

Appointment - National Board of Directors - FCM

2004-79 Berthiaume-Bradley: WHEREAS Councillor Ron Dupuis has resigned from the National Board of Directors (Ontario) of the Federation of Canadian Municipalities (FCM);

AND WHEREAS Councillor Dupuis was the only representative on the National Board of Directors from Northern Ontario;

AND WHEREAS it is important that the City of Greater Sudbury and Northern Ontario continue to be represented on FCM, as it is the only "national voice of municipal government";

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Council of the City of Greater Sudbury hereby recommends and supports the appointment of Councillor Terry Kett to fill the vacancy on the National Board of Directors (Ontario) for the unexpired term ending May, 2004 and further supports his appointment as a Member of the Executive Committee of the National Board of Directors.

CARRIED

Adjournment

2004-80 Berthiaume-Bradley: THAT this meeting does now adjourn.
Time: 8:48 p.m.

CARRIED

Mayor

City Clerk

MINUTES OF THE TENDER OPENING COMMITTEE

Committee Room C-14
Tom Davies Square
2004-02-10

Commencement: 2:30 p.m.
Adjournment: 2:40 p.m.

DARRYL MATHÉ, MANAGER OF SUPPLIES & SERVICES, IN THE CHAIR

Present

B. Mangiardi, Director of Information Technology; K. Lessard, Law Clerk; M. Hauta, Accountant; L. Lesar, Secretary to the Manager of Supplies & Services

Contract CPS04-02
RFP for Computer
Equipment

Contract CPS04-02, Proposals for the City's Computer Equipment - Vendor of Record {estimated total cost of approximately \$1.8MM for three (3) years} were received from the following bidders:

Dell Computer Corporation

IBM Canada Ltd.

Aurora Microsystems o/a 979042 Ontario Inc.

A bid deposit in the amount of \$100,000.00, in the form of a Certified Cheque or Irrevocable Letter of Credit accompanied each proposal submission.

The foregoing proposals were turned over to the Director of Information Technology for review and recommendation. A report outlining the recommendations would be prepared and forwarded to the General Manager of Corporate Services for approval. A copy of this report would be forwarded to the Manager of Supplies & Services.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 2:40 p.m.

Chairman

Secretary

T.O.C. 2004-02-10 (1)

MINUTES OF THE TENDER OPENING COMMITTEE MEETING

Committee Room C-14
Tom Davies Square
2004-02-17

Commencement: 2:30 p.m.
Adjournment: 2:45 p.m.

DARRYL MATHÉ, MANAGER OF SUPPLIES & SERVICES, IN THE CHAIR

Present

K. Lessard, Law Clerk; M. Hauta, Accountant; L. Lesar, Secretary to the Manager of Supplies & Services; M. Coppo, Co-Ordinator of Supplies & Services; R. Martin, Manager of Fleet

Contract Tender for Misc. Hardware

Contract CPS04-01, Tenders for Miscellaneous Hardware were received from the following bidders:

BIDDER	TOTAL AMOUNT
BDI Canada Inc.	\$ 50,579.80 - All Sections
Wesco Distribution	\$ 9,876.07 - Sections A & B
Guillevan International	\$ 52,937.67 - All Sections
Clarke Phillips Supply Co. Ltd.	\$ 21,562.58 - Sections A, B & C
Acklands-Grainger Inc.	\$ 44,061.94 - All Sections
Fastenal Sudbury	\$ 61,633.89 - All Sections
Groom Callaghan Supply Co.	\$ 48,893.28 - All Sections
Weber Supply Co. Ltd.	\$ 47,384.27 - All Sections
C.T.F. Supply	\$ 57,558.01 - All Sections
A&J Home Hardware (M. Michel)	\$110,685.53 - All Sections
Home Depot	\$ 93,207.22 - All Sections

The foregoing tenders were turned over to the Co-Ordinator of Supplies & Services for review and recommendation. A report outlining the recommendations would be prepared and forwarded to the General Manager of Corporate Services for approval.

PWD04-05 Tender for the Purchase of Light Trucks

Contract PWD04-05, Tender for the Purchase of Light Trucks for the Public Works Department {estimated at a total cost of \$669,000.00} were received from the following bidders:

BIDDER	TOTAL AMOUNT
Tasse Automobiles Ltd.	\$688,286.50 - All Items Bid
Bay King Motors	\$520,101.30 - No Bid - A, H & I
Crosstown Oldsmobile Chev	\$493,865.20 - No Bid - A, H & I

Contract PWD04-05
(Continued)

BIDDER	TOTAL AMOUNT
Mike Doyle Dodge Chrysler	\$480,733.35 - No Bid - A, F, H & I
Cambrian Ford Sales Inc.	\$654,528.00 - All Items Bid
Mid North Motors	No Bid
Laurentian Motors Sudbury Ltd.	\$347,087.25 No Bid - A, F, G, H & I
Belanger Ford Lincoln Centre	\$653,302.35 - All Items Bid

The foregoing tenders were turned over to the Manager of Fleet for review and recommendation. A report outlining the recommendations would be prepared and forwarded to the General Manager of Public Works for approval. A copy of this report would be provided to the Manager of Supplies & Services.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 2:45 p.m.

Chairman

Secretary

**THE FIRST MEETING OF THE PROPERTY
STANDARDS APPEAL COMMITTEE**

Committee Room C-12
Tom Davies Square

Tuesday, February 10th, 2004
Commencement: 6:30 p.m.
Adjournment: 7:05 p.m.

CHAIR RUSS THOMPSON PRESIDING

Present Councillors Bradley, Caldarelli, Reynolds

Staff B. Gutjahr, Manager of By-law Enforcement Services; T. Rossignol, Property Standards Officer; R. Swiddle, Director of Legal Services/City Solicitor; A. Haché, Deputy Clerk; K. Bowschar-Lische, Planning Committee Secretary

Declarations of Pecuniary Interest None declared.

MANAGERS' REPORT

Appeal of Order to Remedy
345 Elm Street
Laurence Peter Hunt & Maurice Portelance

Report dated February 3rd, 2004 was received from the Director of Planning Services and the General Manager, Corporate Services regarding an Appeal of Order to Remedy that was issued by a Property Standards Officer under the City of Greater Sudbury Maintenance and Occupancy Standards By-law #2001-200.

Troy Rossignol, Property Standards Officer, advised that a complaint from the tenant was received on January 9, 2004, regarding the condition of Apartment #1, 345 Elm Street, City of Greater Sudbury.

The Property Standards Officer inspected the subject property on January 14, 2004. The inspection revealed numerous defects such as damaged flooring tiles in the kitchen/dining room and bathroom, leaking toilet and bathroom sink, bathtub taps leaking and knobs missing, etc.

On January 16, 2004, an Order to Remedy was issued and sent by registered mail to the property owners, Laurence Hunt and Maurice Portelance requesting various repairs be made to ensure compliance with the Property Standards By-law #2001-200.

The Property Standards Officer reviewed the Order with the owners who have no problem making the repairs but only after the current tenants have vacated the premises. The owners have started proceedings to evict the existing tenants because of rent arrears.

Mr. Maurice Portelance and Mr. Laurence Hunt advised that the tenants were given Notice to Vacate the premises for arrears in rent in the amount of \$1,750.00. Currently, Social Services is paying the rent directly to the landlord but twice the rent was sent to the tenants who kept the rent monies. They pointed out when the premises were rented to the existing tenants, they were not in a state of disrepair. The owners are afraid to attend the premises to collect rent or do renovations and outlined a number of occasions when they have seen the Greater Sudbury Police on the premises regarding disputes between this tenant and other tenants and this tenant and his family.

Appeal of Order to Remedy
345 Elm Street
Laurence Peter Hunt & Maurice Portelance
(cont'd)

They outlined experiences regarding damages to the apartment caused by the tenants and attempts they made to make repairs.

Committee Members discussed extending the time period to complete repairs, however, felt some of the deficiencies were safety issues and should be done as soon as possible.

Mr. Portelance undertook to attend at the Rent Review Board tomorrow to initiate the proper process to evict the tenants quicker for damages to the apartment which is a quicker process than eviction because of non-payment of rent.

The following recommendation was presented:

2004-01 Reynolds-Caldarelli: That the Order to Remedy to Mr. Laurence Hunt and Mr. Maurice Portelance, owners of 345 Elm Street, be upheld and that the Property Standards Officer mediate with the tenants and the owners to attempt to resolve the deficiencies in the near future and should the mediation fail the owners be given three months to complete the repairs.

CARRIED

Adjournment

2004-02 Reynolds-Bradley: That we do now adjourn.
TIME: 7:05 p.m.

CARRIED

DEPUTY CITY CLERK

CHAIR RUSS THOMPSON PRESIDING

PSAC Feb.10/04 1st

- 2 -

M18

**GREATER SUDBURY POLICE SERVICES MEETING
MONDAY, JANUARY 26, 2004
Police Headquarters, 5th Floor Boardroom, Tom Davies Square**

Present:

Andy HUMBER, Chair
Joanne FIELDING, Vice Chair
Councillor Ron BRADLEY
Councillor Eldon GAINER
Mr. David PETRYNA
Rollande MOUSSEAU, Secretary

Ian DAVIDSON, Chief
Jim CUNNINGHAM, Deputy Chief
Sharon BAIDEN, Director of Corporate Services
Staff Inspector Brian Jarrett

PUBLIC

News Media

Rob O'Flanagan, Sudbury Star
Paul Godkin, MCTV

Adoption of Minutes

(2004-2) Fielding-Bradley: THAT the Greater Sudbury Police Services Board Minutes of December 15, 2003, be adopted as circulated and read.

CARRIED

Declarations of Conflicts of Interest

None

Elections

Chief Ian Davidson assumed the Chair and conducted the 2004 board elections for the Chair and Vice Chair positions.

Results of the election -

Chair	-	Mr. Andy Humber
Vice Chair	-	Ms. Joanne Fielding.

Board members congratulated Mr. Humber and Ms. Fielding on their re-election as Chair and Vice Chair of the Greater Sudbury Police Services Board.

**Greater Sudbury Police Services Board
January 26, 2004**

Matters Arising from In Camera Discussions

Vice-Chair Joanne Fielding reported that budgeting issues were discussed IN CAMERA.

Introduction of New Officer

Letter from Chief Davidson dated January 16, 2004, advising that Constable Chris Brown will be in attendance at the January 26th board meeting.

Staff Inspector Brian Jarrett introduced Constable Chris Brown and Chief Davidson and Chair Humber presented the Constable with his service badge. Congratulations were extended to the new Constable by the Board and senior management.

Appointments - Greater Sudbury Police Services Board

Letter from Chief Davidson dated January 16, 2004, attaching correspondence from the Council Secretary for the City of Greater Sudbury reappointing Councillors Ron Bradley and Eldon Gainer to the Police Services Board until 2006.

Retirement - Inspector Gerry Pope

Chief Davidson introduced Inspector Gerry Pope and his wife Vicky to the board and congratulations were extended to Inspector Pope on his retirement. A token of appreciation was presented by Chair Humber.

Introduction Successful Candidates - Recent Promotions

Letter from Chief Davidson dated January 16, 2004, advising that newly promoted personnel would be introduced to the Board at the January 26 board meeting.

Staff Inspector Brian Jarrett introduced the following staff members:

- Inspector Al Lekun
- Inspector Eugene Toffoli
- Staff Sergeant Garry Davidson
- Staff Sergeant John McCormick
- Sergeant Joe Williams
- Sergeant Rob Geick
- Sergeant Sharon Ashick

Chief Davidson and Board members extended congratulations to the newly promoted personnel and their families.

Delayed Priority One Calls

Letter from Chief Davidson dated January 16, 2004, reporting that there were no delayed priority one calls during the month of December 2003.

Departmental Statistics

Letter from Chief Davidson dated January 15, 2004, attaching Statistics for the month of October 2003 along with an overview of incidents of interest.

Staff Inspector Jarrett reviewed the October statistics with board members.

Budget 2004

Letter from Chief Davidson dated January 15, 2004, regarding presentation of the 2004 budget to be discussed on January 26, 2004, with a presentation before Council on March 10, 2004. Ms. Sharon Baiden advised that the 2004 budget is in the process of completion and will be presented at the next board meeting, *February 9, 2004*.

Police Headquarters Renovations

Letter from Chief Davidson dated January 15, 2004, advising that renovations to the front lobby and central records branch are underway. Once completed, The Victim Crisis and Referral Service (VCARS) will be located in the main lobby of police headquarters. Chief Davidson commented that this is a great initiative and partnership with a group of people that provide support services to victims of crime.

Business Planning Update

Letter from Chief Davidson dated January 20, 2004, advising that both internal and external surveys are underway. Oraclepoll Research Limited has been retained to assist with the external survey. Once the survey results are available, the development of the next business plan will be facilitated. The Request for Proposals for the facilitation consultant is still out and the board will be updated when responses are available.

Lions Eye in the Sky

Letter from Chief Davidson dated January 15, 2004, attaching the December 5, 2003, minutes of the Lions Eye in the Sky Advisory Committee, along with incidents of interest.

Canadian Association of Police Boards

Letter from Chief Davidson dated January 15, 2004, attaching the Canadian Association of Police Boards Membership Renewal Form.

(2004-3) Fielding-Bradley: THAT the Board approves the 2004 CAPB membership fee in the amount of \$800 payable to the Canadian Association of Police Boards.

CARRIED

Greater Sudbury Police Services Board
January 26, 2004

Ontario Association of Police Services Boards

Letter from Chief Davidson dated January 15, 2004, attaching the Ontario Association of Police Services Boards Membership Renewal Form.

(2004-4) Fielding-Bradley: THAT the Board approves the 2004 OAPSB membership fee in the amount of \$4,280 payable to the Ontario Association of Police Services Board.

CARRIED

Radar Procurement

Letter from Chief Davidson dated January 20, 2004, attaching a report dated January 21, 2004, respecting the procurement of radar equipment. Staff Inspector Brian Jarrett reviewed the need, training and standardization of the Genesis radar device.

(2004-5) Bradley-Fielding: THAT the Board approves the standardization to Genesis model radar units manufactured by Decateur Electronics for use by the Greater Sudbury Police Service:

And further, that the Board approves the purchase of eight Genesis 11 Directional mobile and ten Genesis VPD stationary radar units with a total cost of approximately \$58,000 with funds to be drawn from the 2003 police reserve and 2003 police capital.

CARRIED

Towing Contract Renewal

Letter from Chief Davidson dated January 20, 2004, attaching a report respecting the renewal of the towing contracts. Ms. Sharon Baiden reviewed the towing tender procedures followed and the increase in rates due to higher insurance costs.

(2004-6) Fielding-Bradley: THAT the Board award towing contracts in the areas as specified by the Board commencing January 1, 2004, for an initial three-year term with an option to extend for an additional two as follows:

- Area 1 - Guse Carriers Inc. o/a Boyuk Towing
- Area 2 - Liberty Towing
- Area 3 - Guse Carriers Inc. o/a Johnny's Towing

CARRIED

Vehicles Purchases 2004

Letter from Chief Davidson dated January 20, 2004, attaching a report respecting planned vehicle purchases for 2004. Chief Davidson reviewed the report with the board.

Police Reserves

Letter from Chief Davidson dated January 20, 2004, attaching a report regarding Police Reserves for 2003. The Chief advised that this reserve, approved by Council on January 15, 2004, is for items still to be purchased. During 2003 a number of budgeted items required intense analysis on specification which prevented actual acquisition prior to year end. The balance of the required items will be purchased shortly. For the information of the Board.

Purchasing By-Law Delegation of Authority

Letter from Chief Davidson dated January 20, 2004, reporting that on January 1, 2004, the City of Greater Sudbury Purchasing By-Law 2003-300 came into effect. Section 8 of the By-law outlines Responsibilities and Authorities providing for a delegation of such authority where appropriate.

(2004-7) Gainer-Fielding: THAT in accordance with the City of Greater Sudbury Purchasing By-law 2003-300, that in addition to the Chief of Police, the responsibility and authority for procurement activity shall be delegated to the Deputy Chief of Police and Director of Corporate Services or designate.

CARRIED

Police Employment in 2004

Letter from Chief Davidson dated January 15, 2004, attaching information with respect to the *Police Employment in 2004* Conference scheduled for March 1 and 2 in Toronto to be hosted by the Police Association of Ontario. For the information of the Board.

Donations of Firearms - Police Museum

Letter from Chief Davidson dated January 20, 2004, attaching a report respecting the recent firearm amnesty and a request to donate firearms to the museum.

(2004-8) Fielding-Gainer: THAT the Board agrees to the donation of the following firearms to the police museum:

Smith & Wesson model 422, 22-calibre ten shot semi automatic
 Smith & Wesson model 41, 38-calibre ten shot semi automatic
 Browning 9 mm, ten shot semi-automatic
 Webley model Mark V 455 calibre six shot revolver

CARRIED

Officer Reclassifications

Letter from Chief Davidson dated January 16, 2004, advising that the following personnel have been reclassified:

To Third Class effective January 12, 2003

Constable Sherry King
Constable Steven Train

Constable Kimberley Hansen
Constable Darren Heffern

To First Class effective December 22, 2003

Constable Andrew Nesbitt

Constable John Santagapita

For the information of the Board.

Notes of Appreciation

Letter from Chief Davidson dated January 16, 2004, advising that his office received the two attached letters of appreciation since the December board meeting. For the information of the board.

New Business

Chair Andy Humber brought forward a trust fund donation request regarding a forthcoming hockey tournament. This item was deferred to the February 9, 2004, board meeting.

The Chief responded to comments from board members regarding speeding on highways, snowmachines on sidewalks and Marihuana Grow Operations.

ADDENDUM

(2004-9) Gainer-Petryna: THAT the Sudbury Police Services Board deals with the items on the Addendum this date.

CARRIED

2003 Board Trust Fund Year End Report

Letter from Board Secretary R. Mousseau attaching the Board Trust Fund Report for the Year 2003. Ms. Sharon Baiden explained that the majority of monies in the trust fund come from the annual police service auction of items seized, found, etc. The monies in the trust fund are used primarily for community charitable activities initiated by the police with a specific board policy in place on the disbursement of these funds.

(2004-10) Fielding-Gainer: THAT the Greater Sudbury Police Services Board approves the 2003 Board Trust Fund Year End Report.

CARRIED

Next Meeting

The next Greater Sudbury Police Services Board Meeting will be held on **MONDAY, FEBRUARY 9, 2004, 4:00 P.M.** - Police Headquarters, 5th Floor Boardroom, Tom Davies Square.

RESUME IN CAMERA DISCUSSIONS - 5:15 p.m.

(2004-11) Fielding-Gainer: THAT this Board resumes IN CAMERA discussions.
Time: 5:15 p.m.

CARRIED

RETURN TO PUBLIC - 8:45 p.m.

Matters Arising from IN CAMERA Discussions

Vice Chair Joanne Fielding reported that personnel and legal issues were discussed In Camera. One motion was approved.

Adjournment

(2004-13) Gainer-Fielding: THAT this meeting be Adjourned.
Time: 8:50 p.m.

CARRIED

**2004 BUDGET PUBLIC INPUT AND INFORMATION SESSION
OF THE CITY OF GREATER SUDBURY**

**Caruso Club
Sudbury, Ward 1**

**Monday, February 16, 2004
Commencement: 7:35 p.m.**

Chair

COUNCILLOR TED CALLAGHAN, IN THE CHAIR

Present

Councillors Berthiaume; Bradley; Caldarelli; Craig; Gainer; Kett; Rivest

City Officials

D. Belisle, General Manager of Public Works; D. Wuksinic, General Manager, Corporate Services; T. Beadman, Acting General Manager, Emergency Services; C. Hallsworth, General Manager of Citizen & Leisure Services; C. Matheson, General Manager of Health and Social Services; D. Nadorozny, General Manager of Economic Development & Planning Services; E. Stankiewicz, Co-Ordinator of Current Budget; S. Jonasson, Director of Finance/City Treasurer; C. Salazar, Manager of Corporate Strategy & Policy Analyst; J. McKechnie, Executive Assistant to the Mayor; K. Khan, Business Analyst; T. Mowry, City Clerk; A. Haché, Deputy Clerk; K. Bowschar-Lische, Planning Committee Secretary; CJ Caporale, Council Secretary

C.U.P.E. Local 4705

W. MacKinnon, President

News Media

MCTV; Sudbury Star

Welcome and
Opening Remarks

Councillor Callaghan welcomed the fifty people in attendance to the 2004 Budget Public Input and Information Session, Roundtable Discussions and Review of Budget Options. He advised the purpose of the meeting was to provide an opportunity for the public to give Council some direction on how they would like this year's budget pressures addressed.

Doug Wuksinic, General Manager of Corporate Services, outlined the format for the Roundtable Discussions to those present. He indicated that input was being sought on four questions:

1. What level of municipal service do you expect?
Should any services be reduced or eliminated?
2. Should those who use a service pay for the service (user fees) and/or should everyone share in the cost (taxes)?
3. What services would you like to see improved or added?
4. Should the City borrow money and/or implement a special levy to fix roads, repair arenas, replace fire trucks, maintain police communications, etc.?

Question #1

What level of municipal service do you expect?
Should any services be reduced or eliminated?

Table 1

Table 1 indicated that the resources should be used more efficiently such as City vehicles. The recreational facilities are owned by the taxpayers and should be kept open and made accessible to the youth of the City.

Table 2

Table 2 felt that there was limited time to answer the questions appropriately. They indicated that Council should take a business approach when addressing the delivery of services. They felt there should be no reductions with respect to facilities and look at privatizing all facilities.

Table 3

Table 3 felt it was difficult to form an opinion in such a short time frame. They felt that the use of volunteers, instead of hiring, would reduce costs regarding street cleaning, day care services, etc.

Table 4

Table 4 felt it was difficult to go through all the list in a short period. They felt that preferred shares should be eliminated; reduce supervisory positions; improve and focus on service levels; lay-off staff if necessary. They indicated that wages was a large expense and more volunteers should be utilized or contract out. They felt that there was too many people doing the job of one person during snow removal and road construction which leads to a perception of waste from the taxpayers. They also felt that the Dow Pool should be re-opened.

Table 5

Table 5 did not agree with the list submitted. They felt that there should be more staff hired to collect the POA fines and that Day Care was essential. Non-mandatory items should be eliminated but keep the school crossing guards and snow removal of sidewalks for seniors. They stated that the Information Centres should be kept open as these help with tourism and they also felt that the air ambulance night landing sites should remain operational.

Table 6

Table 6 indicated that the Handi-Transit service should be expanded because of the aging population. They stated that arenas and facilities must be kept open and/or re-opened. They also felt that the City of Greater Sudbury should borrow money only for road infrastructure without increasing taxes.

Table 7

Table 7 indicated that there were too many items, which were unclear, and too little time to discuss. They pointed out that some options indicated hiring and others indicated lay-offs. They felt that the Budget Committee should take a closer look at what they want to reduce. They felt that privatization needed to be clarified and better defined.

<u>Table 8</u>	Table 8 felt it was difficult to go through the full list. They indicated that Council should review a new way of delivering services and explore privatization of the landfill sites.
<u>Table 9</u>	Table 9 indicated that services should not be reduced, improve on the delivery of existing services, and make them more cost effective. They felt that facilities should be re-opened and maintained. They also stated the need for better road maintenance.
<u>General Comments</u>	Table 1 indicated that the population was aging and the youth of the City were rapidly departing. They felt that in order to generate more revenue a mausoleum should be constructed at the cemeteries, where people would pay a fee for their plot, and a gate installed at the Second Avenue, Sudbury location, to reduce vandalism. They indicated that the budgets should be submitted earlier to allow for more viewing time. The City of Greater Sudbury should purchase four cylinder vehicles for police use.
<u>Question #2</u>	Should those who use a service pay for the service (user fees) and/or should everyone share in the cost (taxes)?
<u>Table 1</u>	Table 1 indicated that some favoured user fees and others thought cost sharing would be beneficial. They felt that the people who utilize the facilities should pay a user fee. They also stated that user fees impact people who cannot afford them, such as children.
<u>Table 2</u>	Table 2 agreed that user fees should be increased but not at full cost recovery. Fees for off hour use should be lowered and utilization of facilities should be monitored.
<u>Table 3</u>	Table 3 could not reach a consensus and do not endorse a user fee for the purchase of tickets by telephone.
<u>Table 4</u>	Table 4 was in favour of user fees. They pointed out that there was not enough information regarding full cost recovery of solid waste costs and wanted to know what impact this had on taxes. They stated that an 80% cost recovery should be implemented for arenas; a charge for false alarms implemented; recover operating costs for pools; increase cost recovery for day camps, but not at 100%; and increase minor variance fees.
<u>Table 5</u>	Table 5 questioned if the user fees that were in place were being used adequately and if the City was fully utilizing all facilities. They felt that the City should increase revenue by using existing services.
<u>Table 6</u>	Table 6 indicated that if there was an increase in user fees, then there should not be an increase in taxes.

Table 7 Table 7 stated that a limited charge for false alarms should be implemented. They agreed to the implementation of a user fee for the purchase of Sudbury Arena tickets by telephone. They agreed to cost sharing as opposed to user fees for the use of community arenas and recreation facilities. They also indicated not to download costs on those who would have problems paying for them.

Table 8 Table 8 endorses the increase of user fees for the use of arenas and pools and the harmonization of minor sports playfield rates. They felt that a phasing in of a uniform rate should be applied, but the level of service should be equal.

Table 9 Table 9 indicated that everyone should pay user fees, "pay now or pay later".

General Comments A participant questioned whether or not school boards should pay a user fee when utilizing the City's facilities. Someone else indicated that it was the responsibility of the community to act together, everything should be equal and everyone should share all costs.

Question #3 & #4 What service would you like to see improved or added?
Should the City borrow money and/or implement a special levy to fix roads, repair arenas, replace fire trucks, maintain police communications, etc.?

Table 1 Table 1 stated that the Dow Pool should be re-opened because it keeps people active, gives people the opportunity to meet others, offers swimming and synchro lessons. Advertizing for the pool should be aggressive.

Table 2 Table 2 indicated that the Dow Pool and Adanac Ski-hill should be re-opened; the sidewalk on 9th Avenue, Lively should be maintained; and photo radar should be implemented to reduce speeding in communities.

Table 3 Table 3 stated that the Dow Pool should be re-opened and kept opened. They suggested that the tipping fees for tires be waived. They stated that if some staff retired and a freeze on hiring was implemented, there would be a savings on wages. They questioned why our firefighters required 4 days of hands on training, if they were trained already. They did not want to borrow money but would like to dedicate a levy for roads only.

Table 4 Table 4 felt that the Dow Pool should be re-opened; a spay/neuter program be subsidized; additional funding to the Salvation Army to secure beds for the homeless be provided; and funding to the Canadian Mental Health Association be provided.

<u>Table 5</u>	Table 5 indicated that snow plowing and removal of snow at local churches should be improved. They also stated that the City's taxi services should be improved. They indicated that the Lake Water Quality Program was important in order to keep Ramsey Lake clean, because this is a major tourist attraction.
<u>Table 6</u>	Table 6 felt that the Dow Pool should be re-opened but for a one-year trial period only; expand on the Handi-Transit services; subsidize a spay/neuter program; and transit fees for students should be reduced or eliminated. They suggested that borrowing be for a short term only and for specific infrastructure projects, such as roads. As well, any infrastructure levy be in effect for a short period only.
<u>Table 7</u>	Table 7 suggested that facilities be re-opened; eliminate snow removal and plowing for churches and community facilities; reduce bus passes or leave as is; develop a Snowboard Terrain Park; and not reinstate the Quarter Century and Retiree Banquet. They indicated that the consensus was split in half regarding borrowing money.
<u>Table 8</u>	Table 8 stated that the Dow Pool needs to be opened for a trial period; funding for the Lake Water Quality Program needs to be increased; and training for firefighters is important. They indicated that borrowing money should be considered for specific infrastructure projects only.
<u>Table 9</u>	Table 9 did not agree with any of the items except for the following three items: increase the number of vehicles to provide Handi-Transit; re-open Dow Pool for a trial period, "use it or lose it"; and increase the frequency of TransCab to Onaping, Levack and Dowling.
<u>Rating of Priorities</u>	Each table was given an opportunity to rank each question in order of priority - from 1 to 5 - with 1 being the lowest priority and 5 being the highest priority. The purpose of this exercise was to give Council an overall guidance on how to address budget pressures facing the City.

Rating of Priorities
(continued)

The results are as follows:

Services should be reduced or eliminated.	8
Those who use a service should pay for the service (user fees).	16
Services should be improved or added.	23
City taxes should be increased to maintain services.	31
The City should borrow money and or implement a special levy to fix roads, etc.	27

Attachments

Charts showing the Rating of Priorities by Individual Tables and a Summary Rating of Priorities is attached.

Closing Remarks

The Chair expressed his appreciation to all those who provided their input and stated that this was a collective opinion and it was important to receive some meaning to the submissions.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 9:50 p.m.

Councillor Callaghan, Chair
Finance Committee

Council Secretary

Rating of Priorities: Individual Tables

	TBL1	TBL2	TBL3	TBL4	TBL5	TBL6	TBL7	TBL8	TBL9
Q.1	0	1	0	1	2	1	1	1	1
Q.2	0	2	0	3	1	3	3	2	2
Q.3	0	3	0	5	3	2	2	3	5
Q.4	0	5	0	4	4	5	5	5	3
Q.5	0	4	0	2	5	4	4	4	4

SUMMARY: RATING OF PRIORITIES

		TOTAL
Q. 1	Services should be reduced or eliminated	8
Q.2	Those who use a service should pay it (user fees)	16
Q.3	Services should be improved or added	23
Q.4	City taxes should be increased to maintain services	31
Q.5	The City should borrow money and or implement a special levy to fix roads	27

**2004 BUDGET PUBLIC INPUT AND INFORMATION SESSION
OF THE CITY OF GREATER SUDBURY**

**Dowling Citizen Service Centre
Dowling, Ward 2**

**Tuesday, February 17, 2004
Commencement: 7:30 p.m.**

Chair

COUNCILLOR TED CALLAGHAN, IN THE CHAIR

Present

Mayor Courtemanche; Councillors Berthiaume; Bradley; Gainer; Kett; Rivest

City Officials

M. Mieto, Chief Administrative Officer; D. Wuksinic, General Manager, Corporate Services; C. Hallsworth, General Manager of Citizen & Leisure Services; C. Matheson, General Manager of Health and Social Services; D. Nadorozny, General Manager of Economic Development & Planning Services; S. Jonasson, Director of Finance/City Treasurer; K. Khan, Business Analyst; A. Haché, Deputy Clerk; K. Bowschar-Lische, Planning Committee Secretary

C.U.P.E. Local 4705

W. MacKinnon, President

News Media

MCTV; Sudbury Star

Welcome and
Opening Remarks

Councillor Callaghan welcomed the sixty-six citizens in attendance to the 2004 Budget Public Input and Information Session, Roundtable Discussions and Review of Budget Options. He advised the purpose of the meeting was to provide an opportunity for the public to give Council some direction on how they would like this year's budget pressures addressed.

Doug Wuksinic, General Manager of Corporate Services, outlined the format for the Roundtable Discussions to those present. He indicated that input was being sought on four questions:

1. What level of municipal service do you expect?
Should any services be reduced or eliminated?
2. Should those who use a service pay for the service (user fees) and/or should everyone share in the cost (taxes)?
3. What services would you like to see improved or added?
4. Should the City borrow money and/or implement a special levy to fix roads, repair arenas, replace fire trucks, maintain police communications, etc.?

ROUNDTABLE DISCUSSIONS

Question #1

***What level of municipal service do you expect?
Should any services be reduced or eliminated?***

Table 1

Table 1 indicated that they looked at reduction options that concerned them directly. They would consider eliminating dust control on certain gravel roads and eliminating snow removal in certain areas depending on amount of snow. They agreed with the options to eliminate purchase of preferred shares from the Greater Sudbury Utilities and to reduce the By-law Officers from six to four.

Table 2

Table 2 was concerned about reducing more services in Onaping Falls. The proposed reduction options are not noticeable to their community as they have minimal police service and snow removal. They also expressed concern regarding reducing bus service and they are paying more. It is costing seniors and lower income people larger amounts of money and they can't afford to get into town to buy groceries and get health services. Last year, the rate went from \$4.00 to \$8.00 per day. They felt that because they are a smaller community, they are being ignored. There is no consideration being given to being equal throughout the community and it seems like there is a disparity. Reducing the number of By-law Officers and reducing sidewalk cleaning is not of concern. A portion of the Trillium budget should be redirected to Minor Hockey in Onaping Falls because they have proven that they are willing to continue working to increase and expand.

Table 3

Table 3 felt that outside consultants should be cut and existing City staff should perform these duties. They felt that road work is not getting done and roads have deteriorated considerably over the last few years. The MTO should be approached to fix Highway 144 which should have been completed 5 years ago. They questioned whether the Power Generation Plant on Elgin Street was sold or being utilized.

Table 4

Table 4 agreed with reducing snow removal because it would be a definite cost savings. They also agree with eliminating tree pruning and replacement and felt that what should be done is fixing the potholes on roads. They felt that discussions should be held on reducing dust control on gravel roads as opposed to eliminating dust control.

Table 5

Table 5 indicated that they receive poor transportation services in their area. There is not enough bus service to Levack and Onaping. They stated that Capreol pays \$2.00 for their bus ride whereas they pay \$4.00 one way to go from Levack to Dowling. The rates should be the same for everyone. They said that they were not too concerned about sidewalk plowing since they have never been plowed in their community. They felt that eliminating school crossing guards was not a good idea as children need protection crossing the road especially in Onaping Falls where they have to cross the highway.

Table 6

Table 6 expected all communities to get the same level of service. They felt that tree pruning and planting should be done every two years. They also indicated that the EarthCare program should be reduced. They have no problem with privatization.

Table 7

Table 7 had no comments.

Table 8

Table 8 indicated that the transfer of responsibility for maintenance and repairs of water and wastewater laterals from mains to lot line to property owners was not well thought out. A property owner who had problems could be faced with costs of \$25,000.00 to \$30,000.00 because of the distance from the lot line to the main. They questioned what the average cost would be for sewer repair.

The Chief Administrative Officer indicated that it would cost approximately \$2,000.00.

Table 8 felt that with respect to automated attendant telephone service for the Call Centre at Tom Davies Square, the human touch should be maintained. They had concerns with the transit service, eliminating transcab services and require background information on costs. They expressed concern regarding closure of air ambulance night landing during the winter months as they are very isolated areas. They said that the By-law Officers should not be reduced since stabilization is needed.

Table 9

Table 9 expressed concerns regarding relocating the Rayside-Balfour Museum. When amalgamation occurred, their museum had a fund of \$18,284.00 and the City is now proposing that to save \$2,880.00 per year, the museum should be relocated. This museum is centrally located at the Trillium Centre and can be kept open for another 6 years with the \$18,284.00.

Question #2

Should those who use a service pay for the service (user fees) and/or should everyone share in the cost (taxes)?

Table 1

Table 1 felt that if a charge is implemented for fire false alarms then there should be 1 free call. With respect to harmonization of fees for fitness centres, they indicated the Gymnastics Club had an agreement with the former Mayor and Council to pay \$3,000.00 per year for 5 years to keep the club at the Onaping Citizen Service Centre open. The agreement also provided for another 5 year extension. Now they have to raise their fees substantially because their rental went from \$3,000 to \$9,000.00. It should be looked at as a community and not as square footage.

Table 2

Table 2 questioned if user fees are charged for parks in downtown Sudbury or Moonlight Beach area or if they were subsidized by the community. They asked Council to remember that the outlying communities are not getting some of the services that are part of the City of Sudbury and to take that into consideration when discussing user fees in outlying communities.

The General Manager of Corporate Services advised that all parks are on the tax bill and are accessible to everyone.

Table 2 expressed concern with respect to the increase of \$.10 for transit fares since they already pay \$4.15 to get to Sudbury. The increase in fees targets lower income families.

Table 3

Table 3 felt that user fees are required. They questioned what the cost of insurance was for all playground facilities in the outlying communities compared to the City.

Table 4

Table 4 spoke regarding adult playfield rental rates increasing by 600%. They want to see all fields brought to the same standards as Terry Fox Field. They have no lights and no washroom facilities. They donated \$5,000.00 to fencing last year.

Table 5

Table 5 felt that harmonization fees for minor sports playfields will hurt children since organized sport is beneficial and keeps them off the streets.

Table 6

Table 6 had no comments.

Table 7

Table 7 had no comments.

Table 8 Table 8 indicated that the 2 upper levels of government should be pressured into providing more funding. Increases should not be more than the level of inflation. We should be careful where user fees lie as the City of Greater Sudbury has pledged to put children first and if these facilities cost more, they will be used less. They suggested that someone at the City be designated to market recreational facilities.

Table 9 Table 9 had no comments.

Table 10 Table 10 stated that to say that it takes the same amount of maintenance for Terry Fox Field and the one in Levack is wrong. They felt that each individual facility should be looked at and costs decided on. They said that harmonization will hurt outlying areas and will result in lower participation levels.

Question #3 & #4 ***What service would you like to see improved or added?
Should the City borrow money and/or implement a special levy to fix roads, repair arenas, replace fire trucks, maintain police communications, etc.?***

Table 1 Table 1 felt that tourism projects should be promoted in the area such as the Tom Morley Project to encourage youth employment. Youth training in First Aid, Lifeguard Training and Coaching should be offered in Onaping Falls so that it can be accessed by youth in the area. They requested help from the City of Greater Sudbury in getting the MTO to build proper walkways on Highway 144 in the Dowling flats. They said that wastewater charges should be controlled.

Table 2 Table 2 is concerned about the pool in their area and felt it was mandatory to maintain their fitness levels. They stated that they are not opposed to some user fees but are concerned if the user fees were the same as in the inner City of Sudbury. They said that transportation is an issue but cautioned that harmonization should be equally based on the level of service each community gets.

Table 3 Table 3 felt that under "services added or improved" , a clause should be added...there should be greater accountability to taxpayers by Council. They also felt that there are too many advisors to Council and too many City vehicles. They wondered where the money to be borrowed and the GST rebate would be used. They felt that the monies generated from the slots should be used to pay the interest on City loans.

Table 4 Table 4 felt that there was a definite problem with garbage. They indicated that increasing the curbside limit to 6 bags may decrease the number of bags of garbage that are found at the end of driveways not placed there by the home owner. They felt that waiving tipping fees is a good idea.

Table 5 Table 5 had no comments.

Table 6 Table 6 had no comments.

Table 7 Table 7 were upset about excessive administration fees and questioned the Director of Leisure Service's position. What are the responsibilities to warrant the salary received while services and facilities are being cut?

Table 8 Table 8 felt that the reduction in student bus fares is a good motivator for getting people around the City. They indicated that there should be a one time grant to Youth Centres in order to keep the children off the streets and involved in extracurricular activities. They said that the City should borrow smart.

Table 9 Table 9 had no comments.

Rating of Priorities Each table was given an opportunity to rank each question in order of priority - from 1 to 5 - with 1 being the lowest priority and 5 being the highest priority. The purpose of this exercise was to give Council an overall guidance on how to address budget pressures facing the City.

The results are as follows:

Services should be reduced or eliminated.	21
Those who use a service should pay for the service (user fees).	29
Services should be improved or added.	31
City taxes should be increased to maintain services.	28
The City should borrow money and or implement a special levy to fix roads, etc.	26

Attachments Charts showing the Rating of Priorities by Individual Tables and a Summary Rating of Priorities are attached.

Closing Remarks

The Chair expressed his appreciation to all those who provided their input and stated that this was a collective opinion and it was important to receive some meaning to the submissions.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 9:50 p.m.

Councillor Callaghan, Chair
Finance Committee

Planning Committee Secretary

Rating of Priorities: Individual Tables

	TBL1	TBL2	TBL 3	TBL 4	TBL 5	TBL 6	TBL 7	TBL 8	TBL 9	TBL 10
Q.1	2	1	2	2	5	3	3	2	1	0
Q.2	1	4	3	4	3	4	5	1	4	0
Q.3	5	5	1	1	4	5	4	3	3	0
Q.4	3	3	4	5	2	2	2	5	2	0
Q.5	4	2	5	3	1	1	1	4	5	0

SUMMARY: RATING OF PRIORITIES

NO.1	Services to be reduced or eliminated	21
NO.2	Those who use a service should pay for the service (user fees)	29
NO.3	Services should be improved or added	31
NO.4	City taxes should be increased to maintain services	28
NO.5	The City should borrow money and or implement a special levy to fix roads, etc.	26

**2004 BUDGET PUBLIC INPUT AND INFORMATION SESSION
OF THE CITY OF GREATER SUDBURY**

**Centennial Arena
Valley East, Ward 3**

**Wednesday, February 18, 2004
Commencement: 7:30 p.m.**

Chair

COUNCILLOR TED CALLAGHAN, IN THE CHAIR

Present

Councillors Berthiaume; Bradley; Caldarelli; Reynolds; Rivest

City Officials

M. Mieto, Chief Administrative Officer; D. Belisle, General Manager of Public Works; D. Wuksinic, General Manager, Corporate Services; T. Beadman, Acting General Manager, Emergency Services; E. Stankiewicz, Co-Ordinator of Current Budget; P. Aitken, Government Relations/Policy Analyst; T. Mowry, City Clerk; CJ Caporale, Council Secretary

C.U.P.E. Local 4705

W. MacKinnon, President

News Media

MCTV; Sudbury Star; Le Voyageur; Valley East Today

Welcome and
Opening Remarks

Councillor Callaghan welcomed the seventy-five people in attendance to the 2004 Budget Public Input and Information Session, Roundtable Discussions and Review of Budget Options. He advised the purpose of the meeting was to provide an opportunity for the public to give Council some direction on how they would like this year's budget pressures addressed.

Doug Wuksinic, General Manager of Corporate Services, outlined the format for the Roundtable Discussions to those present. He indicated that input was being sought on four questions:

1. What level of municipal service do you expect?
Should any services be reduced or eliminated?
2. Should those who use a service pay for the service (user fees) and/or should everyone share in the cost (taxes)?
3. What services would you like to see improved or added?
4. Should the City borrow money and/or implement a special levy to fix roads, repair arenas, replace fire trucks, maintain police communications, etc.?

Question #1

What level of municipal service do you expect?
Should any services be reduced or eliminated?

Table 1

Table 1 pointed out that the list did not indicate a reduction in the use of staff vehicles.

Councillor Callaghan advised those present that there will be a Committee formed, which will involve citizens, to review the Car Policy for the City.

They questioned whether or not the City of Greater Sudbury owned the Greater Sudbury Utilities Inc. and, if so, why was the City of Greater Sudbury buying preferred shares from them. They also stated that before costs are implemented for the water and wastewater laterals from mains to lot line to property owners, the City should upgrade them. They suggested to remove snowbanks only from intersections which would reduce costs. They do not want any reductions regarding street lighting. They felt that the item for the transit service to Lively and Coniston should be raised in those areas and dealt with there. They felt that the Provincial Offences Act (POA) should be contracted out to a Credit Bureau and tree pruning should be maintained by the property owners. They stated that if the Supplies and Services Section were to close, this would result in each department having their own purchasing department.

Table 2

Table 2 wanted the current level of service should be maintained because they do not want to pay more for less. They felt that contracting out was an option to consider. They also felt that the use of a Committee to look into the Car Policy was a great idea. They suggested that the reserve fund should be explained in more detail to the taxpayers and what it is used for. They felt that if more By-law Officers were hired to enforce by-laws, then there would be an increase in revenue. They also felt that if services were reduced then taxes should be reduced.

Councillor Callaghan advised those present that staff is currently working on a report detailing the reserve funds.

Table 3

Table 3 questioned the \$206,000 spent on tree pruning and wanted to know the locations and what was done. They questioned an article in the Sudbury Star that referred to a "slush fund" of \$67 million and thought this money could be used for road construction, "if you don't spend it, please protect it."

Councillor Callaghan clarified that the "slush fund" are reserve funds which are controlled by Council Policy. These reserve funds is dedicated towards pension plan, benefits, sewer and water investments, etc.

Table 3
(continued)

Table 3 asked why the interest from these funds could not be used and Councillor Callaghan clarified that the interest is being invested.

They indicated that if roads were paved with crushed rock and tar like Côté Boulevard, they would last longer and cost less.

Table 4

Table 4 indicated that the current level of service should be maintained. They indicated that the \$36 million increase shown in the budget includes three areas such as salaries, purchases, contracts and provisions to reserves but could not find a link between them and the reductions listed. They felt that the City of Greater Sudbury should contract out the Airport and institutions such as Pioneer Manor. They also stated that if every second street light was turned off, this may reduce costs. They felt that the benefit packages for employees should be looked at.

Table 5

Table 5 indicated that if the City were to plow the streets, plow the sidewalks and then sand the streets, this would save costs. They felt that if the co-ordination of snow removal was better planned, this would eliminate a lot of waste.

Table 6

Table 6 felt that the process this evening did not leave a lot of room for discussion or time to view the handouts. They stated that the level of service was comparable to the rates they are paying. They felt that this process should be geared more to each individual community and their particular issues.

Table 7

Table 7 indicated that the purchasing of preferred shares from the Greater Sudbury Utilities Inc. should be eliminated because only a portion of the City of Greater Sudbury uses their services and not everyone has the opportunity to invest their money back into it. They stated that if snow removal was restricted to one side of the street only, this would reduce costs. They felt that street lighting should be reduced only if it does not affect the safety of children. Reduce winter sidewalk plowing and sanding by 50%, reduce the By-law officers from 6 to 4, and reduce street cleaning and sweeping.

Table 8

Table 8's main concern was Police service consuming 15.2% of the budget when the level of service in Valley East was not sufficient. They indicated that the Police overtime budget was over \$2 million and was wondering if Council would address this with the Chief of Police.

Table 8 raised their concerns over the comments about contracting out and stated that contracting out services eliminates jobs that pay well and creates a decrease in employment for the youth of the City.

Table 11

Table 11 indicated that the preferred shares of the Greater Sudbury Utilities Inc. should be eliminated. They felt that the City should hire POA staff on a trial basis and if the revenue does not increase within the year, then eliminate the jobs. They suggested that if a mechanic was hired, this would decrease the overtime hours, and decrease costs. They also suggested that the use of van to transport people would be more cost effective than hiring taxis. They indicated that employees should drive their own cars to work, use City vehicles when needed, and take their own cars back home.

General Comments

A participant questioned why the citizens from Valley East are paying for preferred shares from the Greater Sudbury Utilities Inc., when they receive their service from Ontario Hydro. He also mentioned the use of City vehicles.

A participant indicated that when comparing the expenditures for 2003 and 2004, there is a net increase of \$36 million on three or four major items. He questioned whether or not Council had an action plan to review these areas for reduction. He stated that the revenues for 2004 are \$20 million greater than 2003 which gives the City a \$56 million "swing" and that Council and staff should review and be able to explain this.

A participant indicated that if there are no sidewalks, then the area should not have to pay for them. The City should implement a by-law, like Hamilton, where the home owner has to clean their own sidewalks and pay a fine if they don't. He also stated that more people should attend these meetings and watch the proceedings on T.V.

A participant suggested that the information centres and museums should be combined to reduce costs.

Question #2

Should those who use a service pay for the service (user fees) and/or should everyone share in the cost (taxes)?

Table 2

Table 2 stated that as ratepayers they pay taxes to receive services and that the taxes should cover some basic level of service. User fees should be paid by the people who use the service especially in Leisure Services. Table 2 also indicated that Area Rating has three levels of service, career, composite and volunteer, and feels that Area Rating should be looked at with respect to the Master Fire Plan in Valley East.

Table 3

Table 3 stated that since the amalgamation, the level of service in Valley East has not been the same.

Table 4

Table 4 stated that the City should educate the residents on Area Rating because not everyone understands it and cannot make an educated decision.

<u>Table 5</u>	Table 5 commented on user fees and the implication of vehicle extraction fees for the Emergency Services. They felt that implementing user fees for the use of emergency services is unreasonable.
<u>Table 6</u>	Table 6 stated that the user fees implemented should be offsetting the reductions on the expense side.
<u>Table 7</u>	Table 7 commented on four items: increase the cost recovery of arenas to 70% because the total 11.5% tax increase should not be applied on property taxes but shared with user fees at 40-60%; implement charges for false alarms; the increase of transit fares should be recovered from people with higher incomes; and increase the fees for day camps.
<u>Table 8</u>	Table 8 stated that the tipping fees for tires should be rated by weight and not size.
<u>Table 9</u>	Table 9 stated that they had a problem with the user fees for the ball fields being raised almost 300%. They indicated that the members of the Slow Pitch have maintained the fields by sodding, upgrading fencing, replaced weeping tiles, painted the fence, improved the drainage system, purchased tarps, pruned and weeded the field, built two sets of stands for public use and base boxes, maintain the fields during the season when City employees are off shift. They want Council to reconsider the user fee increase.
<u>Table 11</u>	Table 11 advised Council they were members of the Valley East Men's Slow Pitch and they have been responsible for the maintenance, labour and obtaining grants for the fields in the past on a volunteer basis. They do not mind paying a user fee but at a reasonable cost. They want the people to continue to use the fields for health reasons.
<u>General Comments</u>	<p>A participant indicated that every household should be given a certain amount of tags for their garbage, and when the tags are finished, then a user fee applied.</p> <p>A participant suggested that the City have the same garbage policy that Barrie has where homeowners must purchase tags from local convenience stores, etc. if they are over the two bag limit. This creates revenue and limits any confusion.</p> <p>A participant stated that people should stop comparing this City with the cities from southern Ontario.</p>

Question #3 & #4

What service would you like to see improved or added?
Should the City borrow money and/or implement a special levy to fix roads, repair arenas, replace fire trucks, maintain police communications, etc.?

Table 2

Table 2 felt that taxpayers could not afford an increase in services when the tax rate is already difficult to meet. An improvement in the essential enhancements such as Emergency Services would be beneficial. They do not agree with borrowing money which would increase taxes by another 3% on top of the 11%.

Table 4

Table 4 stated that taxes must remain low, the services must be provided and the infrastructure maintained. They also suggested that instead of borrowing money, to use the "slush fund", and if this is not possible, then set up a reserve fund for emergency use.

Table 7

Table 7 felt that this Council and staff should look at all the budgets from the past. The purpose of the amalgamation was to create savings of 10-15% savings, but this did not occur. The City has to look at how services were delivered and what the expenditures were in the various former municipalities, take an average, and compare.

Table 11

Table 11 feels that the user fees should not be increased.

Rating of Priorities

Each table was given an opportunity to rank each question in order of priority - from 1 to 5 - with 1 being the lowest priority and 5 being the highest priority. The purpose of this exercise was to give Council an overall guidance on how to address budget pressures facing the City.

The results are as follows:

Services should be reduced or eliminated.	20
Those who use a service should pay for the service (user fees).	31
Services should be improved or added.	31
City taxes should be increased to maintain services.	33
The City should borrow money and or implement a special levy to fix roads, etc.	30

Attachments

Charts showing the Rating of Priorities by Individual Tables and a Summary Rating of Priorities are attached.

Closing Remarks

The Chair expressed his appreciation to all those who provided their input and stated that this was a collective opinion and it was important to receive some meaning to the submissions.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 10:00 p.m.

Councillor Callaghan, Chair
Finance Committee

Council Secretary

Rating of Priorities: Individual Tables

	TBL1	TBL2	TBL3	TBL4	TBL5	TBL6	TBL7	TBL8	TBL9	TBL10	TBL11	TBL12
Q.1	0	4	0	3	1	1	2	0	2	1	2	4
Q.2	5	5	0	4	3	4	3	0	3	2	1	1
Q.3	0	3	0	2	4	2	4	0	5	3	3	5
Q.4	0	2	0	1	5	5	5	0	4	4	5	2
Q.5	0	1	0	5	2	3	1	5	1	5	4	3

SUMMARY: RATING OF PRIORTIES

	TOTAL
Q.1 Services should be reduced or eliminated	20
Q.2 Those who use a service should pay for it	31
Q.3 Services should be improved or added	31
Q.4 City taxes should be increased to maintain services	33
Q.5 The City should borrow money and/or implement a special levy to fix roads	30