits of such collaboration are great, and have seemingly been left untapped.

I thank you for your consideration of this brief letter. I gently urge your careful consideration of the proposal for this initiative. A new approach is indeed needed as we charge ahead.

Sincerely,
Simone Holligan.

Open Guelph Leadership Taskforce Member

March 19th, 2015

Dear Council,

This write in delegation is to request capital funding to be allocated to the City's Open Gov Program. The request is for \$200,000 and is for funding for future Open Gov initiatives – such as the creation of an Open Gov Program Manager position, and associated technology requirements to further develop the myGuelph website.

I have been acting as a community champion for the program for over one year now and definitely see the promise of it in ensuring efficient and transparent municipal governance. Please ensure the funds are allocated for continuance of this program.

Sincerely,

Bryan McPherson, MLA, GISP

Dear Mayor Guthrie and Guelph City Council

Please accept this note as an endorsement of the Open Government initiatives that are underway, and a request for the City to continue building momentum by approving the Budget Expansion Request next Wednesday.

In the past year, I have observed City of Guelph staff bring together representatives from local business, education and community associations and produce tangible results. In the most recent Hack-a-thon, the City obtained software to manage it's bus shelters at a tremendous savings. In essence the parties collaborated and shared their resources to produce a local solution. This model of working together will enable the city to implement modern technologies and systems more quickly and cost effectively than under old models.

For it to continue and grow, open government needs:

- dedicated staff
- to expand the published data for external parties to work with
- a place where the public can learn about Open Government and access new services that become available

The Open Government Action Plan is the roadmap for Guelph:

“to build an exceptional city, by providing outstanding municipal service and value”

Investing in Open Government today will provide a long term return on investment and should be continued. Thank you for the opportunity to provide feedback and for your anticipated support.

Brad Van Horne
