**2018 Budget – Council Question and Answers**

**1. Question (R. Lapierre):**
**I was wondering if we could share the following information in regards to the Hospice ask of 750K. How much capital dollars (either 1 time grants or annual allocation) have we given the Hospice (don't forget they were called Vale prior to current name)? How much HCI funds have been spent for capital? for their RBC run? for any donations? appliances or anything like this (please go back as far as possible)? I would like to understand if the beds being proposed in this addition are the reserved for Greater Sudbury Residents only! Will Greater Sudbury residents get priority or placement at the hospice? Is the hospice tax exempt. If so when did this pass at council and what is the annual value of this?**

Answer:
The history of municipal funding provided to the Hospice is as follows:

- 2007 Budget process, the City of Greater Sudbury approved a one-time capital allocation of $200,000 towards the construction of the Hospice
- 2011 HCI funds of $5,000 for dishwasher
- 2012 Budget process, the City of Greater Sudbury approved a one-time grant of $56,544 related to property taxes from 2008 to 2010.
- 2013 HCI donation of $1,000 towards Hike for Hospice fund raising event
- 2014 HCI donation of $2,000 towards Hike for Hospice fund raising event

In August 2011, the province granted all non-profit hospices property tax exemption retroactive to January 1st of that year. For 2010, the annual property taxes for the Maison Vale Inco Hospice were $24,106.72.
The hospice beds are not reserved only for Sudbury Residents, however they are available to eligible individuals in need of palliative care.

**2. Question (D. McIntosh):**
**Four laning MR 35: Borrowing $33.2m and Event Centre borrowing $100m**

- **What is the expected interest rate? (for each project)**
- **What will be the loan terms? (for each project)**
- **What will be the total cost of each loan (interest and principal)? (for each project)**

Answer:
For MR 35 and the Event Centre, we used estimated interest rates and terms for the budget as the City will need to complete an RFP process to obtain external debt financing. When the RFP process is complete and based on the actual construction prices, the budget will be revised accordingly with the actual interest rates, terms and borrowing amount.

For MR 35, the external debt was estimated at 3.8% interest rate over 25 years with an estimated borrowing (principal) amount of $30,854,201 (based on page 319 (project line for MR 35 Funding from External Debt Financing) of the budget document). The total project cost is estimated at $33,189,447 with current year funding from the capital envelopes of $2,335,246 and the remaining amount from external debt financing of $30,854,201 requiring annual debt repayments of $1,933,508 from 2019 through to 2043 (or 25 years). The total cost of this loan is estimated at $48,337,700 which includes the principal amount of $30,854,201 and interest expense of $17,483,499.

For the Event Centre, the external debt was estimated at 4% interest rate over 30 years with an estimated borrowing (principal) amount of $90 million (based on page 225 of the budget document). The total project cost is estimated at $100,100,000 which will be funded from external debt financing of $90 million, fund-raising of $10,000,000, and naming rights of $100,000. The annual debt repayment will be $5.2 million. The total cost of this loan is estimated at $156 Million which includes the principal amount of $90 Million and interest expense of $66 Million.

**3. Question (D. McIntosh):**
**What is the average age of our City owned winter maintenance equipment/plows(page 9)?**

Answer:
With the delivery of the 9 new plow trucks in December, the average age of our multi-purpose plow trucks will be 7 years.

The average age of our sidewalk plows is 7.5 years

**4. Question (D. McIntosh):**
**Do we have any 2017 dollar numbers to date as a result of the new collection measures for defaulted Provincial Offences (page 79)?**

Answer:
The city has received approximately $7,500 from 5 debtors since implementing the new collection measures in July.

**5. Question (D. McIntosh):**
**Additional operating costs for Kivi Park: I've confirmed that the new play structure is on private property and there are no plans for tennis or volley ball courts on city owned lands. Can we adjust the budget appropriately (page 155)?**

Answer:
Budget estimates were based on the City Council report titled 'Kivi Park Development Update' presented on February 28, 2017. At the time the business case was submitted, the Clifford & Lily Fielding Foundation had not advised that plans for Phase Two developments had been altered. Budget estimates associated with the elements mentioned were as follows:

- Maintenance for volleyball courts - $5,000 annually
- Maintenance for tennis courts - $2,500 annually
- Maintenance for new play structure - $1,000 annually

The base budget will be reduced by $8,500

**6. Question (D. McIntosh):**
**Development Engineering: Transfer of Review Fees not changed. Fees are determined by Ministry of Environment and Climate Change. Do we have full cost recovery on these costs? If not, how much is not being recovered(page 392)?**

Answer:
Transfer or Review fees are at full cost recovery

**7. Question (D. McIntosh):**
**Ski Hill passes. In previous years we have planned to close the hills on a set date and yet there is still ample snow for skiing. Can we not have expiry dates for the annual passes and after the expiry date if the hill remains open past a designated date everyone would have to pay a daily fee? This would help recover the costs of an unplanned extended season(page 421).**

Answer:
Operational budgets are based on a fixed operating season, with the season ending the last weekend of March Break. There is an end date posted on seasonal passes (March 18, 2018 for the 2017/2018 season). Daily lift fees generated from charging the regular user fee to all ski hill users would be minimal. Each additional day operating beyond the posted season would result in operating deficits.

**8. Question (D. McIntosh):**
**Transit passes. Pg 428: Day Passes and Family Passes. What has the uptake been on these options? If it is low, perhaps we should look at holding the price at 2017 levels and investigate how we can better promote the option.**

Answer:
This fare type was introduced in June 2016. The following represents the inventory sold to date and the resulting ridership totals.

| | Jun-Dec 2016 | Ridership | Jan-Oct 2017 | Ridership |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Day Pass | 600 | 1951 | 781 | 2431 |
| Family Pass | 499 | 1331 | 723 | 1502 |

Through the Transit Action Plan process, fares and incentives will be reviewed and recommendations will be made to Council on the proper distribution of fare discounts based on the type of fare.

**9. Question (M. Vagnini):**
**Page 16. Why is population shown at 166,000 when the Census shows 161,000?**

Answer:
The 2016 Census for Greater Sudbury CMA shows a population of approximately 165,000. The statistics on page 16 come from the Metropolitan Outlook 2, Summer 2017, and Conference Board of Canada.

**10. Question (M. Vagnini):**
**Page 23. If these claims are valid, an explanation of how the projects will improve connectivity and future growth should accompany the claims. The statements made conflict with each other.**

Answer:
The ongoing construction of Hwy 69 is evidence that the Province is committed to completing this expansion. The four-lining of Hwy 69 is a critical component for the City's future connectivity to the GTA and economic Success.

The Maley Drive extension is already having an impact in terms of discussion for potential business expansion opportunities within the City and we expect that to continue and be realized fully with the completion of the project.

**11. Question (M. Vagnini):**
**Page 24 indicates that the infrastructure deficit now stands at $1.9 billion. Did the construction work of 2017 have any impact on reducing this? Where did the reductions if any occur? What is the breakdown of that comparison by Roads, Water/Wastewater and Assets?**

Answer:
As per the 2017 Long Term Financial Plan, there was an immediate need of $1.9 billion and needs of $1.2 billion for the remaining 10 years. This would entail an estimated capital requirement over the 10 years of $310 million per year not accounting for inflation. The City's total capital budget in 2017 was $220 million (excluding Police Services). As a result, there were no reductions.

**12. Question (M. Vagnini):**
**Page 25. Are there specific budget items contained in the Budget towards addressing the Asset conditions? If not, why not? What is delaying the addressing of these issues?**

Answer:
All projects are classified in the Capital Budget Detail reports that are included in the published budget document as "New"(N), "Expansion" (E) or "Renewal" (R). Projects with an "R" label are asset renewal projects. The vast majority of projects included in the capital budget are asset renewal projects. To address asset renewal needs at a faster pace, more resources (both financial resources and staff time) need to be available.

**13. Question (M. Vagnini):**
**Page 26. If the above conditions are not being addressed why are we planning on adding to those cost burdens? What is the business rationale behind creating more cost burdens instead of addressing those that already exist and are growing at an alarming rate? We heard in 2012 that an infrastructure deficit of $1.4 billion existed. This Budget indicates that the deficit has now grown to $1.9 billion. Where has the growth came from?**

Answer:
Asset renewal needs are being addressed.

The increase in infrastructure requirements from $1.4 billion in 2012 to $1.9 billion in 2017 is due to more assets reaching the end of their useful lives in any given year compared to those that can be rehabilitated or replaced within the capital budget. The initial study in 2012 included only roads, water, and wastewater assets, the more recent study reflects the addition of other asset classes.

**14. Question (M. Vagnini):**
**Page 31. How is the process presently being used engaging the public? A total of 7 people attended the meeting in Lively. It should be noted that many people are not attending due to an expectation of the same type of presentation as happened for the Optimization Plan in Lively. Follow-up is demonstrated in the questions being asked as presented herein.**

Answer:
The entire budget process is open and transparent. Residents can engage through several ways:

- Through discussions with their ward councilor anytime, or in anticipation of the staff reports published as part of this process (i.e. Budget Directions in May, Budget update in September and the Budget report in December)
- Online via the interactive "build your own budget" tool that was available during the budget development process, or by commenting on the draft budget document itself, released for public review November 7
- In person through a series of "open house"-style meetings held throughout Greater Sudbury

**15. Question (M. Vagnini):**
**Page 36. At the same time as the deficit has been ballooning, the debt per household in 2016 is 250% of what it was in 2014 when Council was elected. The amount of City debt related to the size of the community has multiplied by 2.5 times in just 2 years. The debt to revenue ration has increased by 240% over the same 2-year time period. The same page talks about sustainability. How can this rate of indebtedness growth be sustainable?**

Answer:
Debt levels in Greater Sudbury remain among the lowest of any Ontario municipality. Where debt has been incurred, it has been used to fund asset purchases that will serve several generations of taxpayers. Debt is a legitimate financing option for municipalities and, where it is used to fund asset purchases or asset renewal investments like it has been (and is anticipated to be) in Greater Sudbury, is a useful part of a sustainable financing plan. From a sustainability perspective, Greater Sudbury's relatively high asset consumption ratio (p. 36) suggests our capital assets are older and closer to reaching the end of their useful life than other municipalities. To maintain service levels without interruption, the use of debt for asset renewal will likely be a regular part of future budget deliberations.

**16. Question (M. Vagnini):**
**Page 37. The debt interest as a % of revenues increased by 0.1% in the fiscal year 2014 to 2015. The debt to reserve ratio increased from 0.2 (one fifth) to 0.5 (one half) over the same one-year period. Is this a trend that is still occurring and if so what is the projected time when the debt will be larger than the reserves? The arena/event centre alone will push this ratio to greater than 1 meaning the City debt will exceed the reserve value. Other major projects will continue to push that ratio even higher.**

Answer:
The City of Greater Sudbury's reserve levels are relatively low compared to other municipalities. City Council decides whether to increase reliance on debt financing based on its understanding of service level requirements and other funding options available at the time the decision to use debt is being considered. If Council wanted to maintain a target level for its debt:reserve ratio, it could change either the level of debt incurred or the value of reserves. Such a decision would be timely when reviewing the long range financial plan approved by Council earlier this year.

**17. Question (M. Vagnini):**

**Page 39. It is stated that the City revenues are used to provide and maintain existing service levels and sustain infrastructure. As indicated by the increase in infrastructure deficit from $1.4 billion to $1.9 billion this does not appear to be happening and service levels to the public have been noticeably shrinking. What provisions have been made in this Budget to reverse that trend?**

Answer:
The service levels provided in the 2018 Budget reflect the 2017 service levels approved by Council. Work continues on completing asset condition assessments and incorporating those details into asset management plans. These plans inform capital budgeting decisions.

**18. Question (M. Vagnini):**
**Page 43. The Reserve fund balance has shrunk from about $165 million in 2015 (first year of this Council) to about $125 million in 2017 and a projected value of under $100 million in 2018. That represents a shrinkage of about 40% in three years. If this rate of shrinkage continues there will be no reserves left by the end of the next term of Council in 2022 with the debt. What steps are being taken to stop the shrinkage? See also Page 52.**

Answer:
Council approved a long range financial plan ("LRFP") in the second quarter of 2017. The 2018 budget recommendations were developed to align with the forecasts included in the LRFP.

**19. Question (M. Vagnini):**
**Page 44. Isn't debt per capita a misleading indicator? Cities with different demographics will have different per capita numbers whereas debt per household or per ratepayer would be a better indicator. Does the OMBI track the debt on this basis? In aging communities where a high number of Seniors are resident in Senior's Homes such as Sudbury do the numbers accurately reflect anything meaningful?**

Answer:
Our benchmarking network compares service levels and service performance. It does not compare financing choices among municipalities. As described on p. 37, we provide a variety of indicators using several different views to offer some context for understanding Greater Sudbury's use of debt. By any measure, our debt levels are low. We have capacity for managing a higher level of debt so that we can accelerate asset renewal investments, but whether we use that capacity remains City Council's choice.

**20. Question (M. Vagnini):**
**Page 46. Development charges collected has been in decline since 2011 (40%) and have dropped by about 20% from 2014 to 2016. Is this due to a major slowing of growth in the City. Is this slowing reflected in the expenses being projected? What are the estimated development charges for 2017? What are the projected development charges for 2018?**

Answer:
Based on Building Department statistics, growth is increasing. Development charges are estimated to be approximately $3.3 million in 2017, which will be further described in a report scheduled for presentation to Council by June 2018. Page 16 of the budget document reflects the growth in industrial, commercial, and institutional activity.

**21. Question (M. Vagnini):**
**Page 52. As the full-time positions are only changing by a reduction of 1 are the additional positions identified in the business cases then simply replacing existing positions and are not new positions?**

Answer:
The budget summaries on page 52, and throughout the operating budget section of this document are reflective of the base budget and the resources required to provide the current levels of service. These do not include any proposed additions included in the business case section as these service changes have not yet been approved by Council.

**22. Question (M. Vagnini):**
**Volunteers are shown as 350 with no change from 2017. Are these the same Volunteers as the 350 shown with Fire Services on page 150? If so, the 350 number has never been met but has apparently been budgeted for. Where have the budget funds for the missing Volunteers been going and is it the intent of this Budget to continue that practice?**

Answer:
Yes, these are the same 350 volunteers as shown on page 150 and is the Council approved staffing levels for Volunteer Services. Although Fire Services has never reached this goal, they endeavor to continue to increase the volunteer capacity. Any surplus in one area would go towards deficits in other areas which can be driven by changes in fire activity over the course of the year.

**23. Question (M. Vagnini):**
**Page 52. Contributions to Reserve and Capital show $5.605 million and Contributions from Reserve and Capital show $1.175 million indicating an increase in Reserve and Capital of about $4.43 million. The chart on Page 43 indicates a decrease in Reserve of about $30 million. How is this rationalized?**

Answer:
The contribution to reserve and capital includes the contribution to capital envelopes used to fund the 2018 capital budget.

The decrease in reserves on page 43 reflects the anticipated draws for previous Council approved projects, as well as draws from reserve for the 2018 capital budget.

**24. Question (M. Vagnini):**
**Page 52. The total Budget is indicated as increasing by 3.9% and if the Business Cases are included that rises to 4.12%. This indicates that only the tax levy is held at 3.5% not the Budget. Is this correct?**

Answer:
Page 52 shows the overall operating budget (Net Budget – amount to be collected from property taxation) proposes an increase of 4.0% over the 2017 Council approved budget. The value of staff recommended business cases for service level change adds an additional 0.3% increase bringing the total increase to 4.3% before considering assessment growth of 0.8%. This results in a recommended 3.5% tax increase.

**25. Question (M. Vagnini):**

**Page 52. In spite of an increase of 7.2% in Contributions to Reserve and Capital the Reserve Fund is predicted to decrease by about 25% (Page 43). Where is that money going?**

Answer:
Refer to response on question #23.

**26. Question (M. Vagnini):**
**Page 55. Do these Staffing changes include those changes included in the Business Cases?**

Answer:
No.

**27. Question (M. Vagnini):**
**Page 57. Looking at out-of-pocket cost to the tax payers the numbers on this page look like the following.**

**With a declining population the increase in user fee collection would appear to be overly optimistic or increased rates produces the 14.9% indicated. Which is the case?**

| CONSOLIDATED BUDGET 2018 | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **2018** | **Operating** | **Capital** | **Totals** |
| **Tax Levy** | $259,624,092 | $38,434,776 | $298,058,868 |
| **User Fees** | $120,108,774 | $32,518,779 | $152,627,553 |
| | $379,732,866 | $70,953,555 | $450,686,421 |
| **2017** | **Operating** | **Capital** | **Totals** |
| **Tax Levy** | $249,519,826 | $37,121,297 | $286,641,123 |
| **User Fees** | $114,412,140 | $28,302,725 | $142,714,865 |
| | $363,931,966 | $65,424,022 | $429,355,988 |
| **Increase 2017 to 2018** | | | |
| **Tax Levy** | $10,104,266 | $1,313,479 | $11,417,745 |
| **User Fees** | $5,696,634 | $4,216,054 | $9,912,688 |
| | $15,800,900 | $5,529,533 | $21,330,433 |
| **Increase 2017 to 2018** | | | |
| **Tax Levy** | 4.05% | 3.54% | 3.98% |
| **User Fees** | 4.98% | 14.90% | 6.95% |
| | 4.34% | 8.45% | 4.97% |

Answer:
Based on the latest census data, Greater Sudbury is the only community in northern Ontario that saw a population increase. The proposed water/wastewater rate increase is 7.4% for 2018, consistent with the direction provided by the Finance and Administration Committee in May of 2017 and with the long range financial plan for water and wastewater services. The 2018 budget reflects a larger portion of user fee revenues used to fund the water/wastewater capital program.

**28. Question (M. Vagnini):**
**Page 62. Councillor expenses aren't shown. Have these been changed? An increase is needed over past levels if Councillors are to have the ability to communicate effectively with their constituents.**

Answer:
As per the Operating Budget preparation policy, and consistent with all other operating departments, an inflationary increase of 2% was added to Councillor expenses.

**29. Question (M. Vagnini):**
**Page 147. Why does the Paramedics budget sit at 1.7% when there are known deficiencies?**

Answer:
The increases reflected in Paramedic Services are inline with budget directions. There are pending legislative changes that will allow certified Paramedics to demonstrate new patient care models such as treat & release and diversions strategies. These changes may result in increased capacity within the system. Once the impact of these changes are known, if Paramedic Services determines a need for additional resources a business case would be prepared and submitted for Council's consideration.

**30. Question (M. Vagnini):**
**Page 149. OMBI Key Performance Indicators.**

| | OMBI - KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | URBAN | | | RURAL | | |
| | Reported | Median | % | Reported | Median | % |
| 2010 | 9.48 | 6.7 | 141% | 17.92 | 13.3 | 135% |
| 2011 | 9.18 | 6.93 | 132% | 17.38 | 14.65 | 119% |
| 2012 | 9.33 | 6.62 | 141% | 19.50 | 14.80 | 132% |
| 2016 | 9.57 | 6.63 | 144% | 15.18 | 14.43 | 105% |
| % Change | 0.95% | -1.04% | | -15.29% | 8.50% | |

**In comparison to previous OMBI data, Sudbury Urban Response times have increased by about 1% since 2010 while Median Urban Response times have decreased by about 1% making the Urban response 144% of the Provincial median.**
**At the same time Sudbury Rural Response times have decreased by about 15% while Median Response times increased by about 8.5% making the Rural response 105% of the Provincial median.**
**Is there any explanation for this?**

Answer:
2016 is the first year that Fire Services had a reliable data set based on the implementation of a records management system (Fire House) in 2015. Prior to 2015, the data available to Fire Services was based on paper records that required staff to manually gather and interpret the data.

These numbers fluctuate from year to year and can be impacted by the number of calls, call location and availability of volunteer respondents.

**31. Question (M. Vagnini):**
**Page 150. Fire Services budgets used to show Career costs and Volunteer costs separately. Is that separation still available and can it be provided?**

Answer:
Please see the attached supplemental information.

**32. Question (M. Vagnini):**
**Page 150. Why does the Fire Services budget sit at 3.0% when there are known deficiencies?**

Answer:
The increases reflected in Fire Services are inline with budget directions. There are eight (8) business cases which represent approximately $3.5 million for Fire Services in the 2018 budget for Council's consideration. These are service enhancements, shown separately from the base budget in accordance with Council's budget directions, that could address known deficiencies.

**33. Question (M. Vagnini):**
**Page 150. Why is the Budget showing 350 volunteers in Fire services?**

Answer:
This is the Council approved staffing level for volunteer firefighters. Although Fire Services has never reached this goal, they endeavor to continue to increase the volunteer capacity.

**34. Question (M. Vagnini):**
**If the overall budget is at 3.5% where has the monies from Emergency Services been directed to?**

Answer:
The overall budget change approved as part of budget directions does not mean every department budget can change by 3.5%. Funding changes within a department are based on maintaining the same service levels between 2017 and 2018.

Several factors play a role in the 3.5% increase including:

- Reduction in OMPF funding and other changes in Provincial programs at 1.0%
- Increase in funds for outside boards 1.0%
- Increase in operating budget (net of assessment growth) required to maintain services 0.9%
- Contribution to capital envelopes in accordance with the policy 0.3%
- Proposed business cases 0.3%

**35. Question (M. Vagnini):**
**Where a Business Case represents an increase/decrease in costs on a continuous basis, what is the 10-year cost of that item?**

Answer:
The business cases are prepared on an incremental basis, and therefore reflect the adjustments required to the base budget. Revenues and/or expenses are added to the base budget in year one.

**36. Question (M. Vagnini):**
**Where a Business Case represents a debt repayment cost what is the amount of the debt and what is the total cost of that debt including interest?**

Answer:

Council must approve debt financing for any project. Debt financing identified in the business cases are estimates only as interest rates continue to fluctuate in the capital markets. Council will be apprised of all information on approval of securing or issuing debt.

**37. Question (M. Vagnini):**
**Can these costs be shown parallel to the 2018 Budget amount?**

Answer:
Staff could provide this information if Council requires it.

**38. Question (M. Vagnini):**
**Page 155. Why is the Fence Advertising at James Jerome Park increasing the Budget? If it isn't income generating then why are we doing it?**

Answer:
The proposal is to end the pilot project for Fence Advertising at James Jerome, therefore eliminating the minimal revenue received from this initiative by $7,100 as identified in the report on the November 6, 2017 Community Services Committee Agenda.

**39. Question (M. Vagnini):**
**Page 157. How is Financing ($740,000) for the New Arena/Event Centre a Service Level Charge? It should be noted that although the cost shown is only $740,000 the total cost to the City is projected to be $156 million (Page 225). The public needs to be aware of this.**

Answer:
The annual cost for financing the arena/event centre is a new charge, reflecting a service level change. Information about the event centre, its cost, planned operating model and financing plan has been reported through several publicly available Council reports.

**40. Question (M. Vagnini):**
**Page 150. Volunteers are shown as 350. Has the latest recruitment drive indicated that this is a reliable forecast? Does the budget amount include for all 350?**

Answer:
The ability to achieve and maintain the budgeted 350 volunteers depends on a number of factors which include the demographics of each response area; attrition rates which average 15% per year; and the resources available to host 3 to 4 recruitment drives each year. Although Fire Services has never reached 350 volunteers, they endeavor to continue to increase the volunteer capacity.

The operating budget for volunteer services only includes the wages to meet the requirements under the volunteer collective agreement and the average annual hours related to fire calls in the volunteer areas. The operating budget doesn't include the costs to maintain/replace the vehicle, equipment and buildings associated with the delivery of volunteer services. There is a business case in the 2018 budget, for Council's consideration, to eliminated the $16.1 million capital shortfall that currently exists within Fire Services over the next 20 years.

**41. Question (M. Vagnini):**

**Pages 155, 156 & 158. What total costs are being committed to associated with the 2018 Budget amounts listed?**

Answer:
Page 155 reflects a total of $187,594 which has been included within the base operating budget per Council's direction.

Page 157 reflects the business cases that are recommended by staff for consideration within the 2018 budget.

Page 158 details the business cases that were requested through Council or Committee resolutions.

**42. Question (M. Vagnini):**
**Page 158 lists $5,356,486 worth of what should be maintenance to Fire Services as Service Level Changes. Why are these not part of the Base Budget. Many of these appear to be taken out of the Optimization Plan.**

Answer:
These business cases were requested though Council or Committee resolution.

**43. Question (M. Vagnini):**
**Pages 166, 169, 172, 178, 224, 230 are included as "Business Case for Service Level Change" but specifically state that there will be no Service Level Change. Why are they in this section?**

Answer:
These business cases may not necessarily represent a service level change, however they do require Council approval and are to be considered as part of the budget process.

**44. Question (M. Vagnini):**
**Page 181. What is current full-time to part-time ratio?**

Answer:
The current ratio of part time to full time hourly staff is approximately 1.28 to 1 or 56% part time and 44% full time.

**45. Question (M. Vagnini):**
**Page 215. If bridges can be painted in the field why can't a Fire Hydrant be painted there as well? ($540,000??)**

Answer:
The current practice does involve using City staff to paint the hydrants in place. Painting a hydrant, or any City infrastructure, in the field requires consideration of many factors. For example, weather conditions can affect the quality of a painted product. Removal of existing paint to bare metal is preferable; however, this requires staff to manage residual paint products like lead and paint chips. If sand blasting is used to prepare the surface, then the sand must also be managed to reduce dust and other nuisances. Since most of the existing hydrants likely have lead in the paint, this contaminant must be managed.

It is possible to brush the existing hydrant to remove existing loose paint and simply cover over the old surface. This methodology does not last as well as paint products applied in a controlled setting. This business case recommends against the current practice of field applied paint coatings.

Any product that can be temporarily relocated for the purpose of applying a paint coating, will receive a better quality surface and longer lasting finish if the paint is applied in a factory setting. Bridges, and other similar infrastructure that cannot be temporarily relocated, must be painted in the field. Structures like water towers and bridges are painted in situ, and this process is very expensive to ensure a high quality product with minimal disruption to the environment.

**46. Question (M. Vagnini):**
**Page 225. Is the Arena/Event Centre on HOLD until the $10 million of fund raising has been achieved? If that level isn't achieved who picks up the bill?**

Answer:
No, the Arena/Event Centre is not on hold. The $10 million in fundraising is an estimate as part of the financing strategy. If this amount is not raised, funding from other sources could be required.

**47. Question (M. Vagnini):**
**Page 227. This was supposedly done in 2013 in the CCI Engineering Study. Why are we doing it again? ($467,892)**

Answer:
This business case was requested by Council or Committee resolution.

**48. Question (M. Vagnini):**
**Page 237. This is a reserve fund not a Service Level Change. ($1.5 million per year)**

Answer:
The service being offered to the community is the availability of funds to support programs or projects identified through the development of a CIP (Community Improvement Plan) undertaken as part of the City's Nodes and Corridors Strategy. The business case assumes a regular annual contribution from property taxes, to be applied to a Fund, which would be available to implement projects or programs established within a Council approved CIP. The established fund could be called a reserve fund, and the purpose is to change the level of service currently available for the objectives stated in a CIP.

**49. Question (M. Vagnini):**
**Page 240. This is funding the Downtown Core with no change in Service Level. A give-away for residential property owners to Downtown Core business owners with nothing in return. ($2,715,083 in 2018 and $2,715,83 in 2019)**

Answer:
The Downtown Sudbury CIP has been approved by Council. Local businesses have applied for funding consistent with Council's approved criteria for the program. The business case provides "one-time" funding to support the eligible applications in the system. The business case does not anticipate any funding in 2019. The amount allocated on page 241 for the 2019 fiscal year is shown as a negative, to reflect a reduction in the base budget. This is how a one-time allocation would be removed from future budgets.

The concept of investing in businesses through the mechanism of a CIP is a long established principal within the Municipal and Planning Acts. The investment in specific development programs is anticipated to have a net return on investment in future years. The payback is realized through enhanced property values in the areas within the boundaries of a CIP, through complimentary private investments. The $2.7 million of public investment would result in $35 million of private investment in residential, commercial and other uses Downtown.

**50. Question (M. Vagnini):**
**Page 243. Please explain why this is listed as a Service Level Change instead of being included in Maintenance.**

Answer:
This business case was requested by Council or Committee resolution.

**51. Question (M. Vagnini):**
**Page 246. This appears to be the Optimization Plan in Service Level clothing. The service level impact predicts a call level increase of 2% per year for paramedics but no provisions have been made elsewhere for the staffing and vehicles to accommodate that level of change. (See Page 147). ($40,034,497 in 2018 and $37,979,820[??] in 2019. Page 249)**

Answer:
This business case was requested by Council or Committee resolution.

**52. Question (M. Vagnini):**
**Page 251. This is capital funding of fleet not Service Level Change. The Business Case actually states "This business case has no service level impact." ($706,000 per year forever)**

Answer:
This business case was requested by Council or Committee resolution.

**53. Question (M. Vagnini):**
**Page 254. There have been two consultant studies already done, one by IBI Group and one by CCI Engineering. Why is yet another one needed? ($175,000)**

Answer:
This business case was requested by Council or Committee resolution.

**54. Question (M. Vagnini):**
**Page 257. This is capital and actually decreases Service Level. ($27,293,592)**

Answer:
This business case was requested by Council or Committee resolution.

**55. Question (M. Vagnini):**
**Page 260. This is capital. ($73,600 in 2018 and $1.4 million in 2019, 2020, 2021 & 2022)**

Answer:

This business case was requested by Council or Committee resolution. 2019-2022 reflects additional revenue of $1,400 per year.

**56. Question (M. Vagnini):**
**Page 263. This is an operating budget increase. Are additional lengths included or is this an increase in cleaning frequency only? ($564,203 in 2018 and on-going).**

Answer:
This business case involves additional winter sidewalk maintenance on areas that are already on the list of approved sidewalks only. No additional lengths of sidewalk are anticipated within this option.
The business case anticipates that additional labour and equipment are required to respond to winter events more quickly after the storm ends and after mild spells that cause snow pack to melt.

Although staff already respond to these events, the service standard would be enhanced in response to the request from Council.

**57. Question (M. Vagnini):**
**Page 266. This is not a Service Level Change. It is partially Capital and partially Maintenance. The public is not expected to see a change in service level. With no improvement in service the Business Case is extremely negative. Does this effectively wipe out all HCI projects for the next 20 years? ($6.8 million borrowed for an annual debt repayment of $425,000 for 20 years)**

Answer:
This business case was requested by Council resolution. If approved there will be a change in the level of asset renewal so that the overall quality of playgrounds improves. The public will notice a service level change. The annual HCI fund allocation is budgeted at $600,000. If this option was approved there would be approximately $14,500 of HCI funds annually per ward.

**58. Question (M. Vagnini):**
**Page 269. This should not be a Change of Service. The Change of Service that resulted in creating the street ice problem did not adequately cover the operating cost. A post audit of that change would show that a significant cost portion had been missed in the Business Case. ($66,000 in 2018 and probably every year after)**

Answer:
As described in the business case the service is not currently provided except in unusual circumstances and is not funded.

**59. Question (M. Vagnini):**
**Page 272. A Council decision is required for a $2,000 expenditure. Is this a joke?**

Answer:
This business case was requested by Council or Committee resolution.

**60. Question (M. Vagnini):**
**Page 275. Same comment except for a $5,000 expenditure.**

Answer:
This business case was requested by Council or Committee resolution.

**61. Question (M. Vagnini):**
**Page 278. Organic waste from Multi-unit residential buildings. ($350,000 in 2018 and $137,500 in annual operating cost)**

Answer:
This business case was requested by Council or Committee resolution.

**62. Question (M. Vagnini):**
**Page 281. Organic waste from Special Events. Why are the Special Events not covering this cost with a "User Fee" as they are event specific? ($40,000 in 2018 and ??? beyond)**

Answer:
Council requested staff to prepare this budget option for consideration during the 2018 budget deliberations. It is certainly possible to create a user fee for events to cover this service enhancement.

In considering this type of user fee, Council may want to consider the impact that an additional user fee would have on the feasibility of the event. Many of these events are "not-for-profit" and add social value to the community. In addition, the savings to the life cycle value of the City's landfill provides benefit for the whole community.

The event users may see no additional value for the opportunity to dispose organic material in a green bin, whereas the overall benefit to the City may justify a broader funding mechanism.

**63. Question (M. Vagnini):**
**Page 284. Most High-Risk properties are required by insurers to have proper fire protection and regular inspection of that protection. This Change of Service Level would appear to be the City taking over that responsibility. The liabilities could be massive. (One-time cost $85,000 in Capital, on-going cost $324,590 per year)**

Answer:
The business case for additional Fire Prevention staffing is designed to provide capacity to conduct pro-active, targeted and scheduled inspections for medium and high risk properties throughout the entire city. Currently Fire Services only handles vulnerable occupancies, complaints and request.

Prevention Services is the first line of defense in Fire Services and is a fundamental program outlined in the Establishing & Regulating bylaw, approved by Council, for the delivery of Fire Services within the City of Greater Sudbury.

**64. Question (M. Vagnini):**
**Page 287. To gain recognition by the WHO that Sudbury is Age Friendly. Issues over recent months such as eliminating reduced fares for Seniors and increased user fees at pools, etc. argues against the City achieving such status. WHO recognition is worthless if the facts tell a different story. (On-going cost $134,462)**

Answer:

The City of Greater Sudbury's user fee policy reflects the definition of a senior to be 65+ which is consistent with the WHO. The Seniors Advisory Panel recommended a dedicated staff position to facilitate an age friendly strategy, however the staff recommendation is that age friendly strategy can be supported within the existing staff complement.

**65. Question (M. Vagnini):**
**Page 293. Another Public Safety Officer plus vehicle for Fire Prevention? This function used to be done by Volunteers from the Volunteer Stations. Was this practice discontinued without a Business Case? (One-time cost $42,500 in 2018 plus on-going cost of $162,295. Previous *cost* $0.00 and no vehicle as part of their duties.)**

**How did a Public Relations Officer and an additional Deputy Chief get installed in 2017 without a Business case?**

Answer:
Volunteer firefighters have always provided station generated public education/relations to the community, and continue to do so. This is not provided at 0$ cost, as the remuneration is identified in the volunteer collective agreement. The business case for the Public Safety Officer is to provide targeted Fire Safety education to vulnerable members of the community, such as, students, seniors and under serviced rural areas etc.

There were no additional permanent staff added to Fire Services division in 2017. The Council approved staffing compliment for Fire Services in 2016 was 129 permanent full-time staff and the full-time permanent staffing compliment remained at 129 in 2017.

**66. Question (M. Vagnini):**
**Page 295. Is it the belief that employing the extra officer will eliminate the risks that are identified? Are statistics available that demonstrate this?**

Answer:
In general, targeted public safety and education programs have been proven to improve outcomes and reduce community risk. The Fire Protection and Prevention Act (section 2(1)(a) states "that every municipality shall, establish a program in the municipality which must include public education with respect to fire safety and certain components of fire prevention". Public Education and Prevention are the only regulated component of Fire Services under the Fire Protection and Prevention Act demonstrating the importance this first line of defense.

Currently with only one Public Safety Officer, the service is unable to keep pace with the demand for Public Safety initiates. An additional Public Safety Officer would provide an enhanced capacity for targeted Fire Safety education to vulnerable members of the community, such as, students, seniors and under serviced rural areas etc.

**67. Question (M. Vagnini):**
**Page 296. Training for Fire Fighters. Is this for training the additional volunteers? Qualified Training Facilitators were resident in a number of Volunteer Stations until recently. Has this practice been**

**discontinued without a Service Level Change? (One-time cost $85,000 in 2018 plus on-going cost of $123,960. Previous cost $0.00 as part of their duties)**

Answer:
All officers, career and volunteer provide training as part of regular duties. Career officers do so on duty at no additional cost. Volunteer officers do so as part of regularly scheduled station training, with no additional cost above the training costs associated with the station training. The Trainer/Facilitator Program has been discontinued by the Office of the Fire Marshall, and has been replaced by the National Fire Protection Association Training Officer Standard, known as NFPA 1041. Legislation currently moving forward at the provincial level is expected to confirm training to the applicable NFPA Standard for all training evolutions in the near future. The business case for enhancing the number of Training Officers is to support the career and volunteer training initiatives, create and deliver lesson plans, increase the capacity for recruit training, and address the training shortfalls identified for all fire responders.

**68. Question (M. Vagnini):**
**Page 300. Does the staffing include the summer months?**

Answer:
The Business Case for the Percy Park Sports program was based on wages for two program instructors working Saturdays for the entire year (which includes summer months).

**69. Question (M. Vagnini):**
**Page 312. What is the all-in cost of Maley Drive including pre-engineering, business case studies, soils investigations, detail engineering and all other costs associated with the project? How has the amount of $53.4 million been "partially offset" by Lorne Street and MR35?**

Answer:
The budget for Maley Drive construction was approved at $80.1 million.

**70. Question (M. Vagnini):**
**Page 313. Are the Capital requirements noted in Service Level Changes included in the $1.3 million? While these may be the Capital spending in 2018 where are the Capital commitments that are intended to be made in 2018 summarized?**

Answer:
No, any request through business case is not included in the base operating or capital budgets.

**71. Question (M. Vagnini):**
**Page 318. How many kilometers of ditching does this include? Is that amount both sides ditching or one side only? Are driveway culverts included in the budget?**

Answer:
There are funds in both the operating and capital budget that may be used for constructing or maintaining ditches and culverts. If the ditches or culverts are part of a Municipal Drain, under the Drainage Act, then another source of funds may also be applied.

The roads operations budget reflects a service level of approximately 45 kilometers per year. This is calculated as a length of ditch on one side of a road. Having said that, the exact length of ditch that can be maintained is difficult to estimate and will vary from year to year. The scope of work will depend on the conditions that are encountered, and the scope of work required. For example, material excavated from a ditch may need to be disposed some distance away from the site of the work, which would increase the cost of the work.

The budget does include a small source of revenue from our driveway culvert program. This program is subsidized approximately 50% from residents applying for the replacement of an existing driveway culvert.

**72. Question (M. Vagnini):**
**Page 330. Why is the Flour Mill museum being relocated? Where is the Business Case?**

Answer:
The Flour Mill Museum relocation is a result of the required expansion of the St Charles Lift Station, a capital project within the Water/Wastewater Division. This has been an ongoing capital project since 2010 and due to the sensitivity of the contents and the buildings there have been structural assessments conducted. A business case has not been prepared as the new location of the museum has not been confirmed.

**73. Question (M. Vagnini):**
**Page 330. The loan/debt repayment for a new library is indicated as $250,000 per year. For a 20-year repayment schedule that totals $5 million including interest or a loan of $3.6 million. For 30-year schedule it represents $7.5 million including interest or a loan of $4.6 million. What is the basis, 20 or 30 years? Is the loan amount the estimated cost or will other financing be required in addition to the loan amount?**

Answer:
The $250,000 reflected in the capital budget outlook is an estimated contribution for the New Main Library capital project. The contribution is reflected in future years as the capital project start date and the contribution required are unknown. This will be further clarified as the large project completes the financial analysis in the future phases of the project.

**74. Question (M. Vagnini):**
**Page 337. Why are station building maintenance and repair costs not included in Fire as in other departments? CLEC has Capital spending of $431,233 every year. Fire stations appear to have about $12,000 per year each.**

Answer:
Building maintenance and repair costs are included in departmental operating budgets.

**75. Question (M. Vagnini):**
**Page 340. Is the $120,000 for Health & Safety sufficient? The CCI report in 2013 identified about $1.8 million of Critical, Legislated requirements. How much of that has already been invested?**

Answer:
Project selection is based on a balanced approach considering the amount of the available allotted budget envelope for Capital Projects, the weighing against the risks associated with these items with other urgencies that are broached.

Assets has budgeted approximately $545k since 2013 for the emergency issues.

**76. Question (B. Bigger)**
**Affordability: We have seen a significant change in the pace of decision making and investment in roads, bridges and pipes, as well as transformational projects that have long been part of the community's strategic plans (In some cases, for decades).**

**a) What key investments and considerations are being made to ensure tax dollars are spent efficiently in order to maintain affordability for residents? (From Pg 31)=**
**b) What are the top priorities and some of the key deliverables built into the Capital Budget stemming from the Corporate Strategic Plan and Long-Term Financial Plan? (From Pg 33)**

Answer:

a) The majority of the capital budget is allocated to asset renewal which focuses on the infrastructure requirement as noted in the Asset Management Plan. Larger new investment projects are to be jointly funded with grants from senior levels of government or funded with debt to take advantage of the continuing low interest rates.
b) Some of the key deliverables built into the Capital Budget stemming from the Corporate Strategic Plan and Long-Term Financial Plan includes focus on rehabilitation of existing assets and new assets such as MR 35 expansion, Lorne Street, bridge rehabilitations, various water and wastewater linear pipe replacements and/or lining, as well as partial funding for the Therapeutic Pool and the Elgin Greenway project pending confirmation of grants from senior levels of government.

**77. Question (B. Bigger)**
**Sustainability: Sustainability is the ability to maintain existing service levels and meet existing requirements without significantly increasing the relative debt or property taxes.**

**a) How does our financial position per capita, compare against other municipalities in the BMA Study? (From Pg 36) Where are we, relative to other municipalities? What number are we ranked at?**

Answer:
Of the 102 cities compared in the 2016 BMA Study Greater Sudbury ranked 21st indicating a strong relative position.

**78. Question (B. Bigger)**
**Flexibility: Flexibility is the ability the City has to increase its financial resources to address additional commitments and changes in service levels.**

**a) How does our City's ability to manage and address unanticipated costs compare to other municipalities in the BMA Study? (From Pg 37) Are we still on a good track to manage our finances and take on debt?**

Answer:

The City compares favourably to other municipalities on six of eight of the metrics presented on page 37. As a per cent of own source revenues for tax debt, debt charges and debt outstanding the City is in a much stronger position than other municipalities. Per capita reserves, per capita debt and debt to reserve ratio also compare favourably. The City is weaker on discretionary reserves as a per cent of taxation and as a percent of own source revenues.

As noted above, the City manages its finances well and is in a position to increase borrowing as noted in the Long Term Financial Plan.

**79. Question (B. Bigger)**
**The province allows cities to take on debt of 25% of funds received from a number of sources. We, as a community have set a limit of 10%, and our Debt Management Policy outlines that debt should be affordable, sustainable, and structured in a way that those who benefit from the asset pay for the debt.**

- **a) How much additional debt capacity does the City have, while staying within our current 10 % debt repayment limit? (From Pg 44)**
- **b) How does the current policy on our debt repayment limit compare against other municipalities in the BMA Study? (From Pg 44)**

Answer:

- a) Page 44 of the budget document identifies the additional debt capacity for the City at a range of $420 to $530 million within the 10% debt repayment limit.
- b) Unfortunately the debt repayment limit of other municipalities is not available in the BMA Study. However the chart on page 44 shows that the debt per capita for the City is very low compared the median, the average and all but two other municipalities with a population over 100,000.

**80. Question (B. Bigger)**
**Vulnerability: Vulnerability is the degree to which the City is susceptible to changes in funding sources outside of its control. We have experienced great success in identifying opportunities, and in attracting grants and funding from our provincial and federal partners.**

- **a) What are the most significant new and enhanced provincial and federal funding commitments that have been made by our provincial and federal partners towards investments in roads, water/wastewater, the environment and green infrastructure, municipal transit, as well as seniors & affordable housing over the next decade?**
- **b) What amount of provincial and federal funding have we been successful in receiving over the last two years?**

Answer:

- a) New Provincial and Federal funding commitments include:
  - Ontario Municipal Commuter Cycling $1.1 million
  - Social Infrastructure Fund $4.4 million
  - Investment in Affordable Housing – Extension $6.6 million
  - Homes for Good $9.1 million
  - Social Housing Apartment Improvement Plan $5.3 million
  - Ontario Early Years Child and Family Centres $3.3 million

b) Previous Provincial and Federal funding commitments are as shown:
    - Build Canada Fund & Ministry of Economic Development (Maley Drive) $53.4 million
    - Clean Water and Wastewater Fund $10.55 million
    - Public Infrastructure Transit Fund $7.3 million
    - Ministry of Environment and Climate Change (subwatershed studies) $2.3 million
    - The annual capital budget includes the annual government grants being Federal and Provincial Gas Taxes, and Ontario Community Infrastructure Fund $15.6 million in 2017, $14.9 million in 2016

**81. Question (B. Bigger)**

**Assessment Growth : With low assessment growth, increased pressure to provide services at the same level becomes more difficult. The City's 2015 to 2017 - 3 Year Plan projected the impact of annual assessment growth to be .6% per year.**

a) **What assessment growth have we experienced in 2015, 2016 and 2017, and what assessment growth are we projecting for 2018 and 2019? (From Pg 25)**

Answer:
Assessment growth is as follows:
2015 Actual: 0.3%
2016 Actual: 0.7%
2017 Actual: 0.7%
2018 Projected: 0.8% plus 0.6% (elimination of Commercial and Industrial sub classes)
2019 Projected: 0.8%

**82. Question (B. Bigger)**

**Development Charges: Municipalities in Ontario use development charges to ensure the cost of providing the infrastructure to service new development is not carried by existing residents and businesses. (From Pg 46)**

**These charges are only collected when new development, redevelopment and expansions for residential and non-residential buildings or structures occur. Industrial, Commercial and Institutional investment in our community can significantly contribute to assessment growth and job creation; however, some investors claim that development charges act as a disincentive for investment.**

a) **Please provide details of development charges collected from the I.C.I., vs the Residential sectors over the last 8 years.**
b) **Please provide details of development charges unrecovered to date, for I.C.I., and Residential sectors over the last 8 years.**

Answer:
a) This information is not readily available.
b) Development charges are collected before the issuance of the building permit. There are exemptions within the Development Charges Act and the Development Charges By-Law for certain developments (ie. colleges, school boards, intensification of existing residential, intensification of industrial properties, etc). If this question relates to the total growth related share of costs from the DC background study versus what has been collected as of Dec 31, 2016, it is not split between ICI and residential. For an overall basis, the 2014 DC background study showed the total DC recoverable portion of $103 million over a 10 year planning period, of

which the City has collected approximately $23.4 million to the end of December 31, 2016. Some of the DC collected amount to the end of December 31, 2016 relates to projects and collections since 2009.

**83. Question (B. Bigger)**

**Arts, Heritage and Festival Grants Per Capita: Key performance indicators are provided within the Economic Development plan related to Arts, Culture and Festival expenditures.**

- **a) What years are being used to benchmark KPI figures for Arts, Culture and Festival Expenditures.**
- **b) Do these figures reflect City Council's recent contributions to the Art Gallery, Place des Arts, or the contribution to the Sudbury Theatre Centre?**

Answer:
The KPI's on page 74, and throughout the document reflect the 2016 final position. As a result the contribution to Place des arts (approved in the 2017 budget), and the additional contribution to Sudbury Theatre Centre (approved Oct 24, 2017) are not reflected in the KPI's.

**84. Question (D. McIntosh)**

**Can we have an updated list for all the Unfunded Business Cases ( a revised pg 158) to add the addition business cases prepared?**

Answer:
Please see the attached file reflecting an update to page 158.

**85. Question (D. McIntosh)**

**What is the % increase that the Sudbury & District Health Unit requesting?**

Answer:
The Sudbury & District Health Unit is requesting a 1.8% increase in funding from the City over 2017.