

- 6. Page 67 indicates an increase in \$650K for Environmental Services contracts. What is the cause of that increase? Further to this, on Page. 254 the increased cost in Purchased/Contracted Services in the Environmental Services budget summary is \$777,551. Which is the correct number? (McCausland, G)**

Answer:

Approximately \$285,000 for necessary contractual obligations for the Sudbury Landfill, \$290,000 for waste collection as well as \$75,000 for the processing blue box recyclables. These are multiple year contracts, which are negotiated consistent with the terms and conditions of the contract. Furthermore, the information presented on page 67 is a summary of larger items. Both amounts are correct, however, \$777,551 is the total change in the Purchased/Contracted Services node for Environmental Services.

- 7. Pg.84: Why are the clerk's hours perfectly divided across the different activity areas at 3,600 each? It seems highly unlikely that that reflects that actual division of work. Are we accurately tracking the division of work? (McCausland, G)**

Answer:

The 3,600 hours is simply a straight line calculation of two FTEs worth of time. We haven't yet taken the step of assigning hours to particular services in say, vital statistics, but we could and will when time and activity reporting is implemented. For now, it reflects two FTEs worth of time devoted to that basket of activities. As you pointed out, 1,800 is used as a proxy, when you take out vacation time and any absences, the real figure is much lower but we used 1,800 fairly universally in the service profile exercise.

- 8. What is the annual operational budget impact of operating Lively and Adanac ski hills? (McCausland, G)**

Answer:

The operating budget impact of ski hills (from the 2020 budget) is detailed below. It is important to note that there is a capital component, not reflected in the operating budget, associated with this service. While capital expenditures are not annual expenditures, these operations do rely on capital equipment that requires periodic investments to maintain service continuity and sustain a state of good repair, and should be kept in mind in any review of the ski hills' operations:

Adanac

- Total revenues - \$415,611
- Total expenses - \$514,566
- Net budget - \$98,954

Lively

- Total revenues - \$10,845
- Total expenses - \$118,070
- Net budget - \$107,225

The City also maintains Capreol Ski Hill as an unofficial sliding hill with the following budget impact:

- Total revenues - \$0
- Total expenses - \$17,307
- Net budget - \$17,307

**9. What was the attendance in 2018 for the Copper Cliff Museum and the Anderson Farm Museum (broken out)? What is the total operational budget impact of each museum? (McCausland, G)**

Answer:

**Museum Operating Budgets:**

Anderson Farm Museum - \$202,381

Copper Cliff Museum \$11,510

Flour Mill Museum \$14,480

Northern Ontario Railway Museum \$6,730

**Attendance (including special events in which City is partner):**

Anderson Farm Museum total attendance 2018: 20,525

Copper Cliff Museum total attendance 2018: 454

**10. Pg. 180, Office of the CAO: There is clearly a Grant being introduced this year but it is not clearly identified in the pages following. What is the grant/program implied in the budget summary numbers? Pg. 188, Economic Development: There is clearly a grant introduced in the 2020 budget, but I don't believe it is mentioned in the description pages. What is the grant/program implied in the budget summary numbers? (McCausland, G)**

Answer:

On page 66 and 67 of the budget document are two sets of analyses. One for operating revenues and one for expenses. These analyses highlight the major changes between the 2019 approved operating budget and the proposed 2020 amounts.

The Economic Development Division is part of the Office of the CAO. Both page references cited in your question refer to the same item. The change in 2020 amounts represent grants for the Regional Business Centre and the Mining Supply Program. These programs were available in 2019 but their funding was not confirmed when the 2019 Budget was prepared. Both programs' anticipated revenue and related expenditures are included in the 2020 Budget.

- 11. On Page 192 there is a statement that we are seeing “declining revenues” from changes to police enforcement, but then on page 194 in the budget summary revenues are up 25% or \$636K. What is the source of the increased revenue for Legal and Clerk’s Services? (McCausland, G)**

Answer:

The source of the increased revenue for Legal and Clerk’s Services is for the Red Light Camera program.

- 12. Pg 301; Business Case for Downtown CIP. Can we get a status update on the funds invested in 2019 in the Downtown CIP? (McIntosh, D)**

Answer:

In 2017, City Council allocated \$600,000 to the Downtown CIP. Of this amount \$131,000 has been spent to date and \$331,000 is allocated through signed agreements. \$100,000 was re-allocated by Council to fund a portion of the 2018 Downtown CIP intake. \$15,000 is notionally allocated in draft agreements that have not been executed by the applicant. This leaves approximately \$23,000 in surplus funding.

In 2018, City Council allocated \$5.6 million to the Downtown CIP. This includes \$4.6 million from the City, a request of \$900,000 from the GSDC and \$100,000 from the 2017 Downtown CIP intake. Of this amount, \$1.5 million is allocated through signed agreements. \$4.1 million is notionally allocated in draft agreements that have not been executed by the applicant.

Further to Council's direction earlier this year, staff will evaluate the effectiveness of the CIP programs and will report these findings to Council in Q1 2020, together with recommendations regarding the future of the CIP program.

- 13. Pg 279; Business Case makes mention of not needing to have an Ontario Land Surveyor on staff and that we will contract out when we require those services. Is there an expected savings by making that change? It appears that the Business Case only reflects an additional**

**cost for the proposed change to remove a Control Survey Assistant for a GIS Editor / Survey Control Asst. (McIntosh, D)**

Answer:

The impact of this change is unknown at this time and will be further investigated next year. Any savings will be incorporated into future budgets.

**14. Pg 392: In the document 2020 Capital Project Funding Summary by Year - Why are we seeing such a drop in User Fees from 2020 to 2021 and beyond? (McIntosh, D)**

Answer:

Amounts in future periods represent the amounts committed in those years for multi-year projects that were approved in prior periods. Therefore, they do not show the full amount associated with each funding category in the future periods. Instead, they show the amount required in a particular year to pay for projects that were approved in a previous year.

For example, on p. 392 you will note that the 2022 funding plan for “User Fees” anticipates \$2,593,285, and only \$963,008 beyond 2024. This means for projects that were already approved in prior periods, or are recommended for approval in 2020, we need to commit \$2,593,285 of user fee revenues in 2022 to help pay for them. Similarly, those same projects require \$963,008 beyond 2024.

**15. Economic development page 76 and 77 our goal for business visits was 400-450 but our actual on page 76 was only 200? Is there any major driver of this level of underperformance? (Jakubo, M)**

Answer:

The goal presented is incorrect. The goal for business visits is 250-300.

**16. Page 224 - Children’s services section - the Province has again reduced its funding of a key service from 100% funding to an 80/20 model. The explanation states that staff will be recommending changes to policy to help with this new model. What can we expect in order to continue to facilitate the continued expansion of childcare spaces? (Jakubo, M)**

Answer:

Staff will provide a report at the Community Services Committee Meeting in the first quarter, with an overview of funding with respect to supporting ongoing child care expansion within existing allocations which would remain intact for 2021 due to mitigation. Beyond this available funding, any future expansions would have to be supported through the levy as of 2021.

Essentially, Council will have the decision of whether or not to provide a match to the new Provincial formula which is changing from 100 percent to 80/20. The Province has said they would continue to give the 80% even if Councils do not want to add their 20%. If Council is open to considering ongoing expansion, we can build that into our 2021 budget request. We will also provide information in the report of any pressures in the current system for Council consideration.

**17. Page 294 - Lasalle Corridor - last statement in the alternatives - are there any currently funded projects which Planning could defer in order to reprioritize this business case? (Jakubo, M)**

Answer:

This business case was developed by Planning and Infrastructure Capital Planning staff. If approved by Council, it is anticipated that this work would be led by ICP staff given their Active Transportation Mandate. Currently, neither team has allocated resources to this project. If this project is prioritized by Council, existing planned active transportation and planning projects would be examined to de-prioritize some projects and reallocate existing resources to accomplish Council's priorities.

**18. Page 326 - Spreader laid patches - I want a list of what work could get done with this \$1,000,000? (Jakubo, M)**

Answer:

The \$1 million dollar business case would provide approximately 25,000 sq.m of large asphalt patches. It should be noted that this is a road maintenance activity and not an asset management strategy. The activity focuses on arterial roads where pothole patching techniques aren't as efficient. If approved, a list will be provided in the spring once the roads have been evaluated.

**19. Page 329/330 - Valley Twin Pad - This contemplates funding the entire project ourselves with no ICIP funding. If we receive ICIP funding please show us what this business case would look like? (Jakubo, M)**

Answer:

Investing in Canada Infrastructure Program: Community Culture and Recreation Stream

As per City Council Resolution CC2019-299, the City has made application to the Multipurpose Category of the Community, Culture and Recreation Stream of the Investing in Canada Infrastructure Program (ICIP) for the Valley East Twin Pad Multipurpose Sports Complex project.

Under this funding program, the maximum cost-share percentages of the total eligible costs for projects are as follows:

- Federal Contribution 40.00%
- Provincial Contribution 33.33%
- Municipal Contribution 26.67%

Should the project be approved for ICIP funding, the municipal contribution (including debt financing) would be \$11.58M for the project. Full details below:

Total Project Budget	\$28,374,795
Federal Contribution	\$11,349,918
Provincial Contribution	\$9,457,319
Municipal Contribution	\$7,567,558
Borrowing Costs (based on 30 year amortization at 3% interest rate)	\$4,015,178
Total Municipal Costs	\$11,582,736
Annual payments	\$386,901

**20. Page 336 - Electronic Road Patrol - I do not see any efficiency/savings associated with this business case? So is it correct to state that we need more patrol staff anyways and this would only allow them to do a better job of patrolling? (Jakubo, M)**

Answer:

Electronic Road Patrol offers efficiencies in the following areas:

- Integration between the electronic road patrol system and our work management systems (Cityworks). An electronic road patrol system will utilize the GPS data in our vehicles and send the location of the deficiency directly to Cityworks in the form of a work order. Once the work order is received, staff will prioritize the work and ensure a work crew is assigned to complete the task.
- With dedicated Road Patrollers we will be able to realign our Supervisors' duties to ensure they are spending more time in the delivery of services and supervision of staff.
- Better compliance with the minimum maintenance standards. The data provided in our road patrols is often used in the defense of claims that are made against the City. Tighter integration with our work management system will ensure we complete priority work in a timely fashion thereby reduce the risk associated with the claims process.

**21. On p. 64 of the binder the 4th paragraph speaks to an increase in 10% for 2020 because of external debt financing to complete road projects. Can you remind me "what projects" are we referring to related to the statement above? (Lapierre, R)**

Answer:

All projects funded by debt are located on the Capital Project List on pages 395 and 396 of the budget document. All projects funded by debt have an amount in the 2<sup>nd</sup> last column. Details for each project are available in the 2020 Budget by referring to the associated page reference noted on p. 395-396.

**22. Paramedic Service Capital Investments. There will be \$510k for ambulances and \$267k for emergency response vehicles. What other emergency response vehicles would Paramedic Services need besides ambulances? (McIntosh, D)**

Answer:

The purchase of two Emergency Response Vehicles (ERV) would replace two older units. Our ERV respond to 911 calls, they carry all the advanced medical equipment found in an ambulance and are staffed by a single Paramedic. We have an ERV stationed 24/7 in both Capreol and Levack delivering Paramedic care, they also provide balanced emergency coverage to Valley East and Chelmsford when no ambulance is available.. Our Platoon Superintendents (supervisors all certified Paramedics) utilize them supervising the Paramedics and responding to calls and major incidents. They are used by our Community Paramedics to attend calls at residents homes, shelters, and social housing sites. Two are Command units used by our Deputies Chiefs in support of operations and service delivery issues and regular on-call duties. We also maintain a single ERV Support (pickup truck) that supports emergency operations towing our Remote Response Unit (Gator) trailer or our Multi-Causality Incident trailers to major incidents.

While the configuration and minimum equipment of an ERV's are mandated under provincial legislation and standards, the use of ERV's is a local operational decision. The elimination of these units would have an immediate and significant impact our service levels, resulting in increased response times, leaving areas without Paramedic coverage for extended periods, impact the ability to support any response to major incidents and the delivery of our two Community Paramedic programs would be impacted. Greater Sudbury like most Paramedic Services in North America have utilized these units since 2000, they cost 50% less than an ambulance.

Paramedic Services capital purchases are funded through the Emergency Medical Services Capital Reserve Fund, which is restricted for Paramedic capital purchases only. An annual contribution from operating, which is 50% funded by the Ministry of Health and Long-Term Care, offsets the withdrawals for capital purchases from this fund.

**23. Pg.206 of the Budget Binder: We seem to have a consistent cost of approx. \$4M for Purchased/Contract Financial Services. What are those services and what are the cost centres within that line item? (McCausland, G)**

Answer:

Financial Services Purchased Services	
Property Assessment	2,200,000
Water/Wastewater Billing (recovered from water rates)	1,664,000
Audit Fee	100,000
	3,964,000

**24. What do we need 2 seadoos for? (McIntosh, D)**

Answer:

The seadoos support waterfront operations at Bell Park Main Beach and Moonlight Beach.

Existing machines are 2007 and 2009 models and have required a great deal of servicing in recent years.

**25. Pg. 203 - Why does HR have an over-expenditure on Purchased/Contract Services of approx. \$320K (or 64% over budget). Could you please fill me in on that? (McCausland, G)**

Answer:

A response will be provided in the following week's file.

**26. What is Email Collaboration Mobility and why does it cost \$975,000? (McCausland, G)**

Answer:

Please refer to page 438. This project responds to the direction provided by the 2018 IT Strategy to modernize communication and collaboration tools. Our existing software, such as GroupWise, has been in use for over five years and does not offer the kind of integration opportunities contemporary software now provides. This means, for example, that users cannot integrate email, messaging, calendars and file attachments in ways that are now commonplace. The result is slower responses to inquiries, more personal meetings and related travel, inconsistent document management and missed opportunities for online collaboration.

This project modernizes tools the corporation – including staff, councillors and customers – uses every day for all of its services. Not only will it enhance security, introducing the opportunity to introduce “bring your own device” options and reduce capital spending on hardware replacement, but it will also facilitate new work options that introduces the potential for reconfiguring physical workspaces and reducing the amount of space allocated for each user. It will also include security features to further protect the corporation's data.

We will have a more productive, collaborative and modern workplace as a result of this project. For example, this will introduce the capacity for mobile work order processing, which will reduce



the need for staff to attend a central work location to receive work assignments and/or drop off paper reports describing service accomplishments. Instead, such details could be transmitted electronically to mobile devices that staff would use to record their service efforts. This introduces significant productivity and customer service improvements, which are already commonplace in other private and public sector organizations.

**27. Pg 384: Improvements to Sudbury Landfills. Will the improvements to the Weigh scales enable garbage trucks to bypass the traffic line up so that they can get weighed, dump and get back out to the streets to pick up more garbage? (McIntosh, D)**

Answer:

No, those are structural improvements to the existing scales. However, the project titled, Sudbury Landfill - Upgrades includes a traffic study. We have to complete this study first to review traffic flow in and out of the site, including over the scales. Staff expect a report prior to the 2021 budget process.

**28. Looking over the budget, I was wondering why the PT hours for Economic Development is doubled? 4,634 (2019) and the ask is for 9,583 for 2020. (Lapierre, R)**

Answer:

A number of external government funding sources (such as the Regional Business Centre and the Mining Supply Program) were not confirmed by the time the 2019 Budget was prepared, therefore they were omitted. These programs were ultimately confirmed and provided in 2019, after the budget was prepared, but they are now included in the 2020 document which explains the increased hours.

**29. What are the details surrounding the request for 4 new FTE's for 2020. Why is the request for double the OT hours for 2020. 2019 equals 3,459 and now in 2020 the request is 7,027? (Lapierre, R)**

Answer:

Through negotiations, Five FTEs were included for Transit Services. One FTE would be assigned to Fleet to establish appropriate operational support on weekends and reduce the risk of service gaps or interruptions. Two FTEs would be assigned to Transit Operations for deployment across the system as required to help keep the system running on time. Two FTEs would be assigned to support bus stop/shelter maintenance and bus cleaning.

The new work assignments have more Spare Pieces of work, which are budgeted at OT. When we assign the work, these must all fall within CBA rules. Once everything is assigned, we are left

with "Spare Pieces of work" that are not a complete assignment. It is less expensive to pay an operator to come in to do these trips at OT than to assign an 8 hour shift and have them wait around on standby.

**30. I was wondering where I can find a flow chart/org chart for the CAO's office like on p. 189, 211, 237 & 261. (Lapierre, R)**

Answer:

This has been provided in a separate attachment.

**31. As I am going through the budget binder, I noticed a change in FTE's and a request for 24 new FTE's for 2020. Wondering if you can help and provide insight and where and why so many. (Lapierre, R)**

Answer:

Below is a summary of the FTE changes:

- Increase in 1 FTE position for the Red Light Camera Program (approved in 2019). This position is funded on the tax levy.
- Increase in 6 FTE positions (Truck Drivers) approved through collective bargaining. These positions are funded on the tax levy.
- Increase in 8 FTE positions (Distribution and Collection Operator A and B) approved through collective bargaining. These positions are funded by W/WW.
- Increase in 4 FTE positions (Distribution and Collection Relief Operator) approved through collective bargaining. These positions are funded by W/WW.
- Increase in 2 FTE positions (Roads Supervisor and Water/Wastewater Supervisor) as a result of the 18 positions added through collective bargaining. One position is funded by the tax levy, and the other by W/WW.
- Increase in 3 FTE positions as a result of converting waste servicepersons from part-time to permanent as approved through collective bargaining. These positions are funded by the tax levy.

These positions were acquired to enhance service delivery for existing services.

**32. I was wondering what is the estimated cost for the Moose Mine Rd. bridge replacement project. What is the condition of this bridge and could this be a project that is pushed to a future year? (Lapierre, R)**

Answer:

There is a cost sharing agreement in place with a timber hauling company. This agreement is contingent on construction taking place in 2020. The construction cost estimate is approximately \$1.5M.

This bridge was identified for rehabilitation in our work plan and has been subject to site specific investigations in the past couple years. It was scheduled for detailed design and rehab for 2021. Due to increased truck traffic from the lumber and forest harvesting industry, this bridge is deteriorating at a faster rate than is acceptable and the bridge may have to be load rated, if in fact it has not already been load rated. The Ministry of Natural Resources has provided funds to accelerate the bridge design so that the load rating can be lifted to accommodate demand in the forest industry.

**33. On page 244 there is a Key Performance Indicator of “Percent of Paved Lane Km Where the Condition is Rated as Good to Very Good (Customer Service)”. The CGS KPI result is 39.0% exactly for 5 years in a row (2016-2020f). How is it possible that our roads condition rating is the same year-after-year? (McCausland, G)**

Answer:

The City has around 3,700 lane km of roads, of which 3,100 lane km are hard-surfaced and 600 lane km are gravel surface. Given roads are typically designed for a 20 year life before they require major rehabilitation, then it could be concluded that at a rudimentary level, in order to maintain our road asset at current condition, we need to be carrying out pavement rehabilitation on our hard-surfaced roads at a rate of around 155 lane km per year just to maintain the current KPI levels of roads considered to be in a good to very good state.

In 2019, the City completed rehabilitation of around 140 lane km of hard-surfaced roads, which is similar to the lane km of hard-surfaced roads rehabilitated annually in 2016-2018. Since we have rehabilitated just enough lane km of hard-surfaced roads per year to maintain our existing KPI levels, this explains why the overall KPI has stabilized (i.e. it is no longer decreasing, but nor is it increasing yet).

It is also important to note that KPI is a lagging metric, in which the condition improvement of a road is not reflected in the updated KPI until 1-2 years after the road has been rehabilitated. This is because the road improvements are not be captured until the next pavement condition index (PCI) is obtained when we collect actual field data that analyzes the condition of the road surface. The PCI value is used to classify the condition of the road in the KPI categorization.

Finally, given the large number of lane km in the road asset inventory, for us to realize any significant increase in the overall KPI, we will need to carry out even more lane km of rehabilitation per year for a number of years to see any noticeable increase to the KPI value. The proposed 2020 Capital Budget for ROADS adheres to this commitment for road improvements,

and by increasing the capital budget available for road rehabilitation in 2020 and beyond, we should start achieving an increase in the KPI for road condition over the next 2-5 years.

- 34. On Page 141 the “Total Cost for Roads - All Functions per Lane Km (Efficiency)” is listed at \$21,958, but on page 247 our same cost is listed at \$20,704 for 2018, \$22,116 for 2019f, and \$21,862 for 2020f. What is the cause of this discrepancy? Which is the correct number? (McCausland, G)**

Answer:

The KPI listed on Page 141 is the 2017 amount. The amounts on pages 141 and 247 are correct.

- 35. On pg. 249 there is a bullet that reads “through partnership with the Independent Energy Supply of Ontario.” Should this instead read the “Independent Electricity System Operator (IESO)”? (McCausland, G)**

Answer:

This is correct. An amended page has been provided.

- 36. As one of the projects in the 2020 Budget is the beginning of an accelerated bus fleet replacement program, and considering the draft CEEP specifically identifies electrifying transit as an action item, have we considered replacing our existing diesel buses with fully electric buses? Have we considered replacing our existing buses with hybrid-diesel buses, or compressed natural gas-powered buses if we are not able to move to fully electric buses at this time? (McCausland, G)**

Answer:

Upon approval of ICIP funding, the first ten buses would be ordered as diesel units. As staff move forward with all procurement of infrastructure and/or fleet, consideration will be given to other types of solutions.

Additionally, staff will be working on an Electronic Vehicle Strategy that will be presented in 2020.

- 37. I just wanted to ask if there is a mistake with the Pioneer Manor budget on page 222. I don't understand how the budget for salaries and benefits is up 5.3% while the staffing complement for FTEs is the same and PT Hours is down 10,300 hours. Is that correct? (McCausland, G)**

Answer:

The decrease in part-time hours is due to the change in short-term disability benefits for CUPE 148 full-time employees as a result of the recent arbitrated award. Under the new collective

agreement, full-time employees will receive six Weekly Indemnity days annually, compared to the 18 sick days they were previously entitled. The reduction in part-time hours was used to help offset the cost for the new benefits plan.

Of the \$1.59 million (5.3%) increase in salaries and benefits, \$1.34 million relates to the above-noted change to short-term disability benefits. The remaining \$250K can be attributed to the negotiated general wage increase.

**38. Reading the budget binder this weekend, I noticed on P.70 you speak of reducing PT hours "to better align with work requirements". I was wondering if you can provide details. (Lapierre, R)**

Answer:

Due to budget pressures to bring the organizational budget to a 3.5% increase for 2020, reductions were necessary to the Paramedic Services budget. The reduction of part-time hours was deemed to minimize the impact to front-line staff and will not impact the service level provided by Paramedic Services within the City of Greater Sudbury.

**39. The recommended reduction in grant allocation of 50,000 to this organization could be the death knell for the group. Do we have a contract or work plan signed and have we (the City) been provided with a project status report on tasks? If we do agree with the budget reduction - are there plans to pick up shortfalls created by the decrease in funding internally? (Sizer, A)**

Answer:

For the funding, the Social Planning Council (SPC) signs a single-year agreement through the Social Services Section. Historically, this funding has been used by the organization for base funding. The agreement includes a schedule that indicates the funds are provided for the organization to complete work related to "population health priorities". SPC is required to provide a report each year detailing how the funding was used along with audited financial statements for review before the grant can be issued for the following year.

In reviewing the Grant Agreement for the 2019 Grant which is signed by SPC, Schedule A of the Agreement makes note that "this is a one-time for the 2019 calendar year, to be advanced at such time or times and in such installments...." it should be noted that CGS did not commit to a long term funding agreement with them. Through this agreement SPC would have known that funding would be reviewed on an annual basis and not guaranteed for long term. We have not received the 2019 audited financial statements or project status update for 2019 as it usually submitted in January of the following year.

At this time, the short fall in funding could not be accommodated through internal operational budgets. Social Services programs would not be impacted by this reduction.

**40. Wondering why we are proposing +1 FTE in the communication department. (Lapierre, R)**

Answer:

An increase in one permanent position for the Customer Relations Management software project was approved through the 2019 Capital Budget, and is the increase you see in the document.

**41. I've had a question from a playground association about the reduced fees. When would they be payable? (McIntosh, D)**

Answer:

Should the business case for the creation of new play field user fees for recreational leagues be approved, the fee will be implemented starting in the 2020 season.

Field allocation takes place in the spring and contracts are issued prior to the start of the season (May long weekend). Contracts are payable by the end of June each year, with a reconciliation process (adjustments for actual number of players as per final team rosters) occurring at the end of the season.

**42. I was wondering if you could provide a visual to the reservation logs at both Capreol ice pads for Council, in addition to the utilization stats. (Lapierre, R)**

Answer:

Attached are the ice logs for the 2019-2020 season for Capreol Arena (side 1 & 2).

As per the Valley East Twin Pad Multipurpose Sports Complex report to Community Services Committee on July 8, 2019, utilization for Capreol during the 2018-2019 season was as follows:

- Side one - 37.3%

- Side two - 59.0%

**43. There is a business case on Pg.323 for Additional Labour Resources for Capital Project Delivery. The business case states that they are needed for Capital Program delivery but does not clearly indicate how the budget increase would be implemented. What roles or services would be impacted by the part-time hour increases? (McCausland, G)**

Answer:

A response will be provided in the following week's file.

**44. On Pg.301 of the Budget Binder, there is a business case for the Downtown Sudbury Community Improvement Plan implementation. My understanding is that different aspects of the CIP program have different investment payback periods, with facade improvement**

**payback being very limited. What would be the cost to fund everything except the facade improvements? (McCausland, G)**

Answer:

The Downtown CIP is designed to encourage investment in a manner that is consistent with City Council's goals and objectives to revitalize Downtown Sudbury. The Facade Improvement Program encourages improvements that enhance the quality of the public realm. As noted in Section V of the Business Case on Page 303 of the Budget, the City received approximately \$128,000 in requests, of which \$78,000 was in the form of Facade Improvement Grant requests. If facade grant requests were excluded, the total request would be approximately \$50,000.

**45. I was wondering if we could share with Council what the financial impact would be if Council would approve a 25% reduction in staff travel across the whole corporation (excluding Council & Mayor accounts) As well I would like to have staff's perspective onto the operational impact this could have. (Lapierre, R)**

Answer:

A response will be provided in the following week's file.

**46. At the City Council meeting of October 8, 2019, staff was asked to provide additional information about the reports and studies that are required for the Valley East Twin Pad Multipurpose Sports Complex project as per the SPART memorandum of understanding.**

Answer:

On May 1st, 2019, Yallowega Bélanger Salach Architecture (YBSA) attended a meeting of the City's Sudbury Planning Application Review Team (SPART) in the role of project consultant. As a result of this meeting, no development restrictions were noted. The completion of the following reports are a requirement should Council approve the project, as outlined in the SPART Memo of Understanding:

- Geotechnical & Soils Report to determine soil bearing capacity and water table height of proposed building locations
- Source Protection Plan Section 59 Application
- Stormwater Management Study and Report
- Wellhead Protection Area; By-law considerations, property/parking run off etc.
- Detailed Topographic Survey
- Traffic Study; flow to and from property and its effect on the existing Library, HARC, daycare and residential neighbourhood.

- Analysis of trail conditions and uses in green space to determine amount of disturbance.
- Environmental considerations (carbon footprint, building efficiency, heating/cooling strategies)
- CPTED Design Analysis
- Fire Flow Capacities (Water Pressure Testing)
- Infrastructure and Servicing Upgrades Analysis (water, sanitary, gas, hydro, etc.)

With considerations for the items noted as part of the pre-consultation process, the project budget presented to the Community Services Committee as part of the September 16, 2019 report titled Valley East Twin Pad Multipurpose Sports Complex included the following cost estimates:

- \$2,000,000 for site development and landscaping allowances (includes allowance for structural piles due to high water table)
- \$250,000 for hazardous materials abatement
- \$1,592,301 for professional & design fees
- \$227,472 for other project consultants and studies
- \$3,651,125 for project contingencies and cost escalations

The outcome of these detailed reports and analysis would further outline the technical requirements related to site planning and could have an impact on costing, as the project moves forward into its next phases of development.

Should the project be approved by Council and should there be cost escalations beyond project budgets and contingencies, process for reporting of project variances as per the Capital Budget Policy will be followed.

The advancement of the project to its current state has followed project delivery steps for other similar City projects. This has included the following:

- Community Consultation
- Confirmation of program (building) elements
- Site selection and site schematic
- Establishment of a Class 'D' project estimate



**47. At the City Council meeting of October 8, 2019, requested information on the economic impact of the existing events hosted at the Capreol Arena.**

Answer:

During the 2018-2019 season, the following 5 tournaments utilized the Capreol Arena:

- Capreol Bulldogs Annual Tournament
- Capreol Minor Hockey Annual Tournament
- Richelieu Family Tournament (also utilizes Centennial Arena)
- Valley East Renegades Tournament (also utilizes Centennial, Raymond Plourde and Garson Arenas)
- Valley East Hockey Minor Hockey Association Tyke/Atom Tournament (also utilizes Centennial and Raymond Plourde Arenas)

In order to estimate economic impact of these events, the following assumptions/estimates were made:

1. Tournament organizers were contacted to determine the number of out of town teams
2. Average number of players per team estimated at 12
3. \$154 average spending per visitor trip based on the Greater Sudbury CMA Tourism Profile.

<b>Capreol Arena Tournaments 2018-2019</b>						
	<b>Type</b>	<b>Hours Used</b>	<b>Out of Town Teams</b>	<b>Total Players</b>	<b>Total Visitors</b>	<b>Total Estimated Spend</b>
Capreol Minor Hockey	Youth	61.5	4	168	48	\$7,392
Valley East Minor Hockey	Youth		19	492	228	\$35,112
Valley East Renegades	Youth		31	912	372	\$57,288
Capreol Bulldogs	Adult	21	0	192	-	
Richelieu Family Tournament	Adult		0	372	-	
			<b>Totals</b>	<b>2136</b>	<b>648</b>	<b>\$99,792</b>

The estimated economic impact of these events to the City of Greater Sudbury is \$99,792. The economic impact to the area of Capreol would only be a fraction of this total spend as spending for

accommodations, shopping etc. could take place in other parts of the City and as events are hosted across multiple arenas in some cases. Economic Development staff have commented that other arena facilities may be able to absorb tournament capacity, and therefore impact of visitor spending would not be completely lost, should Capreol side #1 close.

**48. Where can the City make staffing reductions by attrition throughout the City? (Leduc, B)**

Answer:

The effect of these choices reduce service levels. As the descriptions in the 2020 Budget indicate, many of our services are already at, or exceed, available capacity. If Council wishes to pursue these ideas, it should also provide direction about which services it would like to adjust to address the reduced capacity these choices would create.

**49. How many Engineers are within Growth and Infrastructure? (Leduc, B)**

Answer:

A response will be provided in the following week's file.

**50. How can the City decrease consulting fees throughout the organization? (Leduc, B)**

Answer:

The effect of these choices reduce service levels. As the descriptions in the 2020 Budget indicate, many of our services are already at, or exceed, available capacity. If Council wishes to pursue these ideas, it should also provide direction about which services it would like to adjust to address the reduced capacity these choices would create.

**51. What would be the financial impact of closing all Libraries and CSC's on Sundays while keeping the Main Branch open? What would be the impact of reducing the 11 hour shift to 8 hour shifts on Monday to Friday for all libraries? Saturday hours wouldn't change. (Leduc, B)**

Answer:

A response will be provided in the following week's file.

**52. What is the financial impact of having 7 days of operations of ski hills? For clarity, what would be the financial impact of operating Lively for 3 days and Adanac the other 4 with staff working at either ski hill? The combination or mix of days should form part of staff's recommendations. (Leduc, B)**

Answer:

A response will be provided in the following week's file.

**53. What is the financial impact of reducing all arenas to 8 hour shifts? What is the financial impact of closing one arena? The arena should form part of staff's recommendations. (Leduc, B)**

Answer:

A response will be provided in the following week's file.

**54. What is the impact of closing two pools? The pools in question should form part of staff's recommendations. (Leduc, B)**

Answer:

A response will be provided in the following week's file.

**55. It was my understanding that the AMR project was previously reported to be budgeted at \$10 million. The 2020 budget reflects a total cost of \$17 million. Please provide further details of this project and why the total cost has increased. (Leduc, B)**

Answer:

A response will be provided in the following week's file.

**56. I don't see the Pioneer Manor Sprinkler System in the budget. Is this item in the 2020 budget? (Leduc, B)**

Answer:

A response will be provided in the following week's file.