

## **Objectives**

The objective of this performance audit was to assess the extent of regard for economy, efficiency, and effectiveness of operations and service delivery within the Parks Services Section.

## **Scope and Methodology**

The scope of this audit included parks, athletic fields, playgrounds, campgrounds, and support services including administration, depot and fleet costs from 2019 to 2023. Ski hills, community halls, waterfront programs, pools and arenas have been excluded from the scope of this audit.

This audit included discussions with staff, field visits, reviews of time reports, financial reports, invoices, job descriptions and analysis of program costs and revenues between 2019 and 2023 as well as a review of the Parks Services budgets for 2024 and 2025.

## **Background**

The Parks Services Section maintains 1,400 hectares of parkland including 181 playgrounds, 88 play fields, 57 outdoor rinks and 180 kms of non-motorized trails, and 3 campgrounds.

The Section relies on 34 full-time, and 49 part-time, casual and temporary staff in addition to contractors to deliver programs. These figures exclude support from Corporate Services staff.

Table 1 below provides a year over year comparison of budgeted and actual costs and revenues between 2019 and 2023 and budgets for 2024 and 2025.

## **Executive Summary**

This audit identified opportunities to improve the effectiveness, efficiency and economy of service delivery as well as the alignment of the Parks Services Section with the Corporate Strategic Plan, Parks, Open Space and Leisure Master Plan, and Enterprise Risk Management process. Several significant accomplishments were also identified in the last section of the report.

## **Standards**

We conducted our audit in accordance with Generally Accepted Government Auditing Standards which require that we adequately plan audits; properly supervise staff; obtain sufficient, appropriate evidence to provide a reasonable basis for audit findings and conclusions; and document audits. For further information regarding this report, please contact Ron Foster at the City of Greater Sudbury at 705-674-4455 extension 4402 or via email at [ron.foster@greatersudbury.ca](mailto:ron.foster@greatersudbury.ca)

**Table 1 – Revenues & Expenditures**

*(In \$000s)*

Revenues & Expenditures	2019		2020*		2021*		2022*		2023		2024	2025
	Bud	Act	Bud	Act	Bud	Act	Bud	Act	Bud	Act	Bud	Bud
User fees	(500)	(485)	(541)	(79)	(386)	(155)	(573)	(419)	(635)	(463)	(654)	(673)
Lease Revenues	(140)	(165)	(175)	(95)	(195)	(212)	(217)	(281)	(217)	(294)	(217)	(217)
Other Revenues	(21)	(14)	(2)	(2)	(17)	(29)	(2)	(14)	(2)	(14)	(2)	(2)
Capital Contribution	-	(59)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total Revenues</b>	<b>(661)</b>	<b>(723)</b>	<b>(718)</b>	<b>(176)</b>	<b>(598)</b>	<b>(396)</b>	<b>(792)</b>	<b>(714)</b>	<b>(854)</b>	<b>(771)</b>	<b>(873)</b>	<b>(892)</b>
Salaries & Benefits	4,837	4,359	4,952	3,643	5,052	4,246	5,156	4,387	5,312	5,148	5,542	5,749
Materials	1,415	1,549	1,421	1,115	1,467	1,432	1,453	1,752	1,479	1,972	1,580	1,504
Purchases	994	1,468	1,002	1,086	1,001	1,322	1,036	1,491	1,036	1,768	1,036	1,040
Energy Costs	1,299	1,164	1,335	1,055	1,295	1,161	1,317	1,462	1,487	1,387	1,491	1,543
Internal Recoveries	722	730	726	736	783	818	783	744	843	902	1,209	1,254
Capital Contributions	138	153	140	170	143	143	167	180	191	202	195	199
Grants	-	25	25	25	40	36	40	37	40	9	40	40
Vehicle Rental & Financial	143	146	143	158	126	423	130	422	195	427	198	202
<b>Total Expenses</b>	<b>9,548</b>	<b>9,594</b>	<b>9,744</b>	<b>7,988</b>	<b>9,907</b>	<b>9,581</b>	<b>10,082</b>	<b>10,475</b>	<b>10,583</b>	<b>11,815</b>	<b>11,291</b>	<b>11,530</b>
<b>Net Costs</b>	<b>8,887</b>	<b>8,871</b>	<b>9,026</b>	<b>7,812</b>	<b>9,309</b>	<b>9,185</b>	<b>9,290</b>	<b>9,761</b>	<b>9,729</b>	<b>11,044</b>	<b>10,418</b>	<b>10,638</b>
<b>User Fees as % of Total Expenses</b>	<b>5.2%</b>	<b>5.0%</b>	<b>5.5%</b>	<b>1.0%</b>	<b>3.9%</b>	<b>1.6%</b>	<b>5.7%</b>	<b>4.0%</b>	<b>6.0%</b>	<b>3.9%</b>	<b>5.8%</b>	<b>5.8%</b>

\* Pandemic years

## Observation 1: Budget Vs. Actual in 2023

Table 2 below identifies the items causing significant variations between budget and actuals in 2023 and points to a need for increased controls over costs to achieve budgets in 2024 and 2025 as these variations were not offset by cost savings elsewhere in the Leisure Services budget in 2023.

**Table 2 – 2023 Budget Variances**

Item	(Under) Over Budget		Explanation
	\$ 000s	Percent	
User Fees	(170)	27%	Misclassification <sup>1</sup> of Grace Amphitheater revenues \$81K. Athletic fields under budget: \$95 K.
Purchases	732	71%	Expenditure over budget include contract services on playgrounds (\$497K), ground maintenance (\$143K) due to catch up maintenance work post pandemic. Tree purchases (\$89K).
Materials	493	33%	Over-expenditures at depots (\$314K), playgrounds (\$135K) and materials for catch up maintenance work post Pandemic.
Vehicle rental	232	119%	Expenditure of rented vehicles over budgeted amount.

User fees as a percentage of actual costs declined from 5.0% to 3.9% between 2019 to 2023 thereby forcing taxpayers to shoulder a greater portion of costs for Parks Services programs. User fee collections in 2023 fell short of the budget by approximately \$90,000 despite annual rate increases. This trend denotes a declining number of users and should prompt a review of service offerings to consider whether different, or fewer, programs should be offered.

This audit indicated that some of the above-noted shortfalls in user fees stems from the current process of providing youth clubs with unlimited bookings without reference to actual use in the prior years. This practice reduces rental revenues from casual users of sports fields. Staff also acknowledged that some casual users may not be booking these fields or paying rental fees to the City. Staff presently do not perform spot tests to verify the completeness of these revenues.

Actual expenditures on materials and purchases exceeded budgets in 2023 to catch up on maintenance that was deferred during the pandemic but also because of inflationary increases and spending above budgeted levels during Q4.

Vehicle rental expenses increased significantly since 2020 due to the shift from using old city owned vehicles.

Assigning unique cost center codes to programs with user fees facilitates comparison of costs to revenues earned. Table 3 below highlights groupings of costs and revenues where a cost center aggregates multiple activities. For example, cost center 4415 includes soccer fields, baseball, tennis courts and football fields. Cost center 4420 includes playgrounds, outdoor rinks, splash pads, basketball courts, skateboard parks, off-leash dog parks as well as pickleball courts.

### Recommendations:

1.1. In light of the declining user fees, perform a review of service offerings during the next

<sup>1</sup> Budgeted in User fees but recorded in Lease Revenues.

update of the Parks, Open Space and Leisure Master Plan to consider whether different or fewer programs should be offered to ensure these programs are financially sustainable.

- 1.2. Limit the number of field bookings that can be made each season by youth clubs considering their past utilization and other relevant factors to provide more rental opportunities to casual users that pay hourly rates.
- 1.3. Perform periodic verification with assistance from Finance staff to ensure the City is receiving all the user fees to which it is entitled.
- 1.4. Implement monthly budgetary reviews to control actual expenditures within approved budgets with assistance from Finance.
- 1.5. Assign unique cost center codes to each revenue generating activity to assess the adequacy of user fees for these activities. As a minimum, group all activities that attract user fees within cost center 4415 to facilitate matching of revenues and costs for these activities.
- 1.6. To reduce vehicle rental costs, request re-assignment of City owned vehicles that are under-utilized during summer months and rationalize the number of vehicles permanently assigned to Parks Services staff where there is minimal business usage.

### ***Management Response and Action Plan***

*We agree.*

*A business case for funding an update to the City's Parks, Open Space and Leisure Master Plan submitted as part of the 2024/2025 budget process did not receive approval. The master plan process scope of work was to include a review of service offerings for the Division. A staff-initiated business case will be submitted for consideration as part of the 2026 budget process for the required funding to complete this work.*

*The City's field allocation processes require review and should be updated to include an allocation formula. Required field hours for youth associations should be based on long term athlete development stages, governing sports body recommendations for maximum practice and play hours per week and the number of players per team and association. The development of a revised play field allocation policy should be completed in collaboration with stakeholders. The revised field allocation process will also include enhanced reporting requirements for field users to ensure that the City is receiving the appropriate user fees.*

*In Q4 of 2023, Parks Services management began the process of monthly budget reviews in collaboration with Finance staff.*

*As part of the 2024/2025 budget process, a business case was approved for the use of the digital work management system (CityWorks) in Parks Services. Once onboarded, the Parks Services Section will be better able to track activity based time and collect asset-based costs. It is expected that Parks Services will be utilizing the system in Q4 2026.*

*An alternate approach to leased vehicles for Parks Services requirements will require further review with the Assets & Fleet Services Division. The existing fleet of vehicles in Parks Services are being fully utilized. Most vehicles are assigned to crews transporting multiple staff and equipment to work locations. Staff will perform a review of usage of other Parks vehicles to ensure they are being effectively utilized (based on km/hours operated).*

## **Observation 2: Asset Condition & Service Level Impact**

According to the 2023 Asset Management Plan, approximately 25% of the Parks Services assets are in 'poor' to 'very poor' condition and 44% of these assets are in 'fair condition'. Collectively, these condition assessments indicate that current operating budgets are not sufficient to meet service level expectations for these assets.

### **Recommendation:**

- 2.1 Review the assets in 'poor' and 'very poor' condition to prioritize repairs and replacements necessary to manage risks to users of these assets.
- 2.2 As part of next phase of the Asset Management Plan which must be completed by July 1, 2025, consider establishing tiered levels of service based on usage patterns to rationalize these assets and ensure financial sustainability. For example, these plans should rationalize the number of outdoor rinks to a more manageable number.

### **Management Response and Action Plan**

*We agree.*

*The 2024/2025 budget included capital programs for community center, field house and other parks vertical assets. These funds are focused on equipment replacements, upgrades or system improvements that were identified to be critical, urgent and high priority and in fair, poor or very poor condition.*

*The City has previously identified and prioritized play equipment and outdoor sports courts rated in poor condition and has successfully leveraged grants and funding to advance revitalization of 58 playgrounds, 14 tennis court complexes and 14 basketball courts with work underway. Similar reviews and approaches are required for other parks assets including outdoor rinks, playfields, etc.*

*Phase 3 of the City's Enterprise Asset Management process will identify proposed levels of service and the existing condition of assets. Work is currently underway to meet the legislation deadline of July 1, 2025.*

## **Observation 3: Parks, Open Space and Leisure Master Plan (Master Plan)**

The purpose of the original Master Plan from 2004 was to examine all aspects of parks and leisure in an effort to address current and future needs in a prioritized, fiscally responsible, and community-responsive manner. The main objective of the 2014 update to the Master Plan was to realign the City's parks, trails, recreation and leisure services programs and facilities with the community's changing needs subject to 12 guiding principles including financial sustainability.

The 2019 update of the Master Plan indicated that significant work was pending to implement the recommendations from 2014 Master Plan including key strategies to achieve financial sustainability. However, the 2019 update did not consider the City’s requirement to prepare an Asset Management Plan which requires budgets to be aligned with service levels. Our audit indicated that the business case to update the Master Plan included in the 2024-2025 budget was not approved.

**Recommendation:**

3.0 Issue a Request for Proposals in 2026 to update the Master Plan to realign the City’s Parks, Trails, Recreation, and Leisure services programs and facilities with the community’s changing needs and the City’s financial constraints following the completion of the Asset Management Plan in 2025.

**Management Response and Action Plan**

*We agree. The business case for funding an update to the City’s Parks, Open Space and Leisure Master Plan submitted as part of the 2024/2025 budget process identified the need to review recommended provision levels and develop new metrics to guide and measure future service delivery including considerations for geographical distribution based on population projections, resident feedback, etc. A staff-initiated business case will be submitted for the required funding to complete this work.*

**Observation 4: User Preferences and Asset Utilization**

Management collects periodic user information for most park infrastructures. While this information is available in a retrievable form, it is not structured or systematic.

**Table 3 – User Preferences between 2014 and 2019**

Asset Type	Cost Center	2014		2019		Rank Change	Notes
		Facility Nos.	Rank	Facility Nos.	Rank		
Nature Trails	4424	173 km	1	180 km	1	None	39 trails
Multi-use Trails	4424	Incl. above	5	Incl. above	2	↑	Popularity increased to 2 <sup>nd</sup> spot.
Playgrounds	4420	179	3	181	3	None	Facilities increased by 6%
Splash pads	4420	8	9	14	7	↑	Increased popularity No. of pads increased by 75%.
Outdoor Rinks	4420	56	4	57	8	↓	Popularity fell by 4 points
Off-Leash Dog Parks	4420	1	17	2	11	↑	Significant rise in popularity and increase in facilities.
Skateboard Parks	4420	10	15	10	13	↑	Increasing popularity
Basketball Courts	4420	31	20	31	18	↑	Increasing popularity
Pickleball Courts	4420	0	Not rated	10	Not rated	None	

Baseball/Softball Diamonds	4415	73	<b>18</b>	73	<b>16</b>	↑	Increasing popularity
Tennis Courts	4415	59	<b>19</b>	53	<b>20</b>	↓	Some converted to Pickleball
Football Fields	4415	Incl. above	<b>22</b>	Incl. above	<b>22</b>	None	Numbers included in Soccer fields below
Soccer Fields	4415	93	<b>12</b>	93	<b>24</b>	↓	Reduced popularity and competing fields owned by School Boards

**Recommendation:**

4.0 Capture data about utilization of the above assets and incorporate it into the 2025 Asset Management Planning process and update of the master plan to facilitate the rationalization of Parks Services assets and service levels and operating budgets.

**Management Response and Action Plan**

We agree.

*Capturing utilization data for Parks Services presents challenges as these types of types of facilities are for the most part unstaffed/unmonitored, don't require registration and are spread out throughout the community. Historically we have relied on surveys on user preferences, conducted in conjunction with Master Plans, to gauge user preference.*

*More recently, the Leisure Services Division has implemented counters to monitor trail and outdoor court usage at a limited number of areas. This technology provides data that informs utilization patterns. Staff will also explore the resourcing available and effectiveness of utilizing summer employees to conduct spot audits to collect user data.*

*Leisure Services Division staff are also actively researching emerging technologies for capturing utilization data for parks. Several communities are utilizing movement data or geofencing, which provides data based on mobile device use in a geographic area.*

*To expand on or implement these types of technology, additional review by Information Technology staff and resourcing (budget) is required.*

**5. Service Levels & Key Performance Indicators (KPIs)**

Service level comparisons provide insights into costs, trends, and practices of other municipalities. The service levels outlined in 2024-2025 budget for the Parks Services include:

- i. Area of maintained parkland per 1000 residents,
- ii. Forecast of utilized playfield bookings and
- iii. Number of service requests received.

The budget package also provides the operating cost of Parks per capita with the municipal median for 2022 i.e., \$70.73 as compared to municipal median of \$68.10. Tables 4 and 5 below provide additional performance information from the annual MBNCAN and BMA studies.

**Table 4 – Parkland Comparators (MBNCAN Study)**

<b>City Demographics</b>	Windsor	Hamilton	<b>Sudbury</b>	Peer Average*
Urban Area Sq. KMs	147	263	<b>167</b>	205
Total Mun. Area- Sq. KMs	147	1,128	<b>3,625</b>	638
Pop. Density/Sq. KM	1,579	524	<b>46</b>	1,052
<b>Service Level: All Parkland in as a Percent of Total Area of Municipality</b>				
2020	6.9%	2.3%	<b>1.1%</b>	4.6%
2021	6.9%	2.3%	<b>1.1%</b>	4.6%
2022	6.9%	2.3%	<b>1.1%</b>	4.6%
<b>All Parkland in Designated Urban Area as Percent of Urban Area</b>				
2020	6.8%	9.8%	<b>4.9%</b>	8.3%
2021	6.8%	8.6%	<b>4.9%</b>	7.7%
2022	6.8%	8.1%	<b>4.9%</b>	7.5%
<b>Service Level – Hectares per 100,000 Population</b>				
<i>Maintained Parkland</i>				
2020	248	249	<b>867</b>	249
2021	250	248	<b>843</b>	249
2022	247	243	<b>843</b>	245
<i>Natural Parkland</i>				
2020	194	202	<b>1,617</b>	198
2021	195	200	<b>1,573</b>	197
2022	193	197	<b>1,573</b>	195
<b>Economy Measure–Operating Cost \$ per Hectare of Maintained &amp; Natural Parkland</b>				
2020	\$18,318	\$8,247	<b>\$2,278</b>	\$13,283
2021	\$22,055	\$10,424	<b>\$2,459</b>	\$16,240
2022	\$22,850	\$12,878	<b>\$2,928</b>	\$17,864

**Table 5 – Cost Comparisons for Parks Services (BMA Study)**

<b>City</b>	Guelph	Windsor	Kingston	Thunder Bay	Hamilton	<b>Sudbury</b>	Peer Average*
<b>Net Costs per \$100,000 Assessment – Excluding Amortization</b>							
2021	\$52	\$78	\$44	\$100	\$45	<b>\$53</b>	\$64
2022	\$64	\$90	\$43	\$105	\$53	<b>\$65</b>	\$71
2023	\$66	\$87	\$70	\$123	\$62	<b>\$65</b>	\$82
<b>Net Costs per \$100,000 Current Value Assessment – Excluding Amortization</b>							
2021	\$24	\$102	\$32	\$98	\$32	<b>\$49</b>	\$58
2022	\$29	\$121	\$32	\$103	\$38	<b>\$60</b>	\$65
2023	\$30	\$120	\$51	\$122	\$45	<b>\$60</b>	\$74

\* Peer Average excludes Sudbury.



## **Recommendation:**

- 5.1 Augment the existing information in the annual budget with additional performance measures of relevant comparative municipalities in Ontario from MBNCAN and BMA reports to provide more fulsome performance information to Council.
- 5.2 Identify revenue targets and actual revenues for activities that attract user fees.
- 5.3 Identify actual usage levels and targets for the major Parks Services assets such as the Grace Amphitheatre.

## **Management Response and Action Plan**

*We agree.*

*Organizationally, work is underway to update metrics within the City's 48 service profiles. This work is being led by the City's Data, Analytics and Change division. Upon completion, there will be enhanced service level, activity level and performance measures for the Parks and Open Space service and reported in a standardized way. A review of the Parks and Open Space Service area is scheduled for November 2024.*

## **Observation 6: Zero-Based Review**

Parks Services are completely discretionary services that are not necessary to comply with federal or provincial legislation – except for the City's Official Plan which provides the City with the discretion to define these service levels.

Service levels for Parks have traditionally been provided to support healthy lifestyles within the City and to respond to community preferences. While previous master plans have considered the cost of Parks Services, the affordability and financial sustainability of these services has only been one of a dozen different principles considered within the master planning process. Zero-based budget reviews provide the City with an opportunity to reconsider the planning approach for Parks Services as well as the funding levels to support these assets.

In 2025, provincial asset management legislation will force the City to prepare a long-term plan to address the 25% of Parks Services assets that are in poor or very poor condition and 44% of these assets that are in fair condition. Operating and capital plans will have to increase substantially to address the condition of these assets, or the City will have to change our master planning approach to adopt services levels which are more financially sustainable.

## **Recommendations:**

- 6.1 Rationalize the Parks Services assets during the asset management planning process in 2025 and the master planning process in 2026 to provide financially sustainable services using a tiered approach that identifies primary, secondary and tertiary assets.

- 6.2 Prepare a business case to assess the potential opportunity to perform snow clearing activities for parking lots that are presently contracted out to improve the utilization of existing Parks Services staff during the winter.
- 6.3 Prepare a business case to assess the potential opportunity to perform additional grass cutting activities that are presently contracted out to reduce the overall cost of program delivery within the City.

### **Management Response and Action Plan**

*We agree.*

*The planned work with the next phase of Asset Management Planning and the renewal of the Parks, Open Space and Leisure Master Plan, present opportunities to revisit provision level targets and rationalize the services provided by Parks Services. This work also includes the opportunity to introduce or reevaluate classification systems for various Parks assets with corresponding service levels to ensure the Section can provide financially sustainable services. For example, a classification system for non-motorized trails could be introduced (active transportation primary routes, recreational trails, wilderness trails) that would establish appropriate levels of services for each type of trail.*

*A staff-initiated business case will be submitted regarding bringing snow clearing activities in-house. Further review with other departments and divisions is required to examine opportunities for conducting more grass cutting and horticulture work for others. This will be examined in 2025.*

### **Observation 7: Significant Accomplishments**

1. Sudbury's operating costs per hectare of parkland are lower than those within of our municipal peers.
2. The Parks Services Section managed costs effectively during the first two years of the pandemic in 2020 and 2021.
3. Levels of absenteeism and overtime within Parks Services were much lower than average levels within the City between 2019 and 2023.
4. The Section successfully provided services during 2023 with a reduced level of management resources that will help them achieve budget targets in 2024 and future years.
5. The City has been successful in leveraging \$4.3 million towards outdoor court revitalization and \$1.3 million towards trail and track improvements at Bell Park, Delki Dozzi Sports Complex and Fielding Memorial Park.
6. The City has invested \$2.3 million in playground revitalization and has received funding from United Way Centraide Northeastern Ontario in the amount of \$250,000 for the Playground Revitalization project.

7. The City has developed a Community Led Projects Guide and made improvements to the Parks Donation and Memorial Program in order to encourage and support investment by others in parks equipment and upgrades.

**Table 6 – Summary of Significant Risks**

Risk	Total No. of Risks	Risks (Before Controls)			Residual Risks (After Controls)		
		High (15 to 25)	Med (9 to 14.99)	Low (1 to 8.99)	High (15 to 25)	Med (9 to 14.99)	Low (1 to 8.99)
Reputation (R)	1	0	1	0	0	0	1
Operational (O)	5	5	0	0	0	5	0
Financial (F)	5	5	0	0	0	5	0
Legal (L)	1	0	1	0	0	0	1
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>2</b>

**Table 7 – Significant Risks**

Risk	Description of Risk	Inherent Risk	Residual Risk*
O1/F1	Parks services processes may not align with objectives Corporate Strategic Plan	22	12
O2/F2	Parks services processes may not align with master plans and long-term financial plans.	22	12
O3/F3	Parks services processes may not align with the Enterprise Asset Management policy.	20	10
O4/F4	Parks services processes may not be delivered with due regard for economy, effectiveness, and efficiency.	22	13
O5/F5	Parks services processes may not align with the Enterprise Risk Management policy.	21	11
L1/R1	Legal & regulatory obligations may not be met.	14	8

\* Eliminating residual risks (risks after controls) is not cost-effective.

Impact	Services	Technology	People	Strategic	Legal/Reputational	Financial
<b>Very Minor (1)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Less than 90% of service objectives achieved.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Minor performance issues or lack of availability of secondary systems, data loss or corruption.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Minor reportable employee injury.</li> <li>• Increase in number of union grievances.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Minor instances of actions that are at odds with strategic priorities.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Small amount of negative media coverage or complaints to City.</li> <li>• Non-lasting damage or no reputational damage</li> <li>• Theft or Fraud under \$1,000</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Uninsured loss, cost overruns or fines &lt; \$10K</li> <li>• Insured loss &lt; \$100K</li> <li>• Loss of replaceable asset.</li> </ul>
<b>Minor (2)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Less than 75% of service objectives achieved.</li> <li>• Unable to perform non-essential service.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Performance or availability issues with secondary systems or data loss or corruption</li> <li>• Disclosure of non-confidential but embarrassing information.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reportable employee injury.</li> <li>• Loss of key staff but able to recruit competent replacements</li> <li>• Significant increase (&gt;10%) in number of union grievances.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Instances of actions at odds with strategic priorities.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Complaints elevated t the Director level.</li> <li>• Short-term repairable damage to City's reputation</li> <li>• Public outcry for discipline of employee.</li> <li>• Moderate amount of negative media coverage</li> <li>• Theft or Fraud of \$1,000 to \$10,000.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Uninsured loss, cost overruns or fines of \$10K to \$100K</li> <li>• Insured loss &lt; \$100K - \$1M</li> <li>• Inefficient processes</li> <li>• City's actions result in reduced economic development.</li> </ul>
<b>Moderate (3)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Less than 60% of service objectives achieved.</li> <li>• Unable to perform essential service but alternatives exist.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Disruptions or performance issues with significant systems or data loss or corruption</li> <li>• Recoverable data loss from an important system.</li> <li>• Minor disclosure of confidential information.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Multiple employee injuries or long-term disability from one incident.</li> <li>• Inability to retain or attract competent staff.</li> <li>• Increase in stress leave, sick leave or WCB claims.</li> <li>• Work-to-rule union disagreement or short-term strike.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Numerous actions are at odds with strategic priorities.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Public/media outcry for removal of management</li> <li>• Long-term damage to City's reputation</li> <li>• Citizen satisfaction survey indicates unacceptable performance.</li> <li>• Complaints elevated to Council level.</li> <li>• Results inconsistent with commitments made to citizens</li> <li>• Theft or Fraud under \$100,000.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Uninsured loss, cost overruns or fines of &gt;\$100K to \$1M</li> <li>• Insured loss &gt;\$1M to \$10M</li> <li>• Having to delay payments to contractors/suppliers.</li> <li>• &gt;20% current demands cannot be services with existing and approved infrastructure.</li> <li>• City's actions results in lost revenue for significant number of City businesses.</li> </ul>

Impact	Services	Technology	People	Strategic	Legal/Reputational	Financial
<b>Major (4)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Less than 45% of service objectives achieved.</li> <li>• Unable to perform an essential service where no alternative exists.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Unrecoverable loss or corruption of data from an important system</li> <li>• Unavailability or major performance issues with significant systems</li> <li>• Disclosure of sensitive or confidential information</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Serious injury of one or more employees</li> <li>• Legal judgment against the City in workplace matter.</li> <li>• Turnover of key employees</li> <li>• Sustained strike of services.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Numerous actions are significantly at odds with the strategic priorities.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Public/media outcry for change in CAO or Council</li> <li>• Public or senior officials charged or convicted.</li> <li>• Legal judgment against the City in a workplace matter</li> <li>• Integrity breach resulting in decreased trust in City Council or Administration.</li> <li>• Theft or Fraud &gt;\$100,000</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Uninsured loss, cost overruns or fines of &gt;\$1M - \$10M</li> <li>• Insured loss of &gt;\$10M - \$100M</li> <li>• Unable to pay employees and contractors on a time.</li> <li>• Failure to maintain financial capacity to support current demands. City's actions impair local economic conditions.</li> </ul>
<b>Extreme (5)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Less than 30% of service objectives achieved.</li> <li>• Unable to perform several essential services where no alternatives exist.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Unrecoverable loss or corruption of data from a critical system</li> <li>• Unavailability of critical systems</li> <li>• Major disclosure of sensitive or confidential information</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Death of an employee</li> <li>• Major legal judgment against the City in workplace matter.</li> <li>• Significant turnover of key employees with ELT</li> <li>• Sustained strike of key services</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Many actions are significantly at odds with the strategic priorities.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Public/media outcry for change in CAO or Council</li> <li>• Senior officials criminally charged or convicted.</li> <li>• Severe legal judgment against the City in a workplace matter</li> <li>• Major integrity breach resulting in complete loss of trust in City Council or Administration.</li> <li>• Theft/Fraud &gt;\$1,000,000</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Uninsured loss, cost overruns or fines &gt;\$10M</li> <li>• Insured loss &gt; \$100M</li> <li>• File for bankruptcy</li> <li>• Failure to maintain financial capacity to support current demands.</li> <li>• City's actions significantly impair local economic conditions.</li> </ul>

Likelihood	Unlikely (1)	Possible (2)	Probable (3)	Likely (4)	Very Likely (5)
	Less than 20%	>20% but < 40%	>40% but < 60%	>60% but < 80%	80% or more
	Less frequent than every 10 years	May occur in the next 2 years	Will occur this year or next year at least once	May occur regularly this year	Will occur within months may reoccur often