

TO: GENERAL COMMITTEE

SUBJECT: 2015 BUSINESS PLAN

PREPARED BY AND KEY CONTACT: M. JERMEY, CPA, CA, DEPUTY TREASURER, EXTENSION #4407
P. ELLIOTT-SPENCER, MBA, CPA, CMA, GENERAL MANAGER OF COMMUNITY & CORPORATE SERVICES, EXTENSION #4450

SUBMITTED BY: C. LADD, CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER
P. ELLIOTT-SPENCER, MBA, CPA, CMA, GENERAL MANAGER OF COMMUNITY & CORPORATE SERVICES
R. FORWARD, MBA, M.Sc., P. Eng., GENERAL MANAGER OF INFRASTRUCTURE & GROWTH MANAGEMENT
R. BUNN, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR – INNOVATE BARRIE
R. JAMES-REID, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR – ACCESS BARRIE
Z. LIFSHIZ, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR – INVEST BARRIE

CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER APPROVAL: C. LADD, CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER

RECOMMENDED MOTION

1. That the 2015 tax-supported base operating budget for municipal operations, with total gross expenditures of \$200.1 million and a net property tax levy requirement of \$120.8 million, be approved with the following amendments to reflect changes since the Business Plan's publication on February 2, 2015:
 - a) That contracted services within Transit Operations be reduced by \$210,000 to reflect the accurate calculation of inflation on the transit contract;
 - b) That contracted services for the Mady Theatre be reduced by \$40,000 to reflect savings resulting from moving to internal custodial staff;
 - c) That a Seniors Advisory Committee Budget be established in the amount of \$3,500 as per Resolution 14-A-122 adopted by City Council on June 25, 2014 for consideration in the 2015 Business Plan;
 - d) That the tax supported debt charges be decreased by \$6,268.30 to reflect the portion of the Operations Centre Site Works debt issuance that relates to wastewater operations and the corresponding amount be recovered from the wastewater rate;
 - e) That salary and benefits for Access Barrie be decreased by \$53,222 and \$7,868 respectively, and LUMCO funding be reduced by \$17,500, for a net reduction to the tax levy of \$43,590;
 - f) That budgeted Blue Box Revenue be increased by \$150,000 to reflect information received subsequent to the release of the preliminary Business Plan;

- g) That the 2015 budgeted contribution to the Development Charge Discounts/Exemptions reserve be decreased by \$200,000;
 - h) That the 2015 budget for Tax Increment grants be reduced by \$30,000 in respect of the Mady Lakeview development;
 - i) That contracted services within Facilities Development Administration be increased by \$350,000 to reflect the carry forward of the Facility Condition Assessment Program approved in 2014 but not completed, and that \$350,000 from the Federal Gas Tax Reserve Fund be budgeted to fund the Program; and,
 - j) That contracted services within Facilities Development Administration be increased by \$200,000 for the anticipated cost of the 2015 Facility Drawing Inventory Project and that \$200,000 from the Federal Gas Tax Reserve Fund be budgeted to fund the Project.
- 2. That the 2015 tax supported base operating budget for Barrie's Service Partners presented on Page 22 of the 2015 Business Plan, with total gross expenditures of \$82.7 million and a net property tax levy requirement of \$79.0 million, be approved with the following amendments to reflect changes since the Business Plan's publication on February 2, 2015:
 - a) That the County of Simcoe capital program be increased by \$209,293 as approved by the County's Committee of the Whole, and that eligible Development Charge funding be increased by \$102,766, with a resulting increase budgeted draw from the County of Simcoe Capital Reserve of \$106,527;
 - b) That the portion of 2015 County of Simcoe tax-supported gross operating grant request related to the County of Simcoe capital reserve contribution with preliminary base budget of \$1,408,533 be reduced by \$308,533 to a total of \$1,100,000;
 - c) That the County of Simcoe operating budget be decreased by \$315,171 as approved by the County's Committee of the Whole, with a matching reduction to the net tax levy;
 - d) That the Library Board 2015 Municipal Operating Grant Request be decreased by \$148,242 as approved by the Library Board and outlined in Scenario B on Page 26 of the 2015 Business Plan with a resulting reduction of \$146,242 to the net tax levy and a decrease in Development Charge funding of \$2,000;
 - e) That the amount of \$170,000 included in the Library Board 2015 Municipal Operating Grant Request, as it relates to the estimated 2014 deficit related to maintenance costs for the library facilities, be funded from the Tax Rate Stabilization Reserve; and,
 - f) That the Physician Recruitment grant, as outlined on Page 22 of the 2015 Business Plan, be reduced by \$50,000 to a total of \$60,000 in 2015.
- 3. That Scenario A – Tax, with recommended tax-supported Service Level Changes as outlined on Page 25 of the 2015 Business Plan, and as amended in Appendix C, with a net cost of \$273,756 (operating) and \$124,850 (capital), be approved.
- 4. That Scenario C – Tax, as amended in Appendix F, to eliminate the tax-supported contribution to the Parking Reserve, with a net decrease to the tax levy of \$743,000, be approved.
- 5. That Scenario D relating to the addition of 1% Dedicated Infrastructure Funding as outlined on Page 27 of the 2015 Business Plan, with a net increase to the tax levy of \$1,448,409, be approved.

6. That an economic adjustment for non-union staff salaries, of up to 1.5%, be approved.
7. That the Wastewater base operating budget, with gross expenditures of \$39.2 million and revenues of \$39.2 million, be approved with the following amendments to reflect changes since the Business Plan's publication on February 2, 2015:
 - a) That the wastewater funding for debt charges be increased by \$6,268.30 to reflect the portion of the Operations Centre Site Works debt issuance that relates to wastewater operations.
8. That Scenario A - Wastewater, with recommended wastewater supported Service Level Changes as outlined on Page 37 of the 2015 Business Plan, with a net cost of \$22,471 (operating) and \$8,150 (capital), be approved.
9. That the Water base operating budget, with gross expenditures of \$32.7 million and revenues of \$32.7 million, be approved.
10. That the Parking Operations base budget, with gross expenditures of \$2.3 million and gross revenues of \$2.3 million, be approved.
11. That Scenario C - Parking, as amended in Appendix F, to recognize the full year implementation of waterfront meter and special events paid parking, and the addition of paid weekday evening parking, with the net impact of a \$58,329 2015 operating deficit in the Parking Fund, be approved.
12. That the 2015 new capital budget requests of \$33.59 million, be approved.
13. That, consistent with the Capital Project Control Policy, the 2016, 2017, and 2018 capital budget relating to new 2015 capital projects of \$19.4 million in 2016, \$5.1 million in 2017, and \$300,000 in 2018, be approved.
14. That the 2015-2019 Capital Budget items not requiring approval, be received as forecast information.
15. That effective May 1, 2015, By-law 2014-021, as amended, be repealed and replaced with a by-law incorporating the fees and charges presented in the 2015 Business Plan, published February 2, 2015, Pages 327-367.
16. That pursuant to Ontario Regulation 284/09, this report serve as the method for communicating the exclusion of the following estimated expenses from the 2015 Business Plan:
 - a) Amortization expense - \$49.7 million;
 - b) Post-employment benefit expenses - \$2 million; and
 - c) Solid waste landfill closure and post-closure expenses - \$0.6 million.
17. That staff be authorized to submit applications for grants that would reduce expenditures associated with projects, programs and services approved as part of the operating and capital budgets.
18. That the Mayor and Clerk be authorized to execute any agreements that may be required to accept grant funding from other levels of governments or other partners to reduce expenditures associated with programs, services and/or capital projects.

19. That the Treasurer be authorized to make the necessary alterations to the transfer to and/or from reserves to reflect changes since the Business Plan's publication on February 2, 2015.
20. That Debenture financing as identified in the Capital Budget be approved.
21. That staff be directed to undertake a review of the City's Parkade business and report back to Council with respect to options that may include, but are not necessarily limited to:
 - a) Maintaining the business as a going concern; and,
 - b) Discontinuing operations and liquidating the asset.
22. That the City Clerk be authorized to prepare all necessary By-laws to implement the above recommendations.

PURPOSE & BACKGROUND

23. The purpose of this report is to recommend the Corporation's 2015 Business Plan. The proposed Business Plan follows the directions provided by Council in Motion 14-G-177 (described in the 2015 Business Plan on Pages 63-64). Generally, the plan reflects current services and service levels and recommends service adjustments to present a plan that reflects Council's funding guidelines. It also incorporates new service levels directed by Council to commence in 2015.
24. The City continues to lay the foundation for a financially sustainable and responsible plan that addresses the needs of residents and business owners within the community. The City is moving into a period of high growth and will need to manage the costs driven by this growth while continuing to maintain current service levels and existing infrastructure. The Business Plan sets out to balance these pressures.
25. Following the finalization of the 2015 Business Plan, a number of subsequent events were identified that have financial implications for 2015. This report highlights the impact of these subsequent events on the proposed 2015 Budget.
26. Finally, a Budget Workshop was held with Council on February 10, 2015. At this workshop, Council requested that staff investigate various service delivery alternatives and report back through the business planning process. This report highlights the findings of these investigations and any resulting impact on the proposed 2015 Budget.

ANALYSIS

Summary

27. The tax based budget as presented in the 2015 Business Plan Binder included a 3.40% increase relating to the projected cost of 2015 programs and all recommended service level changes (scenarios) plus a 0.64% increase for new Dedicated Infrastructure Funding resulting in a total blended tax increase of 4.04%. Subsequent events and feedback from Council have lead staff to recommend amendments that will result in a 2.71% increase relating to the projected cost of 2015 programs and all recommended service level changes, while the 0.64% increase for new Dedicated Infrastructure Funding, remains unchanged. This would result in a total blended tax increase of 3.35% for a typical home assessed at \$282,000.
28. The proposed water and wastewater rate based budgets as presented in the 2015 Business Plan Binder, included a 2.5% and 5% increase respectively, relating to the projected cost of 2015 programs and all recommended service level changes. Subsequent events have lead staff to

recommend certain amendments as noted in this report. However, the required increase of 2.5% for water and 5% for wastewater for a typical home consuming 180 cubic metres of water annually will remain unchanged.

29. For a typical home assessed at \$282,000 and consuming 180 cubic metres of water, the total cost of the amended 2015 Budget produces a \$149 increase (\$122 from property taxes, \$7 from water and \$20 from wastewater rates), based on the Province maintaining a revenue neutral education rate.
30. The Corporation's Financial Policies Framework establishes an affordability threshold for property tax, and combined water/wastewater rate supported services. Specifically, it states that annual property taxes and combined water/wastewater charges for a typical household will not exceed 4.0% and 2.5% respectively, or in total, 6.5% of household income. If approved as presented, the 2015 Business Plan requires approximately 3.61% of household income to pay for property tax-supported services and a combined 0.82% for water/wastewater, resulting in a grand total of 4.43%.

Tax Supported Operating Budget

Overview

31. The Business Plan Binder reported a net tax levy requirement of \$200.7 million in 2015. However, the net tax levy requirement, after adjusting for recommended amendments, is \$199.1 million reflecting a \$10.2 million increase over 2014 (2014 = \$188.9 million). The levy requirement incorporates the budgetary requirements of the City, the City's Service Partners, proposed Dedicated Infrastructure Funding (Scenario D), and the recommended Service Level Changes contained in Scenarios A, B, and C.
32. The "Financial Summary – Tax Rate" table in Appendix A, communicates the Financial Summary as presented in the Budget Binder with columns added to reflect amendments resulting from subsequent events and feedback received from Council. A column showing the recommended 2015 budget after amendments is also presented.
33. Recommended amendments to the Base Budget totalling a \$676K reduction to the 2015 tax levy are described in the "Base Budget – Recommended Amendments" section below. The table in Appendix B provides a listing of proposed base budget amendments (excluding Scenarios) categorized using the line descriptions from the Financial Summary in Appendix A.
34. Recommended amendments to Scenarios A, B, and C totalling a \$876K reduction to the 2015 tax levy are described in the "Scenarios – Recommended Amendments" section below. The tables in Appendix C communicate Scenarios A, B, and C as presented in the Budget Binder with columns added to reflect feedback received from Council and recommended by staff. Columns showing the recommendation for each Scenario after amendments are also presented.
35. The recommendation for Scenario D (Dedicated Infrastructure Funding) remains unchanged.

Base Budget – Recommended Amendments

36. **Transit Contract** – A subsequent review of the transit contract has identified a \$210,000 reduction in estimated costs as a result of a more accurate projection of inflationary costs applied to the transit contract.

37. **Mady Theatre Contracted Services** – Prior to 2014 custodial staff were contracted to maintain the Mady Theatre for the Performing Arts. An opportunity was identified to use existing internal resources to maintain the facilities. The amendment would recognize a \$40,000 savings which has been realized in contracted services.
38. **Seniors Advisory Committee Budget** – Council directed staff to consider the creation of the Seniors Advisory Committee Budget through Resolution 14-A-122 adopted by Council on June 25, 2014. Currently, committee budgets range from \$3,500 to \$37,500 (International Relations Committee) and staff are recommending a budget of \$3,500 for this committee.
39. **Debt Charges Operations Centre Site Improvements** - 6.25% of the annual debt charges are applicable to wastewater operations. This adjustment would recognize the \$6,268.30 to be funded from the wastewater rate, reducing the tax levy.
40. **Access Barrie Salary and Benefits** – A vacancy within Access Barrie has resulted in temporary staff salary and benefit cost savings in 2015 of \$53,222 and \$7,868 respectively. \$17,500 of this position was funded from LUMCO revenue which would no longer be required to fund the temporary staff in Access Barrie. The net impact on the tax levy is a reduction of \$43,590.
41. **Mady CIP Incentive** – The base budget included a phase-in of the Tax Increment Grant for the BMO portion of the Mady Lakeview site in the amount of approximately \$30,000. Staff have determine that the phase-in is not required in 2015 due to the timing of the project. The impact is a \$30,000 reduction to the tax levy.
42. **Blue Box Revenue** – Based on information received subsequent to the publishing of the Business Plan, staff have determined that budgeted Blue Box Revenue should be increased by \$150,000 in 2015. The impact on the tax levy is a reduction of \$150,000
43. **Development Charge Discounts/Exemptions Reserve Contribution** – The base budget included a \$400,000 contribution to the Development Charge Discounts/Exemptions Reserve in 2015. This reserve is intended to fund any discounts/exemptions that may be granted by Council pursuant to the DC By-law passed in 2014, as these decisions cannot be funded from future Development Charges collected under the Development Charges Act. Staff are recommending a \$200,000 reduction to the provision for 2015.
44. **Facility Condition Assessment Program** - \$350,000 was approved from the Federal Gas Tax (FGT) in 2014 to complete a baseline facility condition assessment for the entire facility portfolio. The work was to have been initiated in Q4 2014 but was delayed to start in Q1 2015 due to competing priorities. This recommendation simply provides for the carryforward of funding to 2015. This amendment has no impact on the tax levy.
45. **Facility Drawing Inventory** – An additional gap in the facilities asset inventory/data was identified in late October by our Archibus consultant with respect to our drawing inventory that is the base for which Archibus is built upon. Similar to other areas our as-built information over the last five to seven years has lagged and the quality and completeness of our drawing inventory has significant gaps. This need was identified close to the end of the business plan development process and therefore was not included in the Business Plan. The funding, while not included in the operating budget as originally presented, is included in the FGT forecast that was circulated to Council but identified as "Facility Condition Audit".

Scenarios - Recommended Amendments

Scenario A (a revised Scenario A, reflecting the directions received at the Budget Workshop of February 10, 2015, and any subsequent events, is included in Appendix C, incorporating the following changes):

46. **Elimination of Residential Tipping Fee** – Council provided feedback to staff at the February 10th Budget Workshop indicating they were not supportive of this recommendation. The service level change has been removed from Scenario A requiring that \$35,000 be added back to the tax levy.
47. **Multi-Residential Organics Pilot Program** – Council provided feedback to staff at the February 9th General Committee meeting (15-G-040) indicating that the implementation of this program in Q4 of 2015 should be considered as part of the 2015 Business Plan development process (previously included in Scenario E – not recommended by staff). The service level change has been added to Scenario A and will require that \$80,944 be added to the tax levy.
48. **Geese Control in Waterfront Parks** – Council provided feedback to staff at the February 10th Budget Workshop indicating they would like to see this service level change added to the recommended Scenario (previously included in Scenario E – not recommended by staff). The service level change has been added to Scenario A and will require that \$50,000 be added to the tax levy.
49. **Stormwater Management Pond Maintenance** – It is the opinion of staff that this operating project is eligible for funding under the expanded eligibility criteria for FGT. Staff are recommending that FGT be substituted for tax as funding source for this project. This will result in a \$250,000 reduction to the tax levy. Council also requested that staff report back on a two year phase-in of this program. The results of staff's analysis are found in the "Additional Information" section.

Scenario B (A revised Scenario B, reflecting the directions received at the Budget Workshop of February 10, 2015, and any subsequent events is included in Appendix C, incorporating the following changes):

50. **County of Simcoe Capital Program** – The County's Committee of the Whole approved an additional \$209,293 for the County of Simcoe capital program. The additional amount consists of \$190,308 for Paramedic Services, \$10,518 for Ontario Works, \$8,501 for Long Term Care, and a reduction of \$34 in Social Housing. The increase to Paramedic Services is mainly attributable to the Alliston and Beeton Paramedic Stations. Approximately \$102,766 would be eligible for Development Charge funding. The remaining \$106,527 would be funded from the County of Simcoe Capital Reserve (13-04-0446). There is no immediate impact to the tax levy as a result of this change due to the use of the County Capital Reserve beginning in 2015.
51. **County of Simcoe Capital Reserve Contribution** – The preliminary 2015 budget included a recommended contribution to the County of Simcoe Capital Reserve in the amount of \$1,408,533. This recommended contribution was determined by calculating a simple 10 year average using the County's 10 year capital forecast. It became apparent subsequent to the publishing of the preliminary budget that certain projects scheduled for earlier in the 10 year forecast are likely not to occur until a later date and that a ramp-up of the reserve contribution may be preferred by Council. The amended reserve contribution plan would see \$1.1 million transferred to the reserve in 2015 which would be ramped up to \$1.3 million in 2016, \$1.45 million in 2017, and \$1.48 million from 2018 onward (assuming no changes in the forecast). The forecast does identify a deficit in 2017 (the preliminary budget also included a couple years with small deficits) however this will depend on when the spending occurs. It should be noted that the County's 2015 tax supported capital program is estimated at \$1,335,195 while only \$1.1 million is being transferred to the reserve. Therefore, it is possible that additional increases may be necessary in future periods to make up for this difference.
52. **County of Simcoe Operating Budget** – The Committee of the Whole approved a reduction of \$315,171 in the County of Simcoe operating budget, consisting of reductions of \$332,337 in Social Housing, \$1,127 in Long Term Care, and an increase of \$18,293 to Paramedic Services.

53. **Library Grant Adjustment** – The 2015 Municipal Operating Grant as approved by the Library Board reflects a decrease of \$148,242 related to reductions in maintenance of the Library facility as performed by the City facility department. This reduction was initially captured at \$150,000 in Scenario B of the 2015 Business Plan Binder. The amendment would adjust the Library Grant to the final approved amount and reconcile the difference captured within Scenario B. In addition, funding from Development Charges was approved at \$170,000 compared to \$172,000 in the 2015 Business Plan Binder, a difference of \$2,000.
54. **Library Grant 2014 Maintenance Deficit** – The 2014 maintenance deficit is projected at \$170,000. This amount has been included in the 2015 grant request. The amendment would remove this amount from the 2015 grant request and fund the deficit from the Tax Rate Stabilization Reserve (13-04-0461), consistent with the City's policy on operating deficits.

Scenario C - Parking

55. **Parking Subsidy** – The 2015 base budget includes a tax funded subsidy directed to the Parking Reserve in the amount of \$743,000. The recommended amendment would eliminate the need for this contribution (subsidy) in 2015. This reduction reflects the impact to the tax supported operating budget of the parking service alternative recommended by EMT. A synopsis of the alternatives considered is found in the Parking Rate Supported Operating Budget section of this report.

Scenario D – Dedicated Infrastructure Fund

56. There are currently no recommended amendments pertaining to Scenario D.

Water and Wastewater Rate Supported Operating Budget

Overview

57. The Water and Wastewater budgets were developed in accordance with the Water Operations Branch 2014 Drinking Water System Financial Plan update provided to Council in Staff Report ENV003-14 in April, 2014 and in accordance with Council's budget directions in Staff Report EMT002-14 in June, 2014. The 2015 Business Plan includes 2.5% and 5% increases in water and wastewater rates. For a typical home that consumes 180 cubic metres annually, the annualized cost of water and wastewater services in 2015 are estimated to be \$310 and \$420 respectively for a combined cost of \$730 (\$703 in 2014). This represents a 3.8% combined increase over 2014 levels of which \$7 relates to water and \$20 relates to wastewater.
58. The contribution to water and wastewater reserves reflected in the 2015 base budget are \$5.9 million and \$12.3 million respectively. After adjusting for the recommended amendments, the transfer to reserve funds will be approximately \$6,000 less for wastewater and will remain unchanged for water.
59. The "Financial Summary – Water Rate" and "Financial Summary – Wastewater Rate" tables in Appendix A communicates the Financial Summaries as presented in the Budget Binder with columns added to reflect amendments resulting from subsequent events and feedback received from Council. A column showing the recommended 2015 budget after amendments is also presented for each user rate.
60. Recommended amendments to the Base Budget totalling \$6,000 are described in the "Base Budget – Recommended Amendments" section below. The table in Appendix B provides a listing of proposed base budget amendments (excluding Scenarios) categorized using the line descriptions from the Financial Summary in Appendix A.

61. Staff are not recommending amendments to any Scenarios as they may relate to Water or Wastewater User Rate supported operating budgets.

Base Budget – Recommended Amendments

62. **Debt Charges Operations Centre Site Improvements** – 6.25% of the annual debt charges are applicable to wastewater operations. This adjustment would recognize the \$6,268.30 to be funded from the wastewater rate.

Parking Rate Supported Operating Budget

Overview

63. The parking service is intended to be self-sustaining through user pay revenue and for the past several years has been operating in a deficit position. Historically, this deficit was funded by the Parking Reserve Fund. The Parking Rate Reserve was depleted in 2014 and the 2015 Parking Rate supported operating budget, as presented in the Budget Binder, required a \$743,000 subsidy from the Tax Rate to partially fund an anticipated operating deficit of \$763,903 in 2015. The Budget Binder also included Scenario C, which recommended adopting paid evening and weekend parking to eliminate the need for the tax rate funded subsidy in 2015 and going forward.
64. Subsequent events and feedback from Council have lead staff to recommend amendments to the base budget and Scenario C that will reduce the forecasted parking rate operating deficit to approximately \$58,000 in 2015 and begin rebuilding the reserve starting in 2016. The principal components of the recommended amendment include:
- a) Full implementation of Waterfront meter and special events parking – This recommended base budget amendment is expected to reduce the anticipated 2015 operating deficit to \$470,829, a reduction of \$293,074 from the preliminary budget; and,
 - b) Weeknight meter parking – This recommended amendment to Scenario C is expected to generate \$412,500 in additional meter revenue in 2015 (assuming July implementation), increasing to \$825,000 in 2016.

These recommended amendments are collectively reflected in the table titled "Scenario C – Amended" in Appendix F.

65. Staff have also investigated various other options for reducing or eliminating the Tax rate subsidy in addition to the recommended option in the amended Scenario C. These options are documented in the table titled "Municipal Parking System Financial Outlook" in Appendix F.

Additional Information – Operating Budget

66. Staff were requested to provide additional information on various components of the 2015 Business Plan. The items discussed below reflect the findings resulting from additional analysis/investigations performed by staff at the request of council:
67. **Multi-Residential Front End Garbage Collection** – Council provided feedback to staff at the February 10th Budget Workshop indicating they would like to see this service level change considered, and requested additional information. Staff have prepared a memo to address Council's questions, see Appendix D.

68. **Organics Collection Program Enhancement** – See memo from staff attached as Appendix E.
69. **Stormwater Pond Maintenance** – Council requested that staff investigate the implications of a two year phase-in of this proposed service enhancement. The results of this investigation are documented in Appendix G.
70. **Operations Rightsizing** – Council requested that staff investigate the implications of a three year phase-in of this proposed service enhancement. The results of this investigation are documented in Appendix H.
71. **Fitness & Aqua-Fit Drop-in Hours** – Council requested that staff report back on the attendance numbers for drop-in times that staff are proposing to eliminate through this service level change. The information gathered by staff is documented in Appendix I.
72. **Parkade** – Council requested that staff report back regarding whether or not the Parkade is achieving full cost recovery and provide a scenario contemplating the potential disposal of the Parkade. While specific numbers are not yet available, staff are confident in reporting that the Parkade operation is not currently self-sustaining. In addition, preliminary information on disposal value indicates it may be significantly below the amount of debt outstanding. However, staff recommend that a more fulsome analysis be performed before Council makes a final decision with respect to the potential disposition of this strategic asset.

2015 - 2019 Capital Budget

73. The 2015 capital budget is \$65.0 million, including \$31.3 million in previously approved funding and \$33.6 million in new funding requests. Details of the 2015 capital budget are found on Pages 260-274 of the 2015 Business Plan.
74. Through Staff Report FACTR002-15, Council passed motion 15-G-021, approving the Streetlight LED Upgrade project in advance of the 2015 Capital Budget approval. The 2015 capital budget as presented includes \$5.5 million for this project, so in order to prevent duplicate approval for the same project; the \$5.5 million has been included in the “previously approved funding” noted in this report, rather than the “new capital funding requests”.
75. Consistent with the Capital Project Financial Control Policy, where the 2015 capital budget includes projects that will be completed over more than one reporting period, Council’s approval of new projects in the 2015 capital budget includes approval of the funds required in 2016, 2017 and 2018, as applicable, to conduct the work. This results in approvals for 2016, 2017 and 2018 totaling \$24.7 million.
76. In addition to the portion of the capital budget that is recommended for approval, the 2015-2019 capital budget provides a forecast for capital spending over the next five years. The 2015-2019 capital budget includes \$627 million in spending, and was developed with a focus on addressing the City’s most critical asset renewal needs, areas currently experiencing service level deficiencies, and required investment to support the growth management process. Appendix J to this report provides further information regarding the capital improvements that are included in the 2015 – 2019 capital budget and the associated benefit to the community. It should be noted that despite the significant investment being made, many projects deemed critical were deferred. As aging assets fail, their ability to deliver service to the community will be impacted.
77. The City will consider advancement of the project New Harvie Road and Big Bay Point Crossing, to start in 2016, rather than 2017. This project is not part of the requested approvals, it is included as forecast in the 2015-2019 capital budget. The Environmental Assessment (EA) for this project is ongoing and involves discussions with the Ministry of Transportation Ontario (MTO). The City has recently learned that MTO’s review of the project may take less time than

originally thought, and the EA is planned to be complete in 2015. This allows this important project to be accelerated to start in 2016, beginning with the design phase. This change will be finalized through the 2016 -2020 capital budget and 2016 business plan.

78. Staff will continue to examine alternative funding options throughout 2015 and bring recommendations forward for Council consideration where staff believe revisions are advantageous to the overall financial health/flexibility of the Corporation (e.g. substituting Federal Gas Tax for debt).

Expenses not included in the 2015 Business Plan

79. Previous reports to Council described reporting requirements for tangible capital asset accounting that came into effect for municipalities in 2010. Generally, the effect of these requirements is to increase the level and type of information presented in the City's financial statements about the stock, condition and use of tangible capital assets to support municipal operations and to disclose information using the "full accrual" method of accounting. This method recognizes expenses when they are incurred and revenues when they are earned, regardless of when the cash outlay occurs.
80. A related provincial requirement that took effect in 2011 is for municipalities to disclose the amounts that are reported in their financial statements but not included in their budgets. For example, the City of Barrie is forecasting depreciation expense of approximately \$49.7 million for 2014. This represents the value of assets that were "used up" to provide programs and services, but the corresponding expenditure in the 2014 budget (transfer to capital reserves) was approximately \$19.2 million. Prior to the introduction of full accrual accounting, this difference would have been neither noted nor reported, but it is significant for understanding how municipalities developed what has become known as "infrastructure deficits".
81. Prior to passing the 2015 budget, municipalities are required to disclose amounts that are expensed in their financial statements, but not included in budgeted figures. For the City of Barrie this includes three expenses:
 - a) Amortization expense - \$49.7 million;
 - b) Post-employment benefit expenses - \$2 million; and
 - c) Solid waste landfill closure and post-closure expenses - \$0.6 million.

The effect of including these expenses in the budget would be to increase the tax levy and user rate requirements. By not including these expenses, reserve contributions are lower than they need to be to maintain assets in a state of good repair to support existing services and service levels in the future. Similarly, as obligations for post-employment benefits or landfill closure costs become due, not including these expenses now increases the impact on future tax levies.

ENVIRONMENTAL MATTERS

82. There are no environmental matters related to the recommendations.

ALTERNATIVES

83. There are three alternatives available for consideration by General Committee:

Alternative #1

General Committee could alter the recommended levy requirement by removing one or more of the recommended service level changes identified in the 2015 Business Plan.

EMT believes these service level changes are required in 2015 to improve the Corporation's ability to respond to service demands, address affordability concerns, and act on previous directions from Council.

Alternative #2

General Committee could alter the proposed recommendation regarding water or wastewater rates.

If a lower rate increase is deemed appropriate, this could be achieved by increasing the amount of the fixed charge applied to both services. Currently, proposed rates assume a 34% fixed charge, consistent with the approved long range financial plan. Increasing the fixed charge would reduce the amount of revenue required from volumetric charges. However, it may exacerbate affordability concerns for low income water customers, since the total revenue requirements would remain unchanged. Increasing the fixed charge (and thereby reducing the volumetric charge) may increase usage, which would be contrary to the goal of protecting the environment.

Alternative #3

General Committee could alter the proposed recommendation regarding the 2015 Capital Budget by changing the capital works that are included.

The recommended capital projects have been carefully prioritized and reflect only the Corporation's most critical needs and affordability thresholds. Removing recommended capital projects in favour of other capital projects that were not considered to be as critical works increases the risk of asset failure and the potential for service interruptions.

FINANCIAL

84. The financial impacts of the 2015 Business Plan are adequately addressed in the analysis section of this report.

LINKAGE TO 2015 – 2019 COUNCIL STRATEGIC PLAN

85. The recommendations included in this Staff Report support the following goals identified in the 2014-2018 Strategic Plan:

☒ Responsible Spending

APPENDIX A

Financial Summary - Tax Rate					
	Budget Binder		Recommended Amendments		Recommended 2015 Budget
	2015 Budget	Tax Impact ¹	Amendments	Tax Impact ¹	Recommended 2015 Budget
Prior Year Tax Levy	\$ 188,895,401				\$ 188,895,401
Maintaining Current Service Levels - Operations:					
Economic Adjustments	\$ 6,449,176	2.85%	\$ (263,590)	-0.12%	\$ 6,185,586
Prior Period Decisions Annualized	\$ 1,856,104	0.82%	\$ (206,500)	-0.09%	\$ 1,649,604
Interfund Charges	\$ (1,257,050)	-0.56%		0.00%	\$ (1,257,050)
Estimated Assessment Growth		-1.17%			
Subtotal - Maintain Current Service Levels - Operations	\$ 7,048,230	1.94%	\$ (470,090)	-0.21%	\$ 6,578,140
Debt & Reserve Management					
Debt Management	\$ (1,046,153)	-0.46%	\$ (6,268)	0.00%	\$ (1,052,422)
Reserve Management	\$ 2,199,699	0.97%	\$ (200,000)	-0.09%	\$ 1,999,699
Subtotal - Debt & Reserve Management	\$ 1,153,546	0.51%	\$ (206,268)	-0.09%	\$ 947,277
Subtotal - Increase to tax levy before Recommended Scenarios and Service Partner Budget Requests	\$ 8,201,776	2.45%	\$ (676,358)	-0.30%	\$ 7,525,417
Service Partner Budget Requests	\$ 2,723,371	1.20%		0.00%	\$ 2,723,371
Subtotal - Increase to tax levy before Recommended Scenarios	\$ 10,925,147	3.66%	\$ (676,358)	-0.30%	\$ 10,248,788
Recommended Scenarios:					
Scenario A - Alternate Service Delivery	\$ 357,812	0.16%	\$ (84,056)	-0.04%	\$ 273,756
Scenario B - Service Partner Adjustments	\$ (200,000)	-0.09%	\$ (791,946)	-0.35%	\$ (991,946)
Scenario C - Parking	\$ (743,000)	-0.33%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ (743,000)
Subtotal - Recommended Scenarios	\$ (585,188)	-0.26%	\$ (876,002)	-0.39%	\$ (1,461,190)
Total Tax Levy before Dedicated Infrastructure Fund	\$ 199,235,360	3.40%	\$ (1,552,360)	-0.69%	\$ 197,682,999
Scenario D - 1% Dedicated Infrastructure Fund	\$ 1,448,409	0.64%		0.00%	\$ 1,448,409
Total Tax Levy	\$ 200,683,768	4.04%		-0.69%	\$ 199,131,408
					3.35%

¹ "Tax Impact %" reflects the total impact on the property tax bill, including the education component.

² "Estimated Assessment Growth" reflects additional tax revenue that will be realized in 2015 without changing rates. Therefore, this line reduces the tax impact.

Financial Summary - Water Rate		
Description	2015 Budget	Rate Impact ¹
Prior Year Water Rate Revenue	\$ 23,966,831	
Change Due To Consumption Estimates ²	\$ -	1.84%
Maintaining Current Service Levels- Operations:		
Economic Adjustments	\$ 135,479	0.58%
Prior Period Decisions Annualized	\$ 149,052	0.63%
Interfund Charges	\$ 1,199,112	5.11%
Subtotal - Maintain Current Service Levels - Operations	\$ 1,483,643	6.32%
Debt & Reserve Management		
Increase in DC funding for Debt Management	\$ (4,443,285)	-18.93%
Reserve Management	\$ 3,115,544	13.27%
Subtotal - Debt & Reserve Management	\$ (1,327,741)	-5.66%
Subtotal - Increase to water rate revenue before Recommended Scenarios	\$ 155,902	2.50%
Total Water Rate Revenue	\$ 24,122,733	2.50%
Recommended Scenarios:		
N/A	\$ -	
Subtotal - Recommended Scenarios	\$ -	

¹ "Rate Impact %" reflects the total impact on the water bill for an average rate payer.

² "Change Due To Consumption Estimates" reflects rate change that is required to maintain revenue levels as consumption levels change.

Financial Summary - Wastewater Rate					
Description	Budget Binder		Recommended Amendments		Recommended 2015 Budget
	2015 Budget	Rate Impact ¹	Amendments	Rate Impact ¹	Recommended 2015 Budget
Prior Year Wastewater Rate Revenue	\$ 29,788,238				\$ 29,788,238
Change Due To Consumption Estimates ²	\$ -	1.39%			1.39%
Maintaining Current Service Levels- Operations:					
Economic Adjustments	\$ 702,722	2.39%		0.00%	\$ 702,722
Prior Period Decisions Annualized	\$ -	0.00%		0.00%	\$ -
Interfund Charges	\$ 246,505	0.84%	\$ 6,268	0.02%	\$ 252,773
Subtotal - Maintain Current Service Levels - Operations	\$ 949,227	3.23%	\$ 6,268	0.02%	\$ 955,495
Debt & Reserve Management					
Increase in DC funding for Debt Management	\$ (4,461,612)	-15.20%		0.00%	\$ (4,461,612)
Reserve Management	\$ 4,572,755	15.58%	\$ (6,268)	-0.02%	\$ 4,566,486
Subtotal - Debt & Reserve Management	\$ 111,143	0.38%	\$ (6,268)	-0.02%	\$ 104,875
Subtotal - Increase to wastewater rate revenue before Recommended Scenarios	\$ 1,060,370	5.00%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 1,060,370
Total Wastewater Rate Revenue	\$ 30,848,608	5.00%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 30,848,608
Recommended Scenarios:					
Scenario A - Alternate Service Delivery ³	\$ 22,471				\$ 22,471
Subtotal - Recommended Scenarios	\$ 22,471				\$ 22,471

¹ "Rate Impact %" reflects the total impact on the wastewater bill for an average rate payer.

² "Change Due To Consumption Estimates" reflects rate change that is required to maintain revenue levels as consumption levels change.

³ "Scenario A - Alternate Service Delivery" is a net expense impact that does not impact rate revenue or the user rate.

APPENDIX B

Tax - Base Budget Recommended Amendments

Economic Adjustments:

Mady Theatre Contracted Services	(40,000)
Access Barrie Employee Compensation	(43,590)
Mady CIP Incentive	(30,000)
Blue Box Revenue	(150,000)
Total	(263,590)

Prior Period Decisions Annualized:

Transit Contract	(210,000)
Seniors Advisory Committee Budget	3,500
Total	(206,500)

Debt Management:

Wastewater Debt Servicing Costs	(6,268)
Total	(6,268)

Reserve Management:

DC Discounts/Exemptions Reserve Contribution	(200,000)
Total	(200,000)

Wastewater - Based Budget Recommended Amendments

Interfund Charges:

Ww Supported debt charge correction	6,268
Total	6,268

Reserve Management:

Ww Supported debt charge correction	(6,268)
Total	(6,268)

APPENDIX C

Scenario A (TAX) - Recommended

Description	Number	Complement		2015 Budget		Recommended Amendment		Amended 2015 Budget	
		2015	2016	Operating	Capital	Operating	Capital	Operating	Capital
Online Citizen Engagement	119	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
After Hours Call Handling	329	-	-	(11,800)	-	-	-	(11,800)	-
Print Shop Equipment Replacement - High Speed Printers/Photocopiers	365	-	-	(7,800)	-	-	-	(7,800)	-
Elimination of Residential Landfill Tipping Fee Subsidy	384	-	-	(35,000)	-	35,000	-	-	-
Contaminated Inactive Land - PSAB 3260 (Note 1)	641	-	-	125,000	-	-	-	125,000	-
CMMS Process Improvements	716	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Waterfront and Marina Strategic Plan	861	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Fee for Fourth and Subsequent Subdivision and Site Plan Submission Review	865	-	-	(20,500)	-	-	-	(20,500)	-
Fire Support Administrator	880	1	-	(9,656)	-	-	-	(9,656)	-
Facility Generalist Services	906	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Corporate Initiative Rightsizing - Accessibility Compliance & Investment Coordination	907	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Facility Services Electrician	917	1	-	(10,050)	-	-	-	(10,050)	-
Purchasing Agent - Temporary	920	-	-	(27,426)	7,690	-	-	(27,426)	7,690
Public Art Reserve	925	-	-	25,000	-	-	-	25,000	-
Benefits and Pension Plan Management Resources	927	1	-	(11,445)	-	-	-	(11,445)	-
IT Consulting Services Reduction	928	-	-	(16,000)	-	-	-	(16,000)	-
IT Software Reduction	930	-	-	(14,000)	-	-	-	(14,000)	-
Stormwater Management Pond Maintenance (Note 1)	936	-	-	250,000	-	(250,000)	-	-	-
Full Time Community Events Programmer	942	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Reduction in Drop-In/Open Swim Hours	949	-	-	(25,000)	-	-	-	(25,000)	-
Reduction in Drop-In Fitness and Aqua-Fit Instructional Programs	950	-	-	(20,000)	-	-	-	(20,000)	-
Reduction in Custodial/Janitorial Contract Services	951	-	-	(80,000)	-	-	-	(80,000)	-
Internalization of Ticket Sales at Downtown Terminal	954	1	-	(68,394)	-	-	-	(68,394)	-
IT Purchasing and Invoicing Support	984	1	-	12,811	-	-	-	12,811	-
Growth Management	987	5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Stormwater User Rate Background Development	989	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Operations Rightsizing	994	6	5	302,072	117,160	-	-	302,072	117,160
Multi-Residential Organics Pilot Program (from Scenario E)	464	-	-	-	-	80,944	-	80,944	-
Geese Control in the Waterfront Parks (from Scenario E)	890	-	-	-	-	50,000	-	50,000	-
Total Net Budget Impact		21	5	357,812	124,850	(84,056)	-	273,756	124,850

Note 1 - Funding source changed from Tax to FGT

Scenario B (TAX) - Recommended

Description	Number	Complement 2015	2016	2015 Budget Operating	2015 Budget Capital	Recommended Amendment Operating	Recommended Amendment Capital	Amended 2015 Budget Operating	Amended 2015 Budget Capital
Physician Recruitment	N/A	N/A	N/A	(50,000)	-	-	-	(50,000)	-
Library - Facility Maintenance Alignment	N/A	N/A	N/A	(150,000)	-	1,758	-	(148,242)	-
Library - 2014 Operating Deficit	N/A	N/A	N/A	-	-	(170,000)	-	(170,000)	-
County of Simcoe - Capital Reserve Contribution	N/A	N/A	N/A	-	-	(308,533)	-	(308,533)	-
County of Simcoe - 2015 Operating Request	N/A	N/A	N/A	-	-	(315,171)	-	(315,171)	-
Total Net Budget Impact				(200,000)	-	(791,946)	-	(991,946)	-

Scenario E (TAX) - Not Recommended; included for Council Consideration.

Description	Number	Complement 2015	2016	2015 Budget Operating	2015 Budget Capital	Recommended Amendment Operating	Recommended Amendment Capital	Amended 2015 Budget Operating	Amended 2015 Budget Capital
Fire Prevention Officer	63	1	-	70,384	38,500	-	-	70,384	38,500
Customer Service Strategy Implementation	331	-	-	50,000	-	-	-	50,000	-
Multi-Residential Organics Pilot Program (moved to Scenario A)	464	-	-	80,944	-	(80,944)	-	-	-
Organics Collection Program Enhancement	495	-	-	362,500	-	-	-	362,500	-
Multi-Residential Front End Garbage Collection	578	-	-	199,750	-	-	-	199,750	-
Geese Control in the Waterfront Parks (moved to Scenario A)	890	-	-	50,000	-	(50,000)	-	-	-
Inclusion Services - Capacity & Support	891	1	-	48,400	-	-	-	48,400	-
Elimination of Summer Beach Lifeguards - Centennial Beach & Johnson's Beach	948	-	-	(61,847)	-	-	-	(61,847)	-
Total Net Budget Impact		2	-	800,131	38,500	(130,944)	-	669,187	38,500

Scenario A (Wastewater) - Recommended

Description	Number	Complement 2015	2016	2015 Budget Operating	2015 Budget Capital
QMS/Optimization	450	1	-	29,765	8,150
Facility Generalist Services	906	-	-	(7,294)	-
Total Net Budget Impact		1	-	22,471	8,150

APPENDIX D – Memo regarding Supplemental Information: Multi-residential Front End Garbage Collection

Through Motion 13-G-233 Council directed staff to meet with interested multi-residential building owners and managers to assess contract and service level differences for the provision of front end garbage collection (including pricing) between the public and private sectors.

It is important to note that the pricing obtained by the municipality for the provision of a multi-residential front end garbage collection service was obtained as an option through the competitive bid process as part of FIN 2013-055P, the most recent waste collection and processing contract. Contract specifications included concise requirements for the following:

- Equipment – new dedicated front end waste collection truck with clear demarcation indicating the vehicle is under contract with the City of Barrie;
- Defined levels of insurance; and,
- Performance securities.

The contract duration for the provision of this service was not identified in FIN 2013-055P as it was listed as an option subject to subsequent council approval. The length of the contract and the amortization of capital costs will also influence the annual cost of providing such a service.

Based on municipal multi-residential information provided in FIN 2013-055P the lowest price obtained for the provision of an optional multi-residential front end collection service was from our current waste collection and processing contractor at \$21.53/multi-residential unit.

Commercial waste collection contractors providing a front end multi-residential garbage collection service under a private contract will use the same front end collection equipment that is used to service their other industrial, commercial and institutional private contracts. It is our understanding that the service provider assumes no liability under these contracts and is not required to provide performance securities. Through staff's discussions with multi-residential building owners and managers it is our understanding that front end garbage collection costs under a private contract can range from approximately \$14.00 to \$32.00/multi-residential unit.

As described in paragraphs 51 and 52 of Staff Report ENV001-15, the municipality offers a Multi-residential Tipping Fee Exemption program to those multi-residential properties that are registered with the Environmental Services Department and are actively participating in the Barrie's recycling program. Under this program, a private waste hauler contracted by a registered multi-residential property can bring the garbage from that multi-residential development to the Barrie landfill for disposal at no cost. In 2014 approximately 3,225 tonnes of garbage was received at the Barrie landfill from approximately 8,250 multi-residential units registered in the Multi-residential Tipping Fee Exemption program. This represents approximately \$467,600 in tipping fees or approximately \$57/multi-residential unit that the municipality did not collect as a result of the Multi-residential Tipping Fee Exemption program. As a result of this exemption program, the Barrie landfill currently receives approximately 80% of the garbage generated by the multi-residential sector.

Should Council choose to implement a multi-residential front end collection service, it is important to note that the cost for the collection services, which were estimated to be \$230,000 in 2013, are in addition to the disposal costs. It is also important to note that, subject to council approval of such a proposed service level enhancement, staff would need to negotiate the current price for this service.

Further to paragraph 35 of Staff Report ENV001-15, staff conducted a follow-up investigation with the eleven (11) municipalities who responded to a brief survey regarding the provision of a multi-residential front end garbage collection service. At the time of printing this memo, nine (9) of the eleven (11) municipalities responded to our follow up request. The findings are presented in Table 1. Front End Bin Service and Table 2. Rebate Programs as attached and can be summarized as follows:

- The municipalities that provide a multi-residential front end collection service are generally pleased with the program and have achieved acceptable customer satisfaction. Collection services were offered in response to concerns regarding service level discrepancies between the single family home and multi-residential sector;
- Some municipalities that have implemented a rebate system in lieu of providing a multi-residential garbage collection service have complex processes to administer the rebate program. Rebates were offered in response to concerns regarding service level discrepancies between the single family home and multi-residential sector;
- One municipality established a rebate system in lieu of providing multi-residential garbage collection and then subsequently transitioned to providing the service. This was done to prevent future issues with the rebate and the municipality experienced resistance from property owners once the rebate was removed;
- One municipality strongly advises against a rebate system as it is a disincentive to waste diversion; and,
- Two municipalities have not encountered any major issues with the rebate system.

Successful multi-residential source separated organics programs reduce that amount of waste directed to the garbage stream which in turn will impact the design of a municipally managed multi-residential garbage collection program. Implementing a multi-residential front end garbage collection program ahead of a fully implemented multi-residential source separated organics (SSO) program will likely trigger higher multi-residential garbage collection start-up costs compared to the cost of multi-residential front end garbage collection program post SSO implementation.

Careful consideration must be given when evaluating the merits of a proposed tax rebate program and the potential impacts on the associated integrated waste management system. Staff would prefer the implementation of a front end garbage service for multi-residential properties to eliminate the administration of the Multi-Residential Tipping Fee Exemption program, provide greater control of waste management for this sector, and ultimately further promote waste diversion through system alignment. City staff would work with multi-residential properties that could not be easily transitioned into this program to identify potential options that would accommodate a front end collection service. It is important to note that staff is aware of some properties because of their current configuration, that this would not likely be possible.

Since effective multi-residential SSO diversion programs can reduce the corresponding garbage tonnages staff is recommending that the provision of a multi-residential front end garbage collection service be considered only after the full implementation of a multi-residential SSO diversion program is complete.

If Council does decide to provide a rebate on the cost of garbage bin collection services for multi-residential properties that choose not to participate in the curbside collection service then it would be preferable to do so as an annual refund payment to cover the properties costs up to a maximum of \$21.53/multi-residential unit. It is important to note that under this scenario, garbage would continue to be disposed of at the municipal landfill at no cost to those multi-residential properties participating in Barrie's Multi-residential Tipping Fee Exemption Program. The property manager would be required to complete an application form annually and submit copies of their garbage bin collection invoices for the relevant year. The form, evaluation criteria, approval/appeal process, communication protocols and payment processes would need to be developed by staff. This additional work is not currently included in staff work plans and it's uncertain where management of this process would reside. The 2015 budget does not cover this additional cost so \$230,000 would need to be added to the Environmental Operations Branch budget.

If Council does decide to refund multi-residential properties for their front end garbage bin collection service then it's recommended to eliminate the Multi-Residential Tipping Fee Exemption and refund the disposal service at a rate of \$57/multi-residential unit (this rate was taken from the Strategic Waste Management Strategy document). This would redirect the multi-residential garbage stream back to the

private sector which represents approximately 3,225 tonnes of garbage or approximately 10% of the total garbage received at the landfill. The Municipality currently collects recyclables (Blue/Gray box materials) from approximately 8,250 multi-residential units and transitioning multi-residential garbage disposal costs back to the individual multi-residential properties through private contracts, may increase the contamination rate of the associated recyclables. Elimination of the Multi-residential Tipping Fee Exemption would require an additional \$606,081 to be added to the 2015 budget as an expense to cover the cost of the disposal refunds.

An important consideration when making the decision to refund a portion or all of the cost of waste collection for the multi-residential sector is that all non-residential properties pay for waste collection and disposal in their property taxes. Many of these properties do not receive a collection service and have to pay for disposal. Issuing a rebate to the multi-residential properties may generate requests by other non-residential properties for similar treatment.

Table 1: Front End Bin Services

Municipality	Reason for offering service	Requirements	Details	Concerns and Suggestion
Town of Smith Falls	Properties pay taxes	Recycling participation	There was a fee in the past, the last 10 years has been no charge	They would prefer owners organize service privately, but still feel they should be providing the service
Region of Halton	They find service better than rebate	Properties must buy or rent the bins	No charge, Collection twice weekly. Prior to 2008 a rebate was offered instead	They switched from the rebate program because they were concerned with too many future issues. They had difficulty with property owners asking for the rebate after they switched to service. They strongly recommend front end bin service over a rebate
Region of Peel	Service was being provided by municipalities when region took over	Recycling participation and adequate storage room and truck access. Properties must buy or rent the bins	No charge, twice per week garbage collection	They hadn't encountered any major issues
City of Ottawa	Municipalities were all doing different service before amalgamation. They started providing the service for consistency	Recycling participation. Properties buy or rent bins	Annual fee of \$38, weekly garbage collection	They hadn't encountered any major issues

Woodstock	They do not provide this service			
-----------	----------------------------------	--	--	--

*Municipalities that did not provide information: Sudbury and Markham

Table 2: Rebate Programs

Municipality	Reason for offering rebate	Requirements	Amount	Details	Concerns and Suggestion
City of Cornwall	Council requires it	Recycling participation	Tonnage x tipping fee	Applications sent to Environmental Services Division, then to Finance once approved. Rebate applied directly to property taxes of owner. For condo rebate is given as a cheque to the condo corporation.	Strongly advise against rebate program. They feel it is a disincentive to increase diversion and that the rebate supports the business owners and not the residents.
County of Simcoe	In lieu of service	Recycling participation	Maximum of \$39/unit/year for garbage and \$52/unit/year for recycling. If properties pay less than the maximum the subsidy only covers their cost	Properties start out with curbside bag collection from a common collection point. They can submit an application to receive the subsidy. Application needs to include invoice and be verified through MPAC.	Having a common collection point comes with issues of illegal disposal so they recommend the rebate system
City of Kingston	In lieu of service	No requirements mentioned	Removal of disposal taxes based on unit type and number	Properties start out with no disposal tax. They always pay collection taxes. They can request to start paying disposal taxes and receive curbside bag service.	They hadn't encountered any major issues

Region of Waterloo	To help offset garbage costs for private garbage collection		\$31/unit/year	Offered to properties that don't receive municipal collection. Properties must submit form. Waste Collection and Diversion department confirms information, and sends list of properties to be rebated to finance. Rebate is sent out through electronic funds transfer	They say it is not a big help in offsetting costs and it takes a large amount of work to administer.
-----------------------	---	--	----------------	---	--

*Municipalities that did not supply information: Dufferin

APPENDIX E – Memo re: Supplemental Information: Organics Collection Program Enhancement

At the request of General Committee, Environmental Services sought pricing from Progressive Waste Solutions for options in addition to those previously identified in Paragraph 25 of Staff Report ENV001-15 to provide the following services as outlined in Table 1 below:

Table 1: Additional Waste Diaper Collection Options

Option	Description	Approximate Annual Cost
Dedicated weekly seasonal diaper and pet waste collection and processing service for a 5 month period from May to September.	Provide equipment and staff to perform weekly collection as a separate waste stream for a 5 month period from May to September. Clear bags required for collection. To ensure appropriate controls are in place to maintain the integrity of the existing organics program a separate processor is recommended, Orgaworld in London.	\$600,000
Dedicated collection of diapers with disposal at the Barrie landfill.	Maximum 2 clear plastic bags of diapers/household on the opposite week of garbage collection for each collection area.	\$420,000 Cost based on hourly rate due to unknown participation rate.
Collection only diaper service with disposal at the Barrie landfill.	Maximum 2 clear plastic bags of diapers. Households would be required to register for the service and a dedicated route on the opposite week of garbage collection would be provided through Progressive Waste Solutions.	\$420,000 Cost based on hourly rate due to unknown participation rate.
Other municipal approaches.	Halton, Durham, Dufferin and Ottawa all provide accommodations to their residents for diaper collection and disposal in the form of extra collections to providing additional bag tags (further program details provided in Table 2).	

General Committee also requested that staff investigate the feasibility of encouraging residents to utilize cloth diaper services to support diaper diversion and potentially create an opportunity for a Municipal subsidy.

- Staff identified one diaper service that is available to City of Barrie residents. This company will deliver unlimited cloth diapers for approximately \$18-\$20/week plus a delivery surcharge of approximately \$4.00/week and return weekly to remove soiled diapers, launder them and replace with unlimited clean cloth diapers. A diaper pail is also required with a charcoal filter to store soiled cloth diapers at a cost of \$59.95. Approximate annual costs for this service per household are estimated at \$1,152.00. This company currently has approximately 10 clients in Barrie.
- A number of cloth diaper suppliers/retailers are also available to City of Barrie residents. One cloth diaper supplier, whose head office is located in Barrie, charges \$350.00 for a year supply of diapers and indicated that they would consider matching a municipal rebate/subsidy. They currently have approximately 200 Barrie clients.

- In a number of municipalities in Quebec, a flat rate rebate of approximately \$100.00-\$150.00/child is issued for using cloth diapers. A receipt of diaper purchase, proof of birth and residency is required and a contract/agreement must be signed and submitted by the parents. Fifty percent refunds are issued for purchases between \$75.00 and \$300.00.

Table 2: Diaper Collection Programs for Disposal in Ontario

Municipalities	Program	Comments
Halton	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Every other week garbage collection/3 bags • Applicants receive 40 tags/year for diapers • Diapers collected same day as garbage • Residents permitted to bring tagged bags of diapers to landfill for free on "off" week • Bags not required to be clear 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not well used • In 2014 less than 1% of residences used program 1076 out of 154,000. • Does not address frequency of collection
Durham	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Every other week garbage collection/4 bags • Applicants must be families with 3 children under the age of 3 and they receive 50 tags/year • Residents permitted to bring tagged bags of diapers to landfill for free on "off" week 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does not address frequency of collection
Ottawa	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Every other week garbage collection/6 bags • Families register in diaper program for 1 year period- no proof required • Residents permitted to place 1 bag of diapers at curb on opposite week of garbage • Clear bags not required 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Addresses frequency of collection • Not recommended by staff • City has to contact families to re-register. • Approximately 6,000 of 290,000 households use this service • Inefficient and costly because of all the driving in between
Dufferin	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 bag every week • Garbage in clear bags • Families with 2 or more children under 4 years can apply • Applicants can receive bag tags, up to 1 every week for up to 6 months • Applicants must re-apply every 6 months 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proof required/I.D. and birth dates for children

APPENDIX F – Scenario C (Parking)

SCENARIO C - AMENDED

	2015 Budget (Revised)
	Includes Full Year of Waterfront Meter, Special Events Revenue, and partial year Weekday Evening Revenue
Operating Revenues:	
Parking Permits (Increased by \$34K in revised 2015 budget)	\$360,000
Parking Meters	\$1,000,000
Parkade Parking Spaces (TD)	\$8,400
Cash In Lieu (2015)	\$15,000
Waterfront Meter Revenue	\$275,000
Special Event Lot Rental Revenue	\$225,000
Weekday Evening (5pm-11pm) Revenue	\$412,500
Operating Revenues sub-total	\$2,295,900
Operating Costs:	
General Operating Expenditures	\$1,068,246
OH Allocations	\$308,180
Operating Costs sub-total	\$1,376,426
Net Operating Funds	\$919,474
Debt Service:	
Collier Street Parkade (Principal)	-\$480,405
Collier Street Parkade (Interest)	-\$485,581
Sub-total All Debt Service	-\$965,986
Net Funds after All Debt Service	-\$46,512
Asset Replacement/Rehab:	
Pay & Display Machine Replacement(see tab "PDM's")	-\$11,817
Resurfacing Current Parking Lots(see tab "P Lots")	
Collier St Parkade Lifecycle Activities	
Sub-total Asset Replacement/Rehab	-\$11,817
Net Funds after Asset Replacement/Rehab	-\$58,329

MUNICIPAL PARKING SYSTEM FINANCIAL OUTLOOK

	2015 (Jul-Dec) Revenue	Annual Revenue	Project 2015-2031 Revenue with Rate Increases	2015 Budget (Revised) Includes Full Year of Waterfront Meter and Special Events Revenue	2015-2031 Budget (Revised) Includes Full Year of Waterfront Meter and Special Events Revenue	Additional Revenue Scenarios					
						Inclusion of: ~ Weekday Evening Revenue (5pm-11pm)	Inclusion of: ~ Weekday Evening Revenue (5pm-11pm) & Saturday Day (9am-5pm) Revenue	Inclusion of: ~ Weekday Evening Revenue (5pm-11pm) & Saturday (9am-11pm) Revenue	Inclusion of: ~ Weekday Evening Revenue (5pm-11pm) & Weekend Revenue	Inclusion of: ~ Increase Current Weekday Hourly Rate by \$0.25/hr	Inclusion of: ~ Increase Current Weekday Hourly Rate by \$0.50/hr
Operating Revenues:											
Parking Permits (increased by \$34K in revised 2015 budget)				\$360,000	\$6,568,544	\$6,568,544	\$6,568,544	\$6,568,544	\$6,568,544	\$6,568,544	\$6,568,544
Parking Meters				\$1,000,000	\$18,245,956	\$18,245,956	\$18,245,956	\$18,245,956	\$18,245,956	\$18,245,956	\$18,245,956
Parkade Parking Spaces (TD)				\$8,400	\$142,800	\$142,800	\$142,800	\$142,800	\$142,800	\$142,800	\$142,800
Cash In Lieu (2015)				\$15,000	\$15,000	\$15,000	\$15,000	\$15,000	\$15,000	\$15,000	\$15,000
Waterfront Meter Revenue				\$275,000	\$5,017,638	\$5,017,638	\$5,017,638	\$5,017,638	\$5,017,638	\$5,017,638	\$5,017,638
Special Event Lot Rental Revenue				\$225,000	\$4,105,340	\$4,105,340	\$4,105,340	\$4,105,340	\$4,105,340	\$4,105,340	\$4,105,340
Weekday Evening (5pm-11pm) Revenue	\$412,500	\$825,000	\$14,640,413		\$14,640,413	\$14,640,413	\$14,640,413	\$14,640,413	\$14,640,413	\$14,640,413	\$14,640,413
Saturday Day (9am-5pm) Revenue	\$108,217	\$216,434	\$3,840,820		\$3,840,820	\$3,840,820	\$3,840,820	\$3,840,820	\$3,840,820	\$3,840,820	\$3,840,820
Sunday Evening (5pm-11pm) Revenue	\$77,119	\$154,237	\$2,737,087		\$2,737,087	\$2,737,087	\$2,737,087	\$2,737,087	\$2,737,087	\$2,737,087	\$2,737,087
Sunday Day (9am-5pm) Revenue	\$29,200	\$58,400	\$1,036,364		\$1,036,364	\$1,036,364	\$1,036,364	\$1,036,364	\$1,036,364	\$1,036,364	\$1,036,364
Sunday Evening (5pm-11pm) Revenue	\$20,800	\$41,600	\$738,232		\$738,232	\$738,232	\$738,232	\$738,232	\$738,232	\$738,232	\$738,232
Hourly Rate Increase of \$0.25	\$125,000	\$250,000	\$4,436,489		\$4,436,489						
Hourly Rate Increase of \$0.50	\$237,500	\$475,000	\$8,429,329		\$8,429,329						
Operating Revenues sub-total				\$1,893,400	\$34,095,277	\$48,735,691	\$51,472,778	\$55,313,598	\$57,088,193	\$38,531,766	\$42,524,606
Operating Costs:											
General Operating Expenditures				\$1,068,246	\$23,246,731	\$23,246,731	\$23,246,731	\$23,246,731	\$23,246,731	\$23,246,731	\$23,246,731
OH Allocations				\$308,180	\$6,706,486	\$6,706,486	\$6,706,486	\$6,706,486	\$6,706,486	\$6,706,486	\$6,706,486
Operating Costs sub-total				\$1,376,426	\$29,953,218	\$29,953,218	\$29,953,218	\$29,953,218	\$29,953,218	\$29,953,218	\$29,953,218
Net Operating Funds				\$506,974	\$14,142,060	\$18,782,473	\$21,519,560	\$25,360,380	\$27,134,976	\$8,578,549	\$12,571,389
Debt Service:											
Collier Street Parkade (Principal)				\$480,405	\$4,804,051	\$4,804,051	\$4,804,051	\$4,804,051	\$4,804,051	\$4,804,051	\$4,804,051
Collier Street Parkade (Interest)				\$485,581	\$4,855,814	\$4,855,814	\$4,855,814	\$4,855,814	\$4,855,814	\$4,855,814	\$4,855,814
Sub-total All Debt Service				\$965,986	\$9,659,865	\$9,659,865	\$9,659,865	\$9,659,865	\$9,659,865	\$9,659,865	\$9,659,865
Net Funds after All Debt Service				\$49,072	\$5,517,805	\$9,122,608	\$11,859,696	\$15,700,516	\$17,475,111	\$1,081,316	\$2,911,524
Asset Replacement/Rehab:											
Pay & Display Machine Replacement (see tab "PDMs")				\$11,817	\$2,238,216	\$2,238,216	\$2,238,216	\$2,238,216	\$2,238,216	\$2,238,216	\$2,238,216
Resurfacing Current Parking Lots (see tab "P.Lots")					\$1,114,696	\$1,114,696	\$1,114,696	\$1,114,696	\$1,114,696	\$1,114,696	\$1,114,696
Collier St Parkade Lifecycle Activities					\$3,150,028	\$3,150,028	\$3,150,028	\$3,150,028	\$3,150,028	\$3,150,028	\$3,150,028
Sub-total Asset Replacement/Rehab				\$11,817	\$6,502,940	\$6,502,940	\$6,502,940	\$6,502,940	\$6,502,940	\$6,502,940	\$6,502,940
Net Funds after Asset Replacement/Rehab				\$470,829	\$12,020,744	\$2,619,669	\$5,356,756	\$9,197,576	\$10,972,171	\$7,584,256	\$3,591,416
Parking Reserve Fund Balance (Tax Subsidy)				\$913,829	\$12,463,744	\$2,176,669	\$4,913,756	\$8,754,576	\$10,529,171	\$8,027,256	\$4,034,416

Notes:

1. Additional revenue scenarios include 6 months of revenue in 2015 and a full year of revenue in the subsequent years.
2. The new revenue scenarios do not include an increase to the level and cost of enforcement. Enforcement at this level is not optimal nor ideal but the hours are aligned with enforcement hours and we can implement the change to parking hours with existing resources.
3. Operating expenses do not include future cost for printing and distributing waterfront parking permits for 2016 and subsequent years. In 2014 the passes cost \$12,000 to print (\$0.20/passes) and \$15,000 for mailout and postage. The price quote to print passes in 2015 is \$0.19 for an order of 20,000 passes. The cost to print and administer the distribution of passes can be recovered by a pass fee of \$15-\$20 for residents. An additional option of charging a fee of \$50-\$70 for non-residents provides an affordable option for vendors and non-residents that live outside the City but like to frequent the waterfront on a regular basis. The revenue from pass sales has not been included in the revenue estimates.

APPENDIX G – Operations Rightsizing

Upon request from Council, staff investigated phasing in the new positions requested under for rightsizing Operations over a three year timeframe. The criteria for the review were similar to that of the allocation over two years. Priority was given to areas of legislative requirements and health and safety concerns. Positions were also reviewed for required skills, such as technical knowledge and specialized training. For these reasons the two Storm/Road Hybrid positions, the Roads Project Coordinator position and the Forestry Learner position, and changes to forestry casual positions were kept in the 2015 year. The Playground Maintenance GME2 position was moved from 2015 to 2016. The Gardener and Department Assistant Coordinator positions were moved from 2016 to 2017. As there is no financial impact to the budget, the Traffic Systems Assistant position was kept in 2015. The table below documents the Operations Rightsizing phased-in over three years as described above.

When the initial review of the department and required positions to rightsize Roads and Parks Operations was completed in the Fall, these 11 positions were selected as the absolute minimum number needed by functional area to start addressing capacity issues with maintenance of City assets, back log of service requests, legislative compliance requirements, meeting Council policies, delivering best practices and improving customer relations. Further delaying the implementation of the requested positions will result in a further backlog of work that will need to be addressed before staff can move to a more proactive and planned approach to asset maintenance and compliance deliverables.

Branch	Request	Increase in Permanent Staff		
		2015	2016	2017
Storm Crew	Storm/Road Hybrid Employees	2	2	
Roads - Technical Svs	Project Coordinator	1		
Roads - Operations	Conversion of long-term FT casual to permanent position	1		
Forestry	Forestry Learner	1		
Playground Maintenance	GME 2		1	
General Parks	GME 2		1	
Horticulture	Gardener			1
Roads, Parks and Fleet Administration	Department Assistant Coordinator			1
		5	4	2

	Net Operating	Capital	Net Operating	Capital	Net Operating	Capital
Original Budget Request	\$266,072	\$117,160	\$533,022	\$52,000	\$599,603	\$0
Revised Budget - 3 Yr Implementation	\$226,698	\$68,180	\$430,023	\$100,980	\$596,008	\$0

APPENDIX H – Stormwater Pond Maintenance

Council question:

Stormwater Pond Maintenance – investigate risk of increasing account budget by \$125,000 over two years or numerous years as opposed to the one time request of \$250,000 in 2015.

Staff Response:

There is a backlog of sediment removal of both forebay and main cells in 11 of the City's stormwater maintenance ponds (SWMP). These ponds require clean out and repairs to restore the quality of water that is being discharged into receiving watercourses. The current watercourse and detention pond budget is sufficient for four pond clean out and repairs a year. The annual request of \$250,000 starting in 2015 was to increase the number of ponds cleaned out and restored to five per year. A reduction in this budget request equates to a longer period of time to address the pond backlog and planned transition to a regular maintenance program.

As the backlog of sediment removal is completed, the proposed maintenance program will transition to the sediment cleaning of the forebay as part of a regular maintenance program to remove sediment collected in the forebay prior to reaching its capacity and spilling into the main cell resulting in increased costs for cleaning and maintenance of the SWMP. As the backlog of the more costly 11 ponds are completed, the number of forebay cleanouts will increase annually to reach a sustained program. This approach will reduce overall costs of operating and improve water quality.

A typical forebay should go for between five and ten years before it requires sediment removal. With the current inventory of 65 wet ponds there is an average of 7.5 "forebay's" a year at \$125,000 to \$150,000 per forebay. This equates to \$937,500.00 to \$1,125,000.00 annually for SWMP cleaning alone.

In addition to sediment removal there is associated maintenance that goes with a pond such as signage, fence repair, vegetation management, animal control, and inspection. This also applies to City watercourses that currently do not have adequate funding to undertake this maintenance work.

APPENDIX I – Fitness & Aqua-Fit Drop-ins

Since our fitness and aqua-fit schedules are established seasonally, we cannot identify or recommend specific classes (with specific days, times, and locations) which will be eliminated from the schedule at this time. (i.e. we cannot recommend that Sunday morning Bootcamp at Holly should be eliminated, to use a hypothetical example) because that specific program may not be offered on that day, at that time, or at that location in the Spring and Summer months.

Through an analysis of fitness and aqua-fit attendance in January, 2015, we can see that by focusing on eliminating those classes with the lowest attendance rates we will minimize the impact to roughly two to four people for each hour eliminated. The large disparity between the average class size, and the minimum recorded class size, indicates that there is an opportunity to be more efficient in the delivery of these programs, without significantly impacting on attendees. With a total proposed reduction of 15 hours per week, it is estimated this change would impact 30-60 residents per week – or 1.5% to 3% of the 1,936 average weekly attendees.

Here is the summary attendance data for our fitness and aqua-fit drop-in classes:

Fitness Attendance Summary - January 2015

	Classes	High	Low	Weekly Average	Class Average
Mondays	24	25	2	265	11.1
Tuesdays	23	26	1	262	11.4
Wednesdays	24	35	1	260	10.7
Thursdays	24	27	1	219	9.2
Fridays	19	25	1	172	9.3
Saturdays	10	25	2	119	11.6
Sundays	5	30	4	68	12.5
TOTAL	129	35	1	1,364	10.6

Aqua-Fit Attendance Summary - January 2015

	Classes	High	Low	Weekly Average	Class Average
Mondays	9	25	4	116	12.9
Tuesdays	11	27	4	146	13.3
Wednesdays	10	26	3	120	12.0
Thursdays	8	24	2	91	11.4
Fridays	6	24	4	96	16.0
Saturdays	--	--	--	--	--
Sundays	1	3	3	3	3.0
TOTAL	45	27	2	572	12.7

Data explanation examples:

On Mondays in January, a total of 24 fitness classes were offered at all three community centres combined. These classes, throughout the entire month, had a high attendance of 25, and a low attendance of 2, for a class attendance average of 11.1 on Mondays.

A total of 129 fitness classes were offered each week in January, with a high attendance of 35 and a low attendance of 2 for a single class. The weekly average total participation in these fitness classes was 1,364, with an overall class average of 10.6 people.

On Mondays in January, a total of 9 aqua-fit classes were offered at all three community centres combined. These classes, throughout the entire month, had a high attendance of 25, and a low attendance of 4, for a class attendance average of 12.9 on Mondays.

A total of 45 aqua-fit classes were offered each week in January, with a high attendance of 27 and a low attendance of 2 for a single class. The weekly average total participation in these aqua-fit classes was 572, with an overall class average of 12.7 people

Appendix J – Capital Plan Statistics and General Information

Service Area	Total City-Owned	Key Issues	Investment Through 2015-2019 Capital Budget	Service Impact of 2015-2019 Capital Budget
Roads	595 km	90 km poor condition (e.g. Gunn Street, Morrow Road)	<p>\$2.5 million in dedicated road renewal in 2015, including \$2 million from 2015 operating budget (crack sealing, resurfacing) and \$0.5 million in capital rehabilitation</p> <p>\$66 million capital in completed road work</p> <p>Additional \$91 million in road work started</p>	<p>21 km crack sealing and 10 km road resurfacing completed in 2015, funded from operating budget</p> <p>32 km of completed road construction</p> <p>Additional 55 km of roads will receive some form of investment (EA, design, construction started)</p>
Interchanges/ Crossings	<p>5 Highway 400 interchanges within City Limits</p> <p>5 Highway 400 crossings within City Limits</p>	<p>Connectivity and congestion along east-west transportation corridors within the City boundary</p>	<p>\$5.1 million in Tiffin Street/Highway 400 Underpass completed work</p> <p>Additional \$7.5 million in new McKay Road Interchange work started</p> <p>Additional \$3 million in new Harvie/Big Bay Point Crossing work started</p> <p>Additional \$2 million in existing overpass/interchange work started</p>	<p>Completed projects include Tiffin/Hwy 400 underpass, with estimated completion in 2018</p> <p>EA/Design/Property/Utilities for McKay Road interchange</p> <p>Design/Utilities for Harvie/Big Bay Point crossing</p> <p>EA/Design work for expansion of overpass/interchange at Dunlop and Bayfield Streets, and expansion of overpass at Anne Street</p> <p>Sidewalk Infill Program proposed for 2016-2025, with first year of design in 2016 and first year of construction in 2017</p>
Active Transportation	<p>605 km of sidewalk</p> <p>51 km of pathways and trails</p>	<p>Gaps in connectivity between sidewalks, bike paths/lanes, and trails</p>	<p>Sidewalks: \$0.9 million in completed work</p> <p>Sidewalk Infill Program: \$2.8 million in completed work</p>	

				<p>Sidewalk selection to follow sidewalk infill policy, with approximately 7.5 km of sidewalk installed between 2017-2019 and an additional 15.5 km of sidewalk installed after 2019</p> <p>1.3 km expansion of trail network, including a Trans Canada trail link, within the former City limits for increased connectivity</p> <p>Whiskey Creek Trans Canada Trail supported by grant funding</p>
<p>NRP</p> <p>The Neighbourhood Renewal Program is focused on the renewal and replacement of local deteriorated infrastructure throughout the City of Barrie. The program is a framework designed to rebuild roads, sidewalks, streetlights, storm and sanitary sewers, water mains and local parks. The purpose of this program is to provide a cost effective, long-term strategic approach to managing local infrastructure.</p>	<p>The City faces ongoing challenges in balancing investment in aging, existing infrastructure with investment in new infrastructure to serve growth.</p>	<p>\$10.6 million in NRP work – completed projects</p> <p>Additional \$13.6 million in NRP work started</p>	<p>Trails: \$0.7 million in completed work</p>	<p>5 km of NRP work – completed projects including</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 5 km road 4 km water 1.4 km sanitary 0.8 km storm sewer <p>Additional 8.5 km of NRP work will receive some form of investment (EA, design, construction started)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 8.5 km road 9 km water 9.3 km sanitary 0.9 km flood protection (sewer and culvert)

Watermain	624 km	57 km cast iron & galvanized	\$28.3 million in water main work completed	21 km of new or reconstructed watermain completed
		Cast Iron and galvanized pipe is prone to failure, and represented 65% of total watermain breaks in 2014	\$3 million in Cathodic protection of ductile iron watermains started; total estimated cost of \$10 million over ten years	Approximately 36 km of ductile iron water mains protected between 2017-2019 and an additional 86 km of water mains protected after 2019
			Additional \$8 million in other watermain work started	Additional 26 km of watermain will receive some form of investment (EA, design, construction started)
Sanitary Sewer	537 km	34 km clay, another 61 km in poor condition	\$26.3 million in sanitary sewer work completed	20 km of new or reconstructed sanitary sewer completed
		50 km of road with no sanitary sewer	Additional \$22 million in sanitary sewer work started	Approximately 4 km of sanitary sewer installed on roads previously unserved
		600-700 properties with no sanitary sewer		Investment in 4 servicing projects; approximately 95 households removed from private septic use by 2019, reducing septic reliance by approx. 15%
				Work started to remove an additional 195 households from private septic use
				Additional 22 km sanitary sewer will receive some form of investment (EA, design, construction started), including 12 km of new sewer
Flood Protection	397 km storm sewer 96 stormwater management facilities	19 km poor condition 120-150 km of road with no storm pipe	\$8.6 million in storm sewer work completed \$1.7 million in watercourse improvements completed	3.5 km of new or reconstructed storm sewer completed Watercourse and culvert improvements completed in 4 drainage areas to reduce flood risk and improve water quality treatment; downstream work enables
			\$10.8 million in culvert work completed	