

## Finalization of the 2022 Budget

Presented To:	Finance and Administration Committee
Meeting Date:	November 29, 2021
Type:	Managers' Reports
Prepared by:	Liisa Lenz Financial Support & Budgeting
Recommended by:	General Manager of Corporate Services

## Report Summary

This report provides a summary of the 2022 Budget.

## Resolutions

### Resolution 1:

THAT the City's share of the tax supported budget for the Nickel District Conservation Authorities (Conservation Sudbury) 2022 budget in the gross expenditure amount of \$1,111,087 and a net property tax levy requirement of \$1,111,087, be approved.

### Resolution 2:

THAT the City's share of the tax supported budget for the Public Health, Sudbury & Districts 2022 budget in the gross expenditure amount of \$7,662,119 and a net property tax levy requirement of \$7,662,119, be approved.

### Resolution 3:

THAT the City's share of the tax supported budget for the Greater Sudbury Police Services 2022 budget in the gross expenditure amount of \$74,547,033 and a net property tax levy requirement of \$68,813,928, be approved.

### Resolution 4:

THAT the City's share of the tax supported budget for the Greater Sudbury Public Library, inclusive of Citizen Services Centres, 2022 budget in the gross expenditure amount of \$9,300,079 and a net property tax levy requirement of \$8,626,537, be approved.

**Resolution 5:**

THAT the City's share of the tax supported budget for the Sudbury Airport Personnel 2022 budget in the gross expenditure amount of \$3,482,047 and a net property tax levy requirement of \$0, be approved.

**Resolution 6:**

THAT the water/wastewater operating budget be approved in the gross expenditure amount of \$90,197,317, representing a user rate increase of 4.8%.

**Resolution 7:**

THAT the water/wastewater 2022 capital budget be approved in the amount of \$42,315,810 funded as follows:

Contributions from Water/Wastewater User Fees \$36,620,810

Contributions from Federal Grants \$960,000

Contributions from the City of Greater Sudbury's Reserves and Reserve Funds \$4,735,000

**Resolution 8:**

THAT the 2022 City of Greater Sudbury's tax supported base operating budget for municipal operations, inclusive of fees and charges and excluding the City's share of the Outside Boards' budgets be approved in the gross expenditure amount of \$468,350,082 and the net amount of \$228,840,685, subject to the following adjustments/amendments:

- a. An increase in the Ontario Municipal Partnership Funding of \$143,300, and a decrease in assessment growth of 0.1% valued at \$302,470.

**Resolution 9:**

THAT the City of Greater Sudbury's 2022 tax supported capital budget be approved in the gross amount of \$115,479,584 funded as follows:

Contributions from the Operating Budget \$41,944,774

Contributions from Federal Grants \$31,363,400

Contributions from Provincial Grants \$18,999,388

Contributions from the City of Greater Sudbury's Reserves and Reserve Funds \$24,301,987

Contributions from the City of Greater Sudbury's Obligatory Reserve Funds \$850,000

External debt financing of \$37,830,035

Development Charges \$190,000

#### **Resolution 10:**

THAT a special capital levy of 1.5% be used as an investment towards the City's aging infrastructure.

#### **Resolution 11:**

THAT pursuant to Ontario Regulation 284/09, this report serves as the method for communicating the exclusion of the following estimated expenses from the 2022 Budget:

- a) Amortization expense - \$75.4 million
- b) Post-employment benefit expenses – \$3.3 million
- c) Solid waste landfill closure and post-closure expenses - \$2.0 million

### **Relationship to the Strategic Plan, Health Impact Assessment and Community Energy & Emissions Plan (CEEP)**

This report refers to operational matters and has no direct impact on CEEP.

### **Financial Implications**

If approved, the net taxation levy increase for 2022 will be 3.2%

### **Backgrounds**

The purpose of this report is to present the City of Greater Sudbury's 2022 Budget for approval. Following budget directions established by the Finance and Administration Committee in June, a review of draft business cases requested to the end of August, and an update provided in October, staff provided the Committee with the proposed 2022 Budget for the Committee's consideration. The recommended budget is a slight increase from the Committee's budget directions as a result of a late budget adjustment as approved by the Greater Sudbury Police Services Board.

Outcomes anticipated by the 2022 Budget make progress on the goals Council identified in its Strategic Plan. If approved as presented, the business cases City Council directed staff to produce throughout 2021 for consideration as part of its 2022 Budget deliberations are not included in order to reflect the guideline Council provided as part of its budget directions to produce a plan that resulted in no more than a 3% property tax change.

### **Base Budget Adjustments**

The following base budget adjustments have been identified since the budget has been finalized:

Proposed 2022 Budget		3.16%
Base Budget Adjustments:		

OMPF Increase	143,300	-0.05%
Assessment Growth Decrease	(302,470)	0.1%
		3.21%

#### *Ontario Municipal Partnership Fund (OMPF)*

At the time the budget was prepared, staff were not anticipating any changes to the OMPF allocation. Since preparing the budget, the province announced OMPF allocations. For 2022, the City will receive \$21.7 million, which equates to \$143,300 more than anticipated. As shown above, these funds are required to offset the shortfall in assessment growth.

#### *Assessment Growth*

At the time the budget was prepared, assessment growth was estimated at 1.0%. MPAC has since completed entering the changes to assessment for 2020, which reflects assessment growth of 0.9%. This results in a funding gap of \$302,470.

#### **Business Cases**

At the budget direction meeting in June, the Finance and Administration Committee requested a special budget meeting to be held on October 5<sup>th</sup> to review all business cases requested during the year up to and including the August meetings. These business cases were reviewed by the committee and directed to be included in the draft budget for further consideration. After the preparation of the 2022 budget document, additional business cases were requested.

#### *New Business Cases*

Appendices included with this staff report present business cases created after the production deadline:

- a) Minnow Lake Boardwalk - At the September 14, 2021 Council Meeting, Council requested a business case to repair the drainage issues impacting the boardwalk along the Bancroft Drive shoreline, as well as repair the boardwalk itself. The business case can be found in 'Appendix 1' of this report.
- b) Reduction in On Street Parking Fees after 5:00pm – At the November 2, 2021 Finance and Administration Committee meeting, a business case was requested to offer free on street parking in the Downtown after 5pm. The business case can be found in 'Appendix 1' of this report.
- c) Municipal Law Enforcement Officers – At the November 3, 2021 Council Meeting, a business case was requested to convert the work of Municipal Law Enforcement Officers into a permanent service. The business case can be found in 'Appendix 1' of this report.
- d) Annual operating funding for Place des arts (Pda) – At the November 3, 2021 Council Meeting, Council requested a business case to provide increased annual operating funding for Place des arts. The business case can be found in 'Appendix 1' of this report.
- e) Funding for Hilltop Seniors Workshop- At the November 3, 2021 Council Meeting, Council requested a business case to provide a one-time grant to the 76 Hilltop Seniors Workshop for 2022. The business case can be found in 'Appendix 1' of this report.
- f) Recreational Vehicle Dumping Site user fee - At the November 23, 2021 Council Meeting, Council requested a business case to propose a fee for use of the recreational vehicle dumping site. The business case can be found in "Appendix 1" of this report.

#### **Special Capital Levy**

Staff recommends a 1.5% special capital levy to address infrastructure funding requirements. This is consistent with the options presented in the Long-Term Financial Plan approved by Council in April 2017.

This would enable the completion of infrastructure renewal work worth \$4.5 million. Numerous municipalities across the country use some form of special levy, typically to address long-standing infrastructure renewal or replacement needs. Greater Sudbury's infrastructure renewal requirements are significant. Without some infusion of additional funds like those provided by a special capital levy, the risk remains high that the city's infrastructure will not be adequate to sustain service levels or meet expected service demands.

If approved, Council has full discretion to identify the specific projects that would be funded by a special levy. Nevertheless, the Capital Budget prioritization process identifies projects that represent staff's view of the highest and best use of limited funds. Should an additional capital levy be approved for the 2022 Budget, the next most critical investment is recommended, which in this case is additional funding towards the 2022 Arterial/Collector program.

### **Municipal Act - Ontario Regulation 284/09**

In accordance with Ontario Regulation 284/09, municipalities are required to disclose amounts that are expensed in their financial statements but not included in budgeted figures prior to Council passing the annual budget. For the City of Greater Sudbury, this includes three expenses for the 2022 Budget:

- a. Amortization expense - \$75.4 million
- b. Post-employment benefit expenses – \$3.3 million; and
- c. Solid waste landfill closure and post-closure expenses/(recovery) - \$2.0 million

The effect of including these expenses for a net total of \$80.7 million in the budget would be to increase the tax levy and user fee requirements. By not including these expenses, the annual contribution to capital and reserves are lower than they will likely need to be to maintain assets in a state of good repair. Similarly, as obligations for post-employment benefits or landfill closure costs become due, future levies would be impacted if the expenses remain unbudgeted.

### **SUMMARY**

The 2022 Budget produces a number of results that demonstrate the progress Council anticipated when it created its Strategic Plan. In addition to providing numerous programs and services that residents rely on every day, the 2022 Budget makes significant investments that improve residents' quality of life. Not only does it address key priorities like road infrastructure and winter road maintenance services, but it also enhances community safety and the environment.

The recommended 2022 Budget document reflects a 3.2% municipal property tax change compared to 2021.

# Business Case - Service Level Change

**Request/Project Name:** Minnow Lake Boardwalk Renovations

**Department:** Community Development

**Division:** Leisure Services

**Council Resolution:** CC2021-251

## I. Executive Summary

### Overview of Proposal

The Minnow Lake Boardwalk is an existing non-motorized trail along Bancroft Drive. The amenity was built in the 1990s, absent of geotechnical and engineering work. The amenity is built near the shoreline and at the same level as Minnow Lake. There are two large culverts which outlet into Minnow Lake which have contributed to deterioration of lock stone and areas of the trail.

There have been increased maintenance requirements of the boardwalk in recent years including requirements to reset lock stone, repair retaining walls and replace walking bridges. The deterioration of the amenity has gone beyond repairs, requiring a section of the boardwalk to be closed earlier this year due to safety concerns.

Following a review of the boardwalk by Parks Services and Growth & Infrastructure staff, it has been determined that costs to repair and/or renovate are beyond approved operational budgets. (For context, the annual approved materials budget for the City's 177 km of non-motorized trails is \$110,000.) Based on the site review, two alternatives were developed. The first option would be a repair strategy which would see restoration of pathway, removal of retaining walls and drain work in the culvert areas. The second, and recommended option would see the path raised approximately 1 meter, relocation of path to ensure proper grading to Minnow Lake and removal of walking bridges. This option will reduce the probability of future trail washouts and repair requirements. Under both scenarios, it is recommended that the lock stone path be replaced with hard packed granular surface to mitigate future maintenance requirements and costs.

## II. Background

### Current Service Level

The City of Greater Sudbury currently maintains 177 kilometres of non-motorized recreational trails. The City of Greater Sudbury has 1.10 kilometres of maintained recreational trails per 1,000 persons (MBNCanada measure). The average of maintained kilometers of trail per 1,000 persons for MBNCanada municipalities is 0.81 (2019 statistic).

### Drivers for Proposed Course of Action

The asset in question has failed and is currently closed due to health and safety concerns.

## III. Recommendation

### Categorize your specific request (mark an 'X' for all that apply):

<input type="checkbox"/>	Change to base operating budget	<input type="checkbox"/>	Change to base FTE allocation
<input type="checkbox"/>	Change to fees (unit price)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Change to revenues (volume change)
<input type="checkbox"/>	Investment in project (Operating)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Investment in project (Capital)

### Recommendation

It is recommended that the trail be renovated, implementing the strategy to raise and realign the pathway at an approximate cost of \$392,500.

### How does this align with Council's Strategic Plan?

<input type="checkbox"/>	Asset Management and Service Excellence	<input type="checkbox"/>	Business Attraction, Development and Retention
<input type="checkbox"/>	Climate Change	<input type="checkbox"/>	Economic Capacity and Investment Readiness
<input type="checkbox"/>	Housing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Creating a Healthier Community
<input type="checkbox"/>	Strengthen Community Vibrancy	<input type="checkbox"/>	

Non-motorized recreational trails provide recreational opportunities for residents to participate in healthy lifestyles. Renovations of the trail will ensure this recreation amenity remains safe and available for residents.

**Does this have a link to the Community Energy & Emissions Plan (CEEP)?**

Not applicable

**IV. Impact Analysis**

**Qualitative Implications**

Capital investment will allow for the reopening of the trail. The proposed raising and realignment of the trail will mitigate future maintenance requirements and costs.

**Quantifiable Implications**

It is estimated that a capital investment of \$392,500 would be required to complete trail renovations. The estimate includes required materials and labour based on unit price schedules provided by the City's engineering section. The estimate also includes a 35% contingency. As the asset in question is an existing City amenity, it is recommended that Capital Reserve Holding Account be utilized as source of funding.

**Operating Revenue - Per Year**

*Detail*

Description	Duration	Revenue Source	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026
Capital General Holding	One-Time	Reserve	\$ (392,500)				
	<b>On-Going</b>		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	<b>One-Time</b>		\$ (392,500)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
<b>Total</b>			<b>\$ (392,500)</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>

**Operating Expenditures - Per Year**

*Detail*

Description	Duration	Funding Source	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026
Contribution to Capital	One-Time	Reserve	\$ 392,500				
	<b>On-Going</b>		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	<b>One-Time</b>		\$ 392,500	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
<b>Total</b>			<b>\$ 392,500</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>

**Impact to Capital**

Yes. It will add a new project to the capital budget. It is anticipated that work will be completed in 2022.

**FTE Table**

Position	Bargaining Unit	Duration	Permanent / Part Time	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026
		<b>Permanent</b>		-	-	-	-	-
		<b>PT Hours</b>		-	-	-	-	-

Yearly Impact	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026
<b>On-Going</b>	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
<b>One-Time</b>	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>

Net Levy Impact	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026
<b>On-Going</b>	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
<b>One-Time</b>	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>
<b>% Levy Increase</b>	<b>0.00%</b>				

**Implementation**

Upon Council approval, necessary approvals and final project design will be completed. Tender to be issued for third party to complete work. It is anticipated that work will be completed in 2022.

**Advantages/Disadvantages**

Advantages	Disadvantages
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Restores an existing non-motorized trail</li> <li>• Improves safety for users</li> <li>• Raising and realignment of trail mitigates future maintenance and repair requirements</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Draw of funds from Capital Holding Reserve that could be utilized for other emergency repairs</li> </ul>

**V. Alternatives**

**Alternatives Considered**

Solution Options	Advantages/Disadvantages	Financial Impact
Conduct refurbishment and repairs only, and not raise/realign trail.	Less capital funding required. Trail would still be subject to wash outs and require more future repairs and maintenance.	\$ 162,000.00
Decommission trail and naturalize area.	Removal of a community amenity that has been enjoyed for decades.	No impact.



# Business Case - User Fee Change

<b>Request/Project Name:</b>	On-Street Parking Fee Reduction		
<b>Department:</b>	Corporate Services	<b>Division:</b>	Corporate Security and By-law
		<b>Council Resolution:</b>	FA2021-73

**I. Executive Summary**

**Overview of Proposal**

The recommended user fee change would provide for on-street parking free of charge after 5:00 p.m. from Monday to Friday as opposed to the current fee structure which requires payment between 5:00 p.m. and 6:00 p.m. and provides for parking free of charge after 6:00 p.m.

**II. Background**

**Drivers for Proposed Course of Action**

Parking utilization and enforcement data indicates that demand for parking in the downtown decreases substantially between 4:30 p.m. and 6:00 p.m. Downtown businesses and institutions have indicated that a change to allow for parking free of charge after 5:00 p.m. could provide an incentive for motorists (particularly those who work in the downtown and pay for parking during the day) to remain in the downtown for the evening to avail themselves of restaurants and retail shopping opportunities. This change has been the subject of a BIA request for several years and was proposed in 2020 along with other parking fee changes. These changes were not approved. Since that time, pay by plate technology has been introduced making it easier to quantify parking demand. The actual demand for 2019 (pre-pandemic) and 2020 was much lower than anticipated and so the overall cost to making this singular change at this time is approximately \$16,500 in lost parking and fine revenue.

**III. Recommendation**

**Categorize your specific request (mark an 'X' for all that apply):**

	Change to base operating budget		Change to base FTE allocation
<b>X</b>	Change to fees (unit price)	<b>X</b>	Change to revenues (volume change)
	Investment in project (Operating)		Investment in project (Capital)

**Recommendation**

The recommended change is to provide for parking free of charge after 5:00pm from Monday to Friday as opposed to the current fee structure which requires payment between 5:00 p.m. and 6:00 p.m. and provides for parking free of charge after 6:00 p.m. The recommendation is especially targeted at retaining those motorists who are in the downtown during the day who experience the additional hour of parking fees as a mild deterrent to remaining in the downtown. It could also encourage some motorists to come to the downtown to enjoy restaurants and retail shopping by starting their evening an hour earlier in the day. The alternatives of using public transportation or other forms of more active transportation exist but are less reasonable for motorists who have driven to the downtown during the day and want to stay downtown in the evening.

**How does this align with Council's Strategic Plan?**

	Asset Management and Service Excellence	<b>X</b>	Business Attraction, Development and Retention
	Climate Change		Economic Capacity and Investment Readiness
	Housing		Creating a Healthier Community
<b>X</b>	Strengthen Community Vibrancy		

The impacts to vibrancy, business attraction, development and retention could be quantified by the number of available spaces that are unused during this low demand period of the day. Using revenue data from 2019 (pre-pandemic), approximately 50% of on-street spaces would have been available or 219 on street spaces. Using revenue data from 2020 (during the pandemic) 86% of on street spaces would have been available or 378 on street spaces. The additional traffic in the downtown that would be encouraged by this change creates parking capacity for businesses in the early evening hours and drives foot traffic adjacent to on street spaces. Further, additional vehicular and pedestrian traffic enhances the vibrancy of the downtown environment on evenings during the week and may lead to crime prevention and increased confidence for greater numbers of individuals to visit the downtown.

**IV. Impact Analysis**

**Qualitative Implications**

This change will create parking capacity that is free of charge to motorists in the early evening between 5:00 p.m and 6:00 p.m. This is a change that has been requested by downtown businesses and institutions for several years and is supported by the Downtown BIA. The change has the potential to increase vehicular and pedestrian traffic in the downtown during weekday evenings.

**Quantifiable Implications**

Data collected in 2019 (pre-pandemic) measured the loss of revenue for meter use (\$65,312), loss of fine revenue (\$8,645) and reduced enforcement costs + \$5,292, making the annual cost of this change in 2019 \$68,665. Data collected (in part using new pay by plate technology) in 2020, during the pandemic, indicated a loss of revenue for meter use of (\$6,478), loss of fine revenue (\$10,035) and reduced enforcement costs of +\$6,832, making the cost of this change \$9,681. It is anticipated that 2022 will reflect more of a post pandemic environment and while it is difficult to determine what this looks like, staff have chosen to use the 2019 data for the purposes of this business case.

**Operating Revenue - Per Year**

*Detail*

Description	Duration	Revenue Source	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026
Parking Fees	On-Going	Parking Reserve	\$ 65,312	\$ 65,312	\$ 65,312	\$ 65,312	\$ 65,312
Parking Fine Revenue	On-Going	Tax Levy	\$ 8,645	\$ 8,645	\$ 8,645	\$ 8,645	\$ 8,645
Contribution from Reserve	On-Going	Parking Reserve	\$ (65,312)	\$ (65,312)	\$ (65,312)	\$ (65,312)	\$ (65,312)
	<b>On-Going</b>		\$ 8,645	\$ 8,645	\$ 8,645	\$ 8,645	\$ 8,645
	<b>One-Time</b>		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
<b>Total</b>			\$ 8,645	\$ 8,645	\$ 8,645	\$ 8,645	\$ 8,645

**Operating Expenditures - Per Year**

*Detail*

Description	Duration	Funding Source	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026
Parking Enforcement	On-Going	Tax Levy	\$ (5,292)	\$ (5,292)	\$ (5,292)	\$ (5,292)	\$ (5,292)
	<b>On-Going</b>		\$ (5,292)	\$ (5,292)	\$ (5,292)	\$ (5,292)	\$ (5,292)
	<b>One-Time</b>		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
<b>Total</b>			\$ (5,292)	\$ (5,292)	\$ (5,292)	\$ (5,292)	\$ (5,292)

Net Levy Impact	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026
<b>On-Going</b>	\$ 3,353	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
<b>One-Time</b>	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
<b>Total</b>	\$ 3,353	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
<b>% Levy Increase</b>	<b>0.00%</b>				

# Business Case - Service Level Change

**Request/Project Name:** Municipal Law Enforcement Officers for Housing, Transit, Parks and Downtown Facilities

**Department:** Security and By-Law Services

**Division:** Corporate Services

**Council Resolution:**

CC2021-296

## I. Executive Summary

### Overview of Proposal

A permanent service level enhancement to provide a mobile security response at Sudbury Housing, Greater Sudbury Downtown Transit Hub, City Parks, and all City of Greater Sudbury facilities. This response will include external patrols of the downtown and assistance for downtown residents, businesses and institutions. Municipal Law Enforcement Officers (MLEO's) will act as a liaison with Greater Sudbury Police Service when the escalation in response is appropriate. This model incorporates facilities and properties associated with Transit, Parks, Arenas, Libraries and Housing. This proposal recommends that the Pilot Program undertaken from December 2020 to December 2021 is made part of the permanent service delivery model and be brought in-house under Corporate Services within the Security and By-law Department. The service level will include Municipal Law Enforcement Officers (MLEO)/Security that are mobile and able to respond to a variety of City facilities to provide additional support to deployed static post guards or where uniformed security is not part of the service delivery. The proposed service level will consist of two (2) MLEOs providing a combination of mobile security and bylaw enforcement services between the hours of 8:30 a.m. and 12:30 a.m., seven days per week enforcing municipal by-laws (Transit By-law, Smoking By-law, Traffic and Parking), provincial legislation (Trespass to Property Act) and federal legislation (Criminal Code). MLEOs will provide a broader authority to regulate behaviours on City property within the Downtown core, at Sudbury Housing locations, and on board City Transit buses. An MLEO can enforce a number of violations by way of issuing a Part I Offence Notice under the Provincial Offences Act. This service level creates safe City spaces and reduces a service gap where police are not able to quickly and regularly respond to non-criminal requests for service. This recommendation is scalable and can support the use of MLEOs for mobile response to other City of Greater Sudbury properties outside of the Downtown core, where there is currently no response beyond police. The net annual investment required for this service level enhancement is approximately \$455,800. There is an internal recovery of \$250,000 from the operating budgets for security from Housing Operations, Transit and Leisure Services. The impact to the levy would be \$205,803, with potential off-setting revenue (Part One Provincial Offence Notices and Part Two Parking Offences) of approximately \$13,000.

## II. Background

### Current Service Level

Within the parameters of the Pilot Program that has been in place for 11 months, the service level includes two MLEO's providing service between 8:30 am and 12:30am seven days a week. The service is mobile and responds to security concerns proactively, as well as by dispatch service. The program is an enhancement to contracted security. The focus is on Transit, Housing, Parks, Downtown and City of Greater Sudbury Facilities. Officers conduct focused patrols at these locations, respond to safety concerns reported by staff and residents, as well as on board transit buses, assist residents with social services connections, and enforce the Trespass to Property Act and other relevant legislation. Furthermore, the MLEO's have been engaged in COVID Education and Enforcement as well as the encampment response. In the absence of the MLEO Program, security services at the Downtown Transit Hub, TDS, housing and Parks are provided by a contractor. The transit location is a static post that does not allow dispatch to another location. Two guards are on site between 6 a.m. and 12:30 a.m., seven days a week. Static post security is provided at Tom Davies Square by a contractor 24 hours a day, 365 days a year. One contracted guard is in the control centre and receives and distributes all information to By-Law. This Guard conducts 24 hour monitoring of video surveillance and fills request for video from Greater Sudbury Police Service. There is one guard at Tom Davies Monday to Friday from 8:30-4:30 conducting internal and external patrols. Additionally, there are two guards posted at 199 Larch St. Greater Sudbury Housing has a static post at 166 Louis and 720 Bruce as well as mobile patrols of several housing locations 7 days a week between 12pm and 4am. Housing operations is also supported by surveillance and dispatch from Tom Davies Square. Within Leisure Services, specific City Parks host security in the summer months through a contract provider with a specific mobile deployment in place. Arenas host security only for special events. The service delivery for contract security involves actively providing customer service and monitoring for anti-social behaviour (via surveillance cameras or in person). When detected, guards are expected to provide a response that ensures adherence to regulations that are in place to support the continuation of service delivery for a variety of City and Provincial services. All guards enforce the Trespass to Property Act on behalf of the City with limited authority provided under the City of Greater Sudbury Trespass to Property Act Policy. The City of Greater Sudbury hosts surveillance cameras at most City facilities, with live monitor for Tom Davies Square, 199 Larch and the Transit Terminal. When responding to security incidents ranging from physical violence, drug use, disturbances, open alcohol, trespass and threats, there exists a real threat where incidents may escalate quickly. In response, security guards are directed to monitor and report to police rather than intervening to stop the offence. This is not the most effective approach to address a number of disturbances.

**Drivers for Proposed Course of Action**

The MLEO's have proven to be an effective support for Sudbury Housing operations, residents, and staff. They regularly respond to security concerns on property and in support of the safety and security of Housing staff and residents. While enterprise-wide contracted security will provide a consistent service level of mobile response, MLEO's are able to respond for immediate concerns reported by residents and staff. These calls include unwanted people or activity, noise complaints, and general security issues and concerns. Additionally, they provide proactive patrols for key properties and completed 1852 focused patrols at housing locations between January and September of 2021. They also attend to escort Staff when they must enter a housing unit for the purposes of inspection or completing work, thereby creating a safe work environment. Aligning with system improvements being made within the Transit Action Plan, this recommended service level enhancement responds to ongoing concerns raised by the public and Transit employees about the perceived safety at the terminal and on buses. It's recommended to support a strategy to increase ridership for the transit service. Incidents of assault, drug/alcohol use, fare evasion and disruptive behaviours on buses and at the terminal, directly relate to a fiscal cost to the municipality. Receiving significant media attention for both, riders would recall an incident in May 2017 where a transit operator was injured when a male suspect assaulted him with a knife on board the bus, and further the event of April 01, 2018, when a man armed with two knives was shot by police inside the transit terminal after making attempts to access a security office and later charging the police. The transit terminal and the downtown core have experienced an increase in intravenous drug use to the extent that it has received significant public and media attention. Supporting police and addiction service providers with education and deterrence, a higher caliber, proactive deterrence is required for a consistent time period to address concerns of drug use and sales and needle discarding within City facilities and parks. Whether on a bus, or at the transit terminal, MLEO's have the authority to arrest, issue fines or trespass someone from all City of Greater Sudbury facilities. Their authorization to do so comes from various forms of legislation, including the Criminal Code of Canada, the Trespass to Property Act and a variety of City By-Laws. With a higher level of training for use of force and an increased ability to enforce legislation, this service will better address risks to staff and residents creating a safe working environment, conducive to requirements within the Occupational Health and Safety Act. In the life of the Pilot Program MLEO's have conducted 1434 focused patrols at transit between January and September, and have implemented a proactive response for boarding the bus for part of their shift. This has been a valuable initiative. Bus operators noticed a decline in fare evasion, and general disruption on the buses. The MLEO's provide a mobile patrol of City Parks in support of safe City Spaces. In 2021 the MLEO's have worked collaboratively with Social Services, the Parks Department and Greater Sudbury Police Service to respond to approximately 10 major encampments within City properties and parks. They have removed encampments in some areas for the purpose of health and safety. Additionally, they have engaged on a daily basis with the homeless population in efforts to connect them with social services. Between January and September MLEO's conducted 1014 focused patrols at parks and provided social service information over 3000 times. Officers are committed to remaining visible in the Downtown core where they have conducted 2149 focused patrols. In support for the provision of safe City spaces and services, the MLEO's proactively patrol a variety of City properties multiple times a day to connect with residents and address concerns that may negatively impact community safety and efficient delivery of City services. This additional service level responds to Community Safety and Wellbeing.

**III. Recommendation**

**Categorize your specific request (mark an 'X' for all that apply):**

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Change to base operating budget	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Change to base FTE allocation
<input type="checkbox"/>	Change to fees (unit price)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Change to revenues (volume change)
<input type="checkbox"/>	Investment in project (Operating)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Investment in project (Capital)

**Recommendation**

The change is to implement the Pilot Program as permanent service level. The recommended service level increase provides additional support to contracted security guards that are deployed at specific locations when dealing with higher level incidents that may not be a high priority for police. Further, where uniformed security is not part of the service level delivery at a City facility or property, this increase provides staff with two (2) highly trained and professional Municipal Law Enforcement Officers (MLEO) to provide a response to security concerns in the City facility. Where MLEOs possess a number of additional legal authorities for enforcement, a responding contract security guard does not have the authority to issue a ticket. Whether on board a bus, at a library, in a park or at the transit terminal, MLEOs have the authority to arrest (under Trespass to Property Act), issue fines or trespass someone from all City of Greater Sudbury facilities. Their authorization to do so comes from various forms of legislation, including the Criminal Code of Canada, the Trespass to Property Act and a variety of City by-laws. With a higher level of training for skills such as first aid, tactical communication and use of force, coupled with an increased ability to enforce legislation, this service will better address risks to staff and residents, creating a safe working environment, conducive to requirements within the Occupational Health and Safety Act. The response to inappropriate behaviour with fines and trespass orders sends a clear message that this behaviour will not be tolerated. Partnering with police for investigations will further the positive collaboration that has already begun in order to support an overall commitment to safety and security in the downtown core. The result of housing, transit, parks staff feeling safe at work will increase employee engagement; there will be a reduction in lost time injuries and absences, further benefiting the service. This recommended service level enhancement is consistent with service levels offered in other large municipalities such as York, Mississauga and Ottawa.

**How does this align with Council's Strategic Plan?**

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Asset Management and Service Excellence	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Business Attraction, Development and Retention
<input type="checkbox"/>	Climate Change	<input type="checkbox"/>	Economic Capacity and Investment Readiness
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Housing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Creating a Healthier Community
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Strengthen Community Vibrancy	<input type="checkbox"/>	

This recommended service level is in line with the strategic plan for Housing, and will improve access to all citizens, especially vulnerable populations, to safe housing options. The City is a direct provider of social housing, funds housing related programs, facilitates development and regulates building safety. Additionally, this recommendation aligns with the strategic initiative for Asset Management and Service Excellence. Specifically, "1.5 Demonstrate Innovation and Cost-Effective Service Delivery" (B) confirms Council's will to "implement the Transit Action Plan in 2019 and continue efforts to expand ridership through innovative and responsive system improvements". The Transit Action Plan confirms that "recommendations of the Downtown transit Area Working Group should be implemented to improve safety and security within Greater Sudbury Transit services, including on board buses and at stop and Mobility Hubs. Further recommending a Transit Bylaw and Municipal Transit Bylaw Officers, the Transit Action Plan confirms that "these officers can support operators and passengers by enforcing the rules and regulations governing the use of the Transit system by issuing offence notices to those contravening the By-law, thereby providing a deterrent to undesirable behaviour at terminals, as well as vehicles". Further, when considering the positive impact that increased security in the Downtown core will have on neighbouring business, this recommendation aligns with the strategic initiative of Business Attraction, Development and Retention and Council's will to "Revitalize Downtown Sudbury with Public Investment that Supports and Leverages Private Investment". With an intent to assist in the promotion and revitalization of the Downtown, there is alignment with Council's initiative to create a Healthier Community. More specifically, a perception that the Downtown City facilities are safe supports Council's will to "promote Greater Sudbury as a great northern lifestyle alternative for workers regardless of where the company they work for is located". The City must continue to invest in active transportation and sustainable transportation, in our parks and trails, and to encourage and support community gatherings and gathering places. In June 2018, the City of Greater Sudbury facilitated a community-wide effort to create "A Call to Action for Population Health: 2018 – 2028." This effort continues through the newly-established Population Health, Safety and Wellbeing Advisory Panel which will also respond to a provincial mandate to work in partnership with the Greater Sudbury Police Service to establish a community safety plan. This strategic goal reflects the continued desire of Council to effect change within the Greater Sudbury community to improve health, economic and social outcomes for its citizens.

**Does this have a link to the Community Energy & Emissions Plan (CEEP)?**

This business case does not have a corresponding link to the Community Energy & Emissions Plan.

**IV. Impact Analysis****Qualitative Implications**

MLEO's are trained in Communication, De-escalation and Incident Response. They are able to respond quickly to conflict between neighbours or visitors to housing locations. This contributes to safety as well as customer satisfaction. Extra patrols, dispatch for security concerns and employee escorts for Sudbury Housing staff will increase employee safety when conducting inspections or daily tasks within tenants units. Employees will remain more engaged when they feel safe and supported at work. This change will achieve a safer environment at applicable City facilities and properties, therefore minimizing risk and exposure to the municipality and its employees. In conjunction with all other service improvements at transit, this service level increase will continue to improve the public perception of transit services and increase employee morale and engagement. As there is a positive link between employee engagement and customer satisfaction, this change will align with system improvements made at Transit and have a positive impact on ridership; as they receive high level customer service and perceptions align with the point that city services/facilities are overall safe. Aligning with the main principles of crime prevention through environmental design (natural surveillance, natural access control and territorial reinforcement), increased ridership and participation services will result in an increased territorial reinforcement for transit, libraries and parks. Successful territorial reinforcement applications include providing amenities in communal areas as a way to encourage activity and use. The amenity in this case is a highly regarded City service/facility that is viewed to be a safe place. "Territorial reinforcement has been described as an umbrella strategy that encompasses natural surveillance and access control. Used properly, natural surveillance and access control can help people to develop a sense of ownership about a space regardless of whether or not they own it. Territoriality often results in challenging behaviour." Territorial reinforcement will also apply to all City of Greater Sudbury Facilities, including parks. With regular patrols and public interaction at parks, members of the public will feel safe to use the space. All encompassed, this service level will reduce exposure to fear, crime, loss and liability, further minimizing risk and exposure for the City of Greater Sudbury.

**Quantifiable Implications**

The financial impacts of this initiative will be additional costs in the areas of FTEs, part-time hours and operating budget. There will be an increase in revenue associated with Part I and II (parking) infractions being issued. Providing two (2) mobile enforcement officers, between 8:30am and 12:30am, for 365 days a year, results in a total of 10,220 hours of labour. Three (3) FTEs with an annual cost of \$240,329.34 and an annual increase of 4739 part-time hours which will cost \$175,635.11. Annual operating costs of \$30,000 are forecasted to cover costs for training (use of force, emergency first aid, tactical communication) uniforms (includes protective vests) equipment (phone, handcuffs) and a vehicle. Annual increases in fine revenue are based on tickets issued under Parks Bylaw, Smoking Bylaw, and Noise Bylaw. In 2021 the majority of fines issued by MLEO's were a result of noise complaints and non-compliance with COVID regulations in the amount of approximately \$12,000. Once the MLEO's are no longer enforcing COVID Regulations and assuming an average fine amount of \$200 per offence notice an annual forecast of \$6,000 would be conservative at approximately 30 tickets issued annually (less than three per month). An annual increase in revenue from Part II (parking) offences is estimated at \$7,000. With an average fine amount of \$25 per offence notice this would be the result of approximately 280 tickets issued annually (less than one per day). It is assumed that increased enforcement abilities both at the terminal and on board buses will positively impact revenue loss associated with fare evasion, and increased fare revenues could be realized through increased ridership. As illustrated in the Update report to Council, in a 4 month period in 2021, the pilot program decreased priority 4-6 calls to Greater Sudbury Police Service thereby supporting their service to respond more effectively to urgent matters of community safety. The MLEO response to such calls at transit and housing properties saw a decrease in calls to police by 11%, specifically Trespass to Property Act (-93%) and Noise Complaints (-100%) at housing and transit locations. There are commitments from these operating departments for funds to be taken from their existing operating budgets for contracted security in the following amounts; \$200,000 from Housing operations, \$25,000 from Transit, and \$25,000 from Leisure Services. A shift in the mobile response will allow for the contribution from Housing. MLEO will patrol and respond to matters at Housing locations between the hours of 0830am and 1230am. A contracted mobile security team will be deployed between the hours of 1230am-830am, thereby providing an enhanced 24 hour service. Efficiencies found using an enterprise security model have allowed for the contributions from Transit and Leisure. Further, the Downtown BIA, who had contributed \$50,000 to the Downtown MLEO Pilot are considering a motion at their December 3rd meeting to provide ongoing support to the MLEO service. These commitments will minimize the overall impact to the levy.

**Operating Revenue - Per Year****Detail**

Description	Duration	Revenue Source	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026
Fines	On-Going	Fine	\$ (6,000)	\$ (6,000)	\$ (6,000)	\$ (6,000)	\$ (6,000)
Parking Fines and Fees	On-Going	Parking Fines	\$ (7,000)	\$ (7,000)	\$ (7,000)	\$ (7,000)	\$ (7,000)
	<b>On-Going</b>		\$ (13,000)	\$ (13,000)	\$ (13,000)	\$ (13,000)	\$ (13,000)
	<b>One-Time</b>		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
<b>Total</b>			\$ (13,000)	\$ (13,000)	\$ (13,000)	\$ (13,000)	\$ (13,000)

**Operating Expenditures - Per Year****Detail**

Description	Duration	Funding Source	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026
Salaries and Benefits	On-Going	Tax Levy	\$ 425,803	\$ 425,803	\$ 425,803	\$ 425,803	\$ 425,803
Operating Expenses	On-Going	Tax Levy	\$ 30,000	\$ 30,000	\$ 30,000	\$ 30,000	\$ 30,000
Housing Contribution	On-Going	Tax Levy	\$ (200,000)	\$ (200,000)	\$ (200,000)	\$ (200,000)	\$ (200,000)
Leisure Contribution	On-Going	Tax Levy	\$ (25,000)	\$ (25,000)	\$ (25,000)	\$ (25,000)	\$ (25,000)
Transit Contribution	On-Going	Tax Levy	\$ (25,000)	\$ (25,000)	\$ (25,000)	\$ (25,000)	\$ (25,000)
	<b>On-Going</b>		\$ 205,803	\$ 205,803	\$ 205,803	\$ 205,803	\$ 205,803
	<b>One-Time</b>		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
<b>Total</b>			\$ 205,803	\$ 205,803	\$ 205,803	\$ 205,803	\$ 205,803

Appendix 1

**FTE Table**

Position	Bargaining Unit	Duration	Permanent / Part Time	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026
Municipal Law Enforcement Officers - FT	IW	On-Going	Permanent	3				
Municipal Law Enforcement Officers - PT	IW	On-Going	PT Hours	4,739				
		<b>Permanent</b>		3	-	-	-	-
		<b>PT Hours</b>		4,739	-	-	-	-

Yearly Impact	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026
<b>On-Going</b>	\$ 192,803	\$ 192,803	\$ 192,803	\$ 192,803	\$ 192,803
<b>One-Time</b>	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
<b>Total</b>	\$ 192,803	\$ 192,803	\$ 192,803	\$ 192,803	\$ 192,803

Net Levy Impact	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026
<b>On-Going</b>	\$ 192,803	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
<b>One-Time</b>	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
<b>Total</b>	\$ 192,803	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
<b>% Levy Increase</b>	<b>0.06%</b>				

**Implementation**

Once approved, Staff would be required to assess and update the job description, and work with HR for approval. To post for permanent and part-time positions and interview candidates, staff would require 60 days to complete the process and allow for start dates. Once onboarded, Staff would reserve 30 days for job specific training if required (use of force, first aid, tactical communication) and post assignment. Management would collaborate with Fleet Services to procure a marked enforcement vehicle capable of safely holding a suspect in the event of an off site arrest and until such time that police can attend to retrieve the suspect. This initiative would require synergies with Senior Management from Community Development and Communications to effectively communicate service level enhancements to residents that utilize applicable services. Once in place, staff would collaborate with police to provide for a very active presence within the Downtown and specific to Housing, Transit, and parks in order to highlight the focus on safety and act as a deterrent.

**Advantages/Disadvantages**

Advantages	Disadvantages
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The ability to recruit and retain high caliber employees for security as opposed to the current challenges where there is limited staffing and training control.</li> <li>• Reduces the gap between security and police and what can be effectively handled before being escalated to police intervention.</li> <li>• Service level is scalable in order to provide a security response to issues at housing, libraries, pools, parks and further offers an enforcement response if violations under Bylaw are noted.</li> <li>• Provides support to City staff that currently deal with issues beyond their scope of work when considering incidents of documented drug use, drug paraphernalia and associated unpredictable behaviours of intoxicated clients.</li> <li>• Contributes to safe working environment for all CGS staff. Responds to safety concerns brought forward by housing, transit, parks staff and customers.</li> <li>• An ability to issue Part I Offence Notices in order to deter behaviour on buses and at the transit terminal will create a safe environment for staff and riders and will positively impact the overall perceived level of safety in the downtown core.</li> <li>• Addresses the safety concern raised by transit operators and discussed by the Transit Task Force.</li> <li>• Will positively impact the reputation of City of Greater Sudbury Services and may result in increased patronage within the Downtown core; further positively impacting transit ridership and employee engagement.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An internal service is more costly than a contracted service, with the City having higher per-hour wages and associated operating costs</li> <li>• More forward approach to stopping offensive behaviours creates possible health and safety risks, which will have to be managed by existing management.</li> </ul>

Appendix 1

V. Alternatives

Alternatives Considered

Solution Options	Advantages/Disadvantages	Financial Impact
<p>Utilize contract security guards for mobile response units as opposed to MLEO's</p>	<p>Advantage: The overall cost is reduced. A mobile response model will be in place to support a response to security incidents at City facilities.                      Disadvantages: There is a shortage of contracted security services available, without the MLEO service we will see an increase in police calls, control over the quality of guards is a challenge outside of meeting the minimum requirements of a contract. Guards are paid less per hour and the loyalty and ownership for the position is less than an internal employee. Contract guards would require specific delegation of authority to issue offence notices under Bylaw. Challenges have been experienced within the municipality when contractors are issuing offence notices under Bylaw as noted in previous animal control contract.</p>	<p>Annual savings of \$65,000 going with contracted service as opposed to internal staff</p>

# Business Case - Community Grant

**Request/Project Name:** Additional Operating Dollars for Place des Arts

**Department:** CAO's Office

**Division:** Economic Development

**Council Resolution:** CC2021-297

## I. Executive Summary

### Overview of Proposal

At the Council meeting of October 26, a resolution was passed requesting a business case for the increase of Place des Arts annual operating funding to \$260,000 for consideration as part of 2022 Budget deliberations. This follows a request made by the Board of Directors of Place des Arts dated August 31, 2021 requesting an increase to the municipal operating grant.

Place des Arts is one of the four Large Projects supported by the City of Greater Sudbury since 2016, following Council direction. The City of Greater Sudbury has contributed to the Place des Arts project since its early stages, and has provided funding of \$5 million as well as the contribution of land to support the capital construction of the facility itself. The City also contributes \$149,213 annually as a grant for operational costs. Place des Arts has previously indicated in 2016 and updated in 2018 that the facility will require annual operational funding of \$260,000 from the City, which represents an increase of \$110,787 annually. The organization has also stated that the municipal contributions to operating costs will be a crucial component to their success in securing ongoing operational funding from the federal and provincial governments as well as other funding agencies.

## II. Background

### Current Service Level

Place des Arts has received \$5 million plus the provision of land for the capital construction of the facility building, and currently receives \$149,213 as an annual operating grant from the City for operations. The organization's tenant partners also receive annual funding through the Arts & Culture grant program through the operating grant stream.

For additional context, the City and Place des Arts have signed a Capital Contribution Agreement that states that "provision of the Funds in no way commits the City to provide other or additional funding for the Project or to contribute to any costs of the Project in excess of the Estimated Cost of the Project or to provide operational funding for the Project once constructed".

## III. Recommendation

### Categorize your specific request (mark an 'X' for all that apply):

<input type="checkbox"/>	Change to base operating budget	<input type="checkbox"/>	Change to base FTE allocation
<input type="checkbox"/>	Change to fees (unit price)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Change to revenues (volume change)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Investment in project (Operating)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Investment in project (Capital)

### Recommendation

An annual operating grant of \$260,000 reflects an increase of \$110,787 each year to the current contribution of \$149,213. Place des Arts has also noted that this municipal contribution provides key leverage for the organization to access funding from senior levels of government. It also helps to protect the investment the City has already made in the capital project of Place des Arts, and supports job creation in the downtown core.

### How does this align with Council's Strategic Plan?

<input type="checkbox"/>	Asset Management and Service Excellence	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Business Attraction, Development and Retention
<input type="checkbox"/>	Climate Change	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Economic Capacity and Investment Readiness
<input type="checkbox"/>	Housing	<input type="checkbox"/>	Creating a Healthier Community
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Strengthen Community Vibrancy	<input type="checkbox"/>	

Operating grant dollars help Place des Arts realize its goals of becoming the cultural hub for Franco-Ontarian culture in Greater Sudbury and northern Ontario. The centre will also support downtown revitalization by offering programming that will increase foot traffic in the core, increase real estate values downtown, help to raise awareness of the city's cultural identity and create tourism opportunities by attracting new audiences and out of town visitation.



## IV. Impact Analysis

## Qualitative Implications

Support for Place des Arts operations will advance goals related to downtown revitalization, tourism and culture. The facility will also help to increase foot traffic downtown and provide space with potential for events and festivals. The project also enhances work being done by YES Theatre on the Refettorio project as well as Downtown Sudbury's seasonal patio program. Operational dollars also help to support the creation of 20 full-time and 17 part-time employees at the facility. As noted by Place des Arts, benefits include:

Growth in employment in the professional arts and culture sector  
 Growing number of specialized, qualified workers  
 Better positioning for Greater Sudbury to take advantage of opportunities in the arts and culture sector  
 Development of new commercial partnerships in the tourism sector including cultural tourism  
 Increase in major events bringing people to Greater Sudbury  
 High occupancy rate of rentable space within the PdA venue, strengthening the centre's viability, and creating a more vital, "lived in" downtown  
 Meet the needs of the Greater Sudbury community for medium-sized specialized venue for arts and cultural programming  
 Increased number of visitors downtown and increased support for local businesses  
 Support attraction and retention of talented workforce/creative professionals to Greater Sudbury  
 Develop partnerships with organizations that support the integration of francophone newcomers (professional immigration, post-secondary institutions)  
 Attract medium-sized conferences, forums, and meetings to Greater Sudbury  
 Increased synergy and collaboration amongst PdA and its seven founding members (performance, production, programming, and back office) as well as new partnerships with other community arts and cultural groups

## Quantifiable Implications

Place des Arts currently receives \$149,213 each year as a municipal grant for operational costs. The increase of \$110,787 will bring this total to \$260,000 and will support staffing and administrative costs incurred in running Place des Arts as an arts and culture hub for Greater Sudbury northern Ontario. Place des Arts will manage the facility, hire the professional staff required for its operations, and strengthen the capacity of the arts and culture sector, building on current expertise and ensuring the sector's continued growth and development. Once fully operational, Place des Arts will generate over 60% of its own revenues (along with office and venue rentals, sales of services). The balance of its operating costs (30% to 40% of overall budget) will be subsidized by public funders, including Heritage Canada, the Canada Council for the Arts, the Ontario Arts Council, and the City of Greater Sudbury. These operating grants are standard for organizations such as PdA which operates in Canada's cultural sector. What is unique about PdA's situation is the relative strength of its business model and diverse revenue sources. Comparable organizations typically only achieve the 30% mark in terms of self-generated revenues.

## Operating Revenue - Per Year

## Detail

Description	Duration	Revenue Source	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026
	On-Going		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	One-Time		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
<b>Total</b>			\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -

## Operating Expenditures - Per Year

## Detail

Description	Duration	Funding Source	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026
Place des Arts Grant	On-Going	Tax Levy	\$ 110,787	\$ 110,787	\$ 110,787	\$ 110,787	\$ 110,787
	On-Going		\$ 110,787	\$ 110,787	\$ 110,787	\$ 110,787	\$ 110,787
	One-Time		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
<b>Total</b>			\$ 110,787	\$ 110,787	\$ 110,787	\$ 110,787	\$ 110,787

Yearly Impact	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026
On-Going	\$ 110,787	\$ 110,787	\$ 110,787	\$ 110,787	\$ 110,787
One-Time	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
<b>Total</b>	\$ 110,787	\$ 110,787	\$ 110,787	\$ 110,787	\$ 110,787

  

Net Levy Impact	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026
On-Going	\$ 110,787	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
One-Time	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
<b>Total</b>	\$ 110,787	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
<b>% Levy Increase</b>	<b>0.04%</b>				

# Business Case - Community Grant

**Request/Project Name:** Annual Grant for 76 Hilltop Seniors

**Department:** Community Development

**Division:** Leisure Services

**Council Resolution:** CC2021-298

## I. Executive Summary

### Overview of Proposal

At the November 3, 2021 Special City Council meeting, the following request for a business case was approved:

WHEREAS the 76 Hilltop Seniors Woodshop is an incorporated not-for-profit organization which has been in existence since the early 80s that provides seniors with a facility and tools to create woodworking projects with the assistance and guidance of a day foreperson;

AND WHEREAS the 76 Hilltop Seniors Woodshop has in the past enjoyed a membership averaging approximately 70 members which assisted in the raising of revenue to fund its operating expenses;

AND WHEREAS the 76 Hilltop Seniors Woodshop has been successful in obtaining a variety of grants to sustain its capital needs and has so far, not had to request assistance to cover their operating expenses;

AND WHEREAS the COVID-19 pandemic has created some unsustainable challenges for the group, particularly as a result of not being able to use the facility and sell memberships to cover its rising operating costs;

AND WHEREAS although the Woodshop is once again up and running and is slowly regaining some of its membership, it still faces a revenue shortage and decreased capacity limits;

AND WHEREAS their yearly operating budget prior to the pandemic had been approximately \$12,000, that budget has seen an increase, particularly in the way of insurance rates, with declining revenues;

AND WHEREAS the 76 Hilltop Seniors Woodshop provides active living and socializing opportunities to seniors which can enhance their quality of life;

AND WHEREAS annual grants are provided to many other community organizations across the City of Greater Sudbury;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the City of Greater Sudbury directs staff to develop a business case to provide an annual grant to the 76 Hilltop Seniors Woodshop of up to \$7,500 for 2022 and future years, for Council's consideration during the 2022 Budget deliberations.

## II. Background

### Current Service Level

In 2021, City Council approved annual grants totaling \$880,571 to:

- 9 Seniors Active Living Centres
- 17 Community Action Networks
- 6 Community Centres
- 3 Special Event Organizers
- 2 Youth Centres
- 4 Non profit Curling Clubs
- 11 Community Organizations

In accordance with the provisions of the Seniors Active Living Centres Act (SALC) mandated under the Ministry of Seniors Affairs, the City contributes annually to eligible seniors centres in the amount of 20% of the centre's eligible operational costs.

The purpose of the Seniors Active Living Centre funding is to support regular operating costs associated with promoting active and healthy living, social engagement, and learning for persons who are primarily seniors and/or older adults by providing activities and services. the maximum (provincial funding) amount available for a 12-month year is up to 80 per cent of the net annual operating costs of maintaining and operating the program, to a maximum of \$42,700.

As stipulated in the legislation, municipal support of the maintenance and operating costs of the SALC program is mandatory to qualify for SALC funding from the ministry. The value of the municipal contribution can be cash or in-kind, or a combination of both, representing 20% of operating costs.

## III. Recommendation

**Categorize your specific request (mark an 'X' for all that apply):**

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Change to base operating budget	<input type="checkbox"/>	Change to base FTE allocation
<input type="checkbox"/>	Change to fees (unit price)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Change to revenues (volume change)
<input type="checkbox"/>	Investment in project (Operating)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Investment in project (Capital)

**Recommendation**

It is the recommendation that the City provides one-time funding in the amount of \$7,500 to provide immediate support to the organization. Future funding is subject to approval of provincial Senior Active Living Centre (SALC) grant.

**How does this align with Council's Strategic Plan?**

Asset Management and Service Excellence		Business Attraction, Development and Retention
Climate Change		Economic Capacity and Investment Readiness
Housing	X	Creating a Healthier Community
Strengthen Community Vibrancy		

This business case supports City of Greater Sudbury's 2019–2027 Strategic Plan's objective of creating a healthier community focus on Quality of Life, advancing the Population Health Priority of an Age Friendly community. 76 Hilltop Seniors provides programming for older adults, promoting an active and healthy lifestyle and life long learning opportunities.

**IV. Impact Analysis**

**Qualitative Implications**

The proposed financial support will provide funding to ensure 76 Hilltop Seniors are able to continue programming for older adults and cover operating costs. One time funding will bridge the organization until they can secure ongoing financial support through the Province's Seniors Active Living Centre program.

**Quantifiable Implications**

The business case recommendation is to provide a one-time funding in the amount of \$7,500 to 76 Hilltop Seniors in 2022. This grant will be covered within proposed operational budget for 2022, therefore no tax levy impact.

**Operating Revenue - Per Year**

*Detail*

Description	Duration	Revenue Source	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026
	On-Going		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	One-Time		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
<b>Total</b>			\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -

**Operating Expenditures - Per Year**

*Detail*

Description	Duration	Funding Source	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026
Community Grant	One-Time	Tax Levy	\$ 7,500				
Maintenance	One-Time	Tax Levy	\$ (7,500)				
	On-Going		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	One-Time		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
<b>Total</b>			\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -

Yearly Impact	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026
On-Going	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
One-Time	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
<b>Total</b>	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -

Net Levy Impact	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026
On-Going	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
One-Time	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
<b>Total</b>	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
<b>% Levy Increase</b>	<b>0.00%</b>				

# Business Case - Service Level Change

**Request/Project Name:** Recreational Vehicle Dumping Stations

**Department:** Water/Wastewater Treatment & Compliance

**Division:** Growth & Infrastructure

**Council Resolution:** CC2021-313-A1

## I. Executive Summary

### Overview of Proposal

The City of Greater Sudbury operates Recreational Vehicle (RV) Wastewater Dumping stations at the Sudbury Wastewater Treatment Plant (Kelly Lake Road, Sudbury), the Valley East Wastewater Treatment Plant (Yorkshire Drive, Val Caron), and the Chelmsford Water Pollution Control Plant (Laurette Street, Chelmsford). These sites are subsidized through the water rate and operate with no user fees.

Based on two reports presented to Operations Committee, "Operation of Recreational Vehicle Dump Sites at Wastewater Treatment Facilities" (September 20, 2021) and "Supplemental Report – Operation of Recreational Vehicle Dump Sites at Wastewater Treatment Facilities" (October 18, 2021), resolution CC2021-313-A1 was passed by Council on November 23rd, 2021 approving:

- 1) The closure of the recreational vehicle dump sites at the Valley East and Chelmsford Wastewater Treatment Plants due to safety and operational concerns, and;
- 2) The installation of an automated payment system and required accessibility modifications at the Sudbury Wastewater Treatment Plant at an estimated installation cost of \$13,184 with annual operating costs of approximately \$46,812 per year to be funded from Wastewater operating funds.

## II. Background

### Current Service Level

The RV dumping sites operated by the City of Greater Sudbury offer the ability for users to empty greywater or wastewater tanks into a 4-inch opening in the center of a public works manhole cover. Users empty their tanks by gravity through a flexible discharge hose, and there is non-potable water provided at each station for rinsing the emptied tanks and performing any necessary cleanup. These sites are subsidized through the water rate and operate with no user fees.

Prior to the COVID-19 pandemic, and associated state of emergency, the operating hours for the three sites were as follows:

- 1) Sudbury WWTP: Open all year, 24 hours/day; and,
- 2) Valley East WWTP & Chelmsford WPCP: Open the first Tuesday after Victoria Day to the first Tuesday after Thanksgiving; Sunday to Thursday 08:00 to 19:30, Fridays 08:00 to 15:00 and closed on statutory holidays.

### Drivers for Proposed Course of Action

The Recreational Vehicle Dumping sites at the Chelmsford Water Pollution Control Plant and the Valley East Wastewater Treatment Plant present a number of safety issues to users and currently do not comply with the Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act (AODA). Continued operation in their current configurations pose a risk to the City, and to facility users. The identified risks include:

- Lack of appropriate turn around areas, increasing risk of collision with vehicles or pedestrians;
- Lack of appropriate signage and traffic indicators;
- Close proximity to operational activities and process hazards; and,
- Potential interference with City, contractor or emergency services vehicles on site.

## III. Recommendation

### Categorize your specific request (mark an 'X' for all that apply):

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Change to base operating budget		Change to base FTE allocation
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Change to fees (unit price)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Change to revenues (volume change)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Investment in project (Operating)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Investment in project (Capital)

### Recommendation

As per council resolution CC2021-313-A1, the approved change is to close the RV dumping stations at the Valley East WWTP and Chelmsford WPCP while performing minor upgrades at the Sudbury WWTP in order to mitigate identified risks and collect a user fee for cost recovery. Upgrades will include the installation of an automated payment system, increased signage and accessibility modifications to meet the AODA requirements.

Based on council resolution CC2021-313-A1, it is recommended that a user fee of \$21.25 per dump be implemented. This fee would provide full cost recovery at an estimated 2,200 dumps/year.

Appendix 1

**How does this align with Council's Strategic Plan?**

<b>X</b>	Asset Management and Service Excellence	<b>X</b>	Business Attraction, Development and Retention
	Climate Change		Economic Capacity and Investment Readiness
	Housing		Creating a Healthier Community
	Strengthen Community Vibrancy		

RV dumping services are generally provided by private businesses in other communities in Ontario. Through reducing the number of operating sites operated by the City and charging an appropriate user fee, it is expected that alternate service providers, such as gas stations and RV dealerships, will develop the required infrastructure for RV dumping stations. This will ensure that the City is not providing a subsidized service which can be done by local businesses, while also reducing risks associated with existing assets.

**Does this have a link to the Community Energy & Emissions Plan (CEEP)?**

This report refers to operational matters and has no direct connection to the Community Energy & Emissions Plan or the Strategic Plan.

**IV. Impact Analysis**

**Qualitative Implications**

This change will mitigate operational and safety risks currently present for CGS employees and members of the public, while achieving full cost recovery for a service which has been historically subsidized through the water rate.

**Quantifiable Implications**

- Elimination of 1,800 unbudgeted casual operator hours at the Valley East and Chelmsford dump sites (approximately \$42,860 per site, \$85,720 total per year)
- Elimination of unbudgeted utilities costs at the Valley East and Chelmsford dump sites (approximately \$550 per site, \$1,100 total)
- Cost recovery for 900 casual operator hours at the Sudbury WWTP (approximately \$42,860 per year) through implementation of a user fee
- Cost recovery for utilities costs at the Sudbury WWTP (approximately \$1,100 per year) through implementation of a user fee
- Cost recovery of automated payment system rental and maintenance costs (approximately \$2,852 per year) through implementation of a user fee
- Introduce an RV dump fee of \$21.25 per dump, based on an estimated 2,200 visits annually to fully recover operating costs
- Cost recovery for one time capital costs to address AODA and operational modifications at the Sudbury WWTP (approximately \$13,184) through contributions from wastewater capital reserve funds

**Operating Revenue - Per Year**

**Detail**

Description	Duration	Revenue Source	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026
RV Dump Fees	On-Going	User Fees	\$ (46,812)	\$ (46,812)	\$ (46,812)	\$ (46,812)	\$ (46,812)
Contribution from Reserves	One-Time	Reserves	\$ (13,184)				
	<b>On-Going</b>		\$ (46,812)	\$ (46,812)	\$ (46,812)	\$ (46,812)	\$ (46,812)
	<b>One-Time</b>		\$ (13,184)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
<b>Total</b>			\$ (59,996)	\$ (46,812)	\$ (46,812)	\$ (46,812)	\$ (46,812)

**Operating Expenditures - Per Year**

**Detail**

Description	Duration	Funding Source	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026
Sudbury WWTP Labour	On-Going	User Fees	\$ 42,860	\$ 42,860	\$ 42,860	\$ 42,860	\$ 42,860
Sudbury WWTP Materials	On-Going	User Fees	\$ 2,852	\$ 2,852	\$ 2,852	\$ 2,852	\$ 2,852
Sudbury WWTP Utilities	On-Going	User Fees	\$ 1,100	\$ 1,100	\$ 1,100	\$ 1,100	\$ 1,100
Contribution to Capital	One-Time	Reserves	\$ 13,184				
	<b>On-Going</b>		\$ 46,812	\$ 46,812	\$ 46,812	\$ 46,812	\$ 46,812
	<b>One-Time</b>		\$ 13,184	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
<b>Total</b>			\$ 59,996	\$ 46,812	\$ 46,812	\$ 46,812	\$ 46,812

**Impact to Capital**

There will be a small increase to the Wastewater Capital Budget in the amount of \$13,184 for minor modifications required at the Sudbury WWTP. There will be no impact to the Water/ Wastewater rate as the project will be funded from a contribution from the Capital Financing Reserve Fund - Wastewater.

Appendix 1

**FTE Table**

Position	Bargaining Unit	Duration	Permanent / Part Time	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026
Casual Waste Water Operator A	OW	On-Going	PT Hours	900	900	900	900	900
		<b>Permanent</b>		-	-	-	-	-
		<b>PT Hours</b>		900	900	900	900	900

Yearly Impact	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026
<b>On-Going</b>	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
<b>One-Time</b>	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
<b>Total</b>	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -

Net Levy Impact	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026
<b>On-Going</b>	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
<b>One-Time</b>	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
<b>Total</b>	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
<b>% Levy Increase</b>	<b>0.00%</b>				

**Implementation**

For the dumping stations at the Valley East WWTP and Chelmsford WPCP:

- a public service announcement will be issued, along with additional information posted on the City's website and external websites indicating that these sites are now closed for RV dumping; and,
- revised signage will be placed at the affected facilities, and the roadways leading to those facilities, indicating that they are now closed for RV dumping.

For the dumping station at the Sudbury WWTP:

- Wastewater Treatment staff will perform AODA modifications along with installing an automated payment system and additional signage as outlined in the report "Operation of Recreational Vehicle Dump Sites at Wastewater Treatment Facilities" presented to Operations Committee on September 20, 2021. These modifications will be completed before the peak use period (Victoria Day to Thanksgiving) in 2022.

**Advantages/Disadvantages**

Advantages	Disadvantages
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Allows for collection of a user fee to achieve cost recovery, as per CGS policy</li> <li>• Effectively mitigates identified risks to users and CGS staff</li> <li>• Allows for continued operation of the Sudbury WWTP site (365 days/year)</li> <li>• Allows for development of alternate service locations by private businesses</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reduces number of RV dumping stations from 3 to 1</li> <li>• Reduces accessibility to RV dumping stations for residents in outlying areas</li> </ul>

**V. Alternatives**

**Alternatives Considered**

Solution Options	Advantages/Disadvantages	Financial Impact
User fee of \$15/dump	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Matches average cost charged by public and private campgrounds within the boundaries of CGS.</li> <li>- Does not achieve full cost recovery; shortfall of approximately \$13,812 would be funded by a corresponding reduction in Wastewater capital projects to maintain a 4.8% water/wastewater rate increase.</li> </ul>	\$ (13,812.00)
User fee of \$30/dump	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- User fee would be approximately double the average amount charged by public and private campgrounds within the boundaries of CGS.</li> <li>- Revenue would potentially exceed operating costs (at 2,200 dumps/year), providing positive net cash flow to Water/Wastewater.</li> <li>- Magnitude of user fee would most likely drive recreational vehicle users to find alternate service providers who charge a lower fee, thereby reducing revenue.</li> </ul>	\$ 19,188.00