

Corporate Services

2019 Budget Questions

Part I

Advance Questions

Q *Corporate Services, Page 11: We anticipated an opening balance of \$4.9 million but it turned out to be \$13.2 million. Why the difference?*

A The variance of \$8.3M is mainly due to the variances in the closing balances between the 2017 Forecast and the 2017 Actual. The opening balance for the 2018 Budget was based on the 2017 August Forecast closing balance.

The variance of \$8.3M can be summarized as follows:

| | 2017 August Forecast | 2017 Actual | Variance |
|-------------------------------|----------------------------|----------------|-------------|
| Capital Carry Forward | \$350,000 | \$7,728,000 | \$7,378,000 |
| Solid Waste Management Fund | | | \$1,301,000 |
| Transfer from Capital | \$0 | \$661,000 | \$661,000 |
| Increase in User Fee Revenues | \$3,160,000 | \$3,548,703 | \$388,703 |
| Landfill Closure Accrual | \$600,000 | \$349,000 | \$251,000 |
| Gross Total | | | \$8,679,000 |
| Other Funds | | | -\$379,000 |
| Final Total | | | \$8,300,000 |

Q *Corporate Services, Page 14: ITI Economic Development Officer – GNWT isn't providing funding for a tourism center in YK in 2019 and on?*

A The GNWT has committed to providing funding in the amount of \$161,000 per year to the City for the Visitor Centre (pending their budget approval).

Q *City Administrator, Page 21: Have we included funding for our strategic planning?*

A There is \$27,000 allocated in 2019 for Strategic Planning.

Q *Corporate Services, Page 40: Why the decrease in materials?*

A A substantial portion of the Materials object was client facing hardware (computers, monitors, etc.). As these purchases collectively represent a capital asset, for 2019 these allocations have been consolidated and categorized as a capital expenditure.

| | |
|---|--|
| Q | <i>Corporate Services, Page 41: Just a note: We need an initiative to decrease our postage budget!</i> |
| A | Ongoing initiatives to encourage citizens to sign-up for electronic delivery of utility bills have resulted in 40% of accounts now receiving e-bills. Further savings could be achieved if tax and assessment notices could be delivered electronically, however the most recent legal opinion states that this is not allowed under PATA. Administration has included resolutions to get this changed, but the GNWT has indicated they will not be opening up this piece of legislation in the near term. |
| Q | <i>PCED, Page 44: Why is PCED over budget on general services?</i> |
| A | The City contributed approximately \$100,000 per year to the NFVA for visitor services. Since the City took over visitor services in the lower boardroom at City Hall, the city has been in receipt of \$161,000 from ITI for the provision of visitor services. PCED's general services budget for visitor services is higher than usual due to the inclusion of expenses from the visitor centre. However, the revenue for PCED is also substantially higher than previous years due to the inclusion of the \$161,000 from ITI. |
| Q | <i>Community Services, Page 46: Is the Homelessness Coordinator provided for by federal funding? If so, when does the funding expire?</i> |
| A | The funding of the Homelessness Coordinator is a shared cost 50/50 with City and Federal HPS Funding. The current Agreement expires March 31, 2019. The City has been advised that the funding under a new title, Reaching Home will be provided to the City at minimum to the same funding level. |
| Q | <i>Community Services, Page 49: Where's the sponsorship \$\$?</i> |
| A | The sponsorship appears under User Charges. The 2018 invoices were sent out after the budget document was drafted so the expected revenue is not correctly represented: it should be \$24,500. |
| Q | <i>Community Services, Page 49: If we don't receive funding for any other order of govt, the City will be providing the full \$371k from City taxes?</i> |
| A | That is correct. Various funding sources are being investigated. |
| Q | <i>Community Services, Page 51: Fuel expenditure – was \$5k in 2017, forecasted at \$19k but came out at \$6k, so why are we anticipating that it'll be \$14k?</i> |
| A | The majority of the fuel expenditures are for pellets, and are manually allocated among three facilities (Pool, Curling Club, YKCA). The 2018 Forecast is understated; it should be about \$10K. For the 2019 to 2021 budget, the five-year average consumptions have been used to calculate the budget amounts. |
| Q | <i>Community Services, Page 53: Shouldn't we include the Fastball contribution in the revenue section? If not here, where is it?</i> |
| A | The contribution from the Fastball Association is for a Capital project, and is reflected in the Other Grants line of the Tommy Forrest Ball Park Upgrades project on page 118. |

| | | | | | | | |
|------|--|------|-----|------|-----|------|-----|
| Q | <i>Community Services, Page 50 & 54: Great to see the decrease in expenditures on fuel, maintenance and power at the Fieldhouse and Arenas. On pg 55, I see the pool still forecasts an increase in fuel & power. It's not on a pellet boiler?</i> | | | | | | |
| A | <p>The Pool is on pellet boiler but there were times that it was not operational, requiring the City to rely on heating oil. Therefore the five-year average consumption was used to budget for 2019 to 2021.</p> <p>The new boiler for Fieldhouse, Multiplex, PW Garage, Parks Garage has only been operational for about a week, so the estimated fuel consumption between heating oil and pellet is a very high level estimate for the 2019 to 2021 Budget.</p> | | | | | | |
| Q | <i>Community Services, Page 56: Did we not get a grant in 2018 that we were anticipating?</i> | | | | | | |
| A | Correct – there was an assumption made that the grant level would be consistent with previous years. | | | | | | |
| Q | <i>Community Services, Page 56: I still really miss the performance measures for the divisions, so I really hope that we can get them in place for next budget. With \$300k of taxes going to the recreation division, what's the % of costs recovered by the division? In looking at the 2016 budget, it was in the 70-72%, but the Net Expenditures were half of what they are now (~\$157-200k vs \$325k).</i> | | | | | | |
| A | <table data-bbox="164 741 357 842"> <tr> <td>2016</td> <td>70%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2018</td> <td>67%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2019</td> <td>62%</td> </tr> </table> <p>The increase in expenditures includes additional staff for the summer day camp, and the addition of several new events such as the Aurora Festival. (Special Events are included in Recreation).</p> | 2016 | 70% | 2018 | 67% | 2019 | 62% |
| 2016 | 70% | | | | | | |
| 2018 | 67% | | | | | | |
| 2019 | 62% | | | | | | |
| Q | <i>Community Services, Page 60: Why the decrease in user charges at the Wildcat? Are we charging less to use the space?</i> | | | | | | |
| A | The season typically runs from the May long weekend to the September long weekend and is often dictated by the timing of the spring weather and when the nasty weather in the latter part of August, early September commences. A new contractor will be in place for 2019/20 which often leads to a some give and take on the operating season due to set up of the kitchen etc. Revenues reflect this reality. | | | | | | |
| Q | <i>Public Safety, Page 66: The General Services (dog pound contracted costs and towing charges) has gone up from \$68k in 2017 to \$99k in 2019. Why? Do we have a new contract? Are we recovering any of these expenses with user charges? What's the net (revenue and expenses)?</i> | | | | | | |
| A | <p>The General Services category also includes MED Public Relations, Bike Rodeo expenses, MED telephone/communications, and MED software. 2017 actual expenditures were low in several of these Line Items and 2019 amounts were based upon historic trends. In addition, the MED software (occurrence reporting software and GPS tracking) expense was new as this was previously within the IT budget.</p> <p>The City works under contract arrangements for the Dog Pound and Towing services and does recover 50% of amounts received from Dog Pound Fees.</p> | | | | | | |
| Q | <i>Public Safety, Page 68: Is the firehall hooked up to the pellet boiler? Why no decreases here but decreases at arena and fieldhouse?</i> | | | | | | |
| A | The Fire Hall is connected to the pellet boiler but the consumption pattern isn't yet known, so the 2019 fuel Budget has not taken it into consideration. More concrete data will become available in 2019 to budget for future years. | | | | | | |

| | | | |
|---|---|------------------|---|
| Q | <i>Planning and Lands, Page 72: Is the \$50,000 for the City's annual contribution to the Capital Area committee operations new?</i> | | |
| A | The Capital Area Development Plan recommends that each property owner shall consider, in their annual budget deliberations, monetary contribution, contributions in kind, or any other contribution approved by the Committee. Each owner has been part of the engagement process for the Capital Area and identified \$50,000 as a reasonable amount to request during budget deliberations to contribute to capital projects, initiatives, and events related to the Governance Area. To date the City has not formally received a response from other parties on their contribution. | | |
| Q | <i>Planning and Lands, Page 75: Materials - \$30k in 2017, \$35k in 2018, why \$60k in 2019?</i> | | |
| A | The 2017 and 2018 Budget for materials was \$59,000 and the 2019 Budget is \$60,000. The 2017 Actuals are lower than budgeted because less than \$4,000 of the \$28,000 budgeted for research, mapping, and land surveys was utilized. As well, in 2017 only \$15,000 of the \$23,000 budgeted for Heritage Committee projects was spent; the unused portion transferred to Heritage Committee Reserve. | | |
| Q | <i>Public Works, Page 80: Wages and benefits: \$855k in 2017, \$875 in 2018, so how are we going to achieve \$817k in 2019?</i> | | |
| A | The \$817K allocation for 2019 is based on the budget for permanent positions and overtime; there is no budget for casual positions. However, the 2018 August forecast includes \$100,000 for a casual position. If the Department continues to use the unbudgeted casual then the \$817K is not achievable. | | |
| Q | <i>Public Works, Page 83: Note 1 – did we sell sand? To who? And we'd generate \$100k from it??</i> | | |
| A | Sand is used by various contractors for a multitude of activities. For example, Northland Utilities requires sand for all their electrical trench bedding. City contractors use sand for concrete and asphalt blends. The City monitors volumes and reports to the GNWT. \$100k is a forecasted number based on similar workloads that occurred in 2017. | | |
| Q | <i>Public Works, Page 85: Opening balance for 2018 turned out to be \$2m better (budget vs forecast). How come?</i> | | |
| A | There are a few reasons why the SWF ended up in a better position at the end of 2017. A summary is below: | | |
| | Revenues | \$418,000 | Higher than budget (mainly due to Internal Chargebacks which saw a significant increase due to the number of large capital projects) |
| | Expenses | \$676,000 | Under budget (\$380k relates to amortization with the remaining coming from savings from all areas – wages, contracted costs, annual closure expense, etc.) |
| | Transfer from Capital | <u>\$661,000</u> | Expansion of the Compost Pad resulted in remediation of the land which reduced the liability associated with the Landfill closure. A transfer was done to reflect the cost of using Capital Funding on activities associated with Landfill closure. |
| | Impact on Fund balance | \$1,755,000 | |

| | | | | | | | |
|--------------|---|---------|----------|--------------|---|-------|-----------|
| Q | <i>Public Works, Page 87: Opening balance for 2018 turned out to be about \$200k better (budget vs forecast). How come?</i> | | | | | | |
| A | <p>The difference is due to variances in between the August 2017 Forecast and the 2017 Actuals:</p> <table data-bbox="211 283 1299 388"> <tr> <td>Revenue</td> <td>\$68,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Expenditures</td> <td>-\$122,000 (the 2017 Salary and Power Actuals were lower than forecast)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total</td> <td>\$189,000</td> </tr> </table> | Revenue | \$68,000 | Expenditures | -\$122,000 (the 2017 Salary and Power Actuals were lower than forecast) | Total | \$189,000 |
| Revenue | \$68,000 | | | | | | |
| Expenditures | -\$122,000 (the 2017 Salary and Power Actuals were lower than forecast) | | | | | | |
| Total | \$189,000 | | | | | | |
| Q | <i>Public Works, Page 88: Note 4, does it have to be a Municipal Engineer or a regulatory analyst?</i> | | | | | | |
| A | The preference would be for an engineer or tech position to be able to provide cross training in the event of sick or other unforeseen leave/vacancies in the division. A regulatory analyst would be confined (in theory) to a single line of work. | | | | | | |
| Q | <i>Planning and Lands, Page 90: Will the Niven Lake Ravine Multi-Use trail be coming to Council for approval before being built? Do we have a design concept yet?</i> | | | | | | |
| A | The project commenced a few years ago and was put on hold due to staff changes and work load. There is a concept that has been developed and is available to be shared. | | | | | | |
| Q | <i>Community Services, Page 93: Note 2 – when does the Referendum for the pool borrowing happen? Have we included the cost to hold the referendum in the pool budget?</i> | | | | | | |
| A | <p>Assuming that Council approves the funding to proceed with the Architectural and Engineering portion of the project, an RFP process will commence in January or February of 2019 with a target date of completion for the September/October time frame. Once complete, the project cost will be presented to Council for deliberation. It is likely that the time frame to move to a referendum may be in the latter part of 2019.</p> <p>The referendum costs are reflected in the General Services line of the City Clerk Budget on page 31.</p> | | | | | | |
| Q | <i>PCED, Page 97: Will the DMO be wrapping up now that the funding is done? And start again when we get the hotel levy in place?</i> | | | | | | |
| A | The DMO project is in its final stages. The City will maintain the Extraordinary Yellowknife Brand and website through visitor services. The Hotel Levy, when in place, will be used to establish the DMO. | | | | | | |
| Q | <i>Corporate Services, Page 97: Appreciate the 2017 carry-forward column! Does it actually include funding carry-forwarded from previous years?</i> | | | | | | |
| A | Yes, the 2017 Carry Forward column reflects the total of carry forwards from previous years (although most were from 2017). | | | | | | |
| Q | <i>Community Services, Page 119: Who will be maintaining the new park/play area? Will we have to review the equipment every year? Do staff have enough time to incorporate into their work schedules?</i> | | | | | | |
| A | Due to the nature of a playground and the requirement for inspections by a certified inspector, the City will have to ensure it is maintained to the correct standard. The staff priorities will have to be adjusted to accommodate for this i.e. there may be marginally less maintenance at one of the smaller parks like Hordal or Jeske. | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|---|-----------|--------------------------|----------|--|----------|
| Q | <i>Community Services, Page 120: Operational impacts – this section is currently only maintained in the summer correct? So it'll cost approximately \$2,000 more a year to maintain this section of the trail? Going on the Trail Maintenance figures in the 2016 budget (cost per m. to maintain paved trails – winter).</i> | | | | | | |
| A | Yes, the rudimentary trail marked by bollards and painted foot prints is maintained in summer only. The staff time to maintain the expanded will equate to the same approximate costs. Similar to the playground at Tommy Forrest, a shift in priorities will have to occur. For winter operations this may take away from some staff time that would be allocated to outdoor ice rinks. | | | | | | |
| Q | <i>Community Services, Page 122: What's the history of the FOTR stage? Who paid to build it?</i> | | | | | | |
| A | The City provided \$25,000 in 1998. This contribution was only a portion of the costs; FOTR carried out a fundraising campaign to raise the required funds. | | | | | | |
| Q | <i>Community Services, Page 123: It cost \$21,000 to put out the RFP for City Hall's steps replacement? There was no bid that came in on budget?</i> | | | | | | |
| A | The \$21K was spent on the Architectural and Engineering phase of the project. Once the project moved to Class A estimates it was apparent that funding level would not suffice. | | | | | | |
| Q | <i>Community Services, Page 124: \$3.2m next operational costs (i.e. \$3.2m in taxes vs the current \$1.2m) is too much. How can we set the O&M cap for the new facility so that the architecture & engineering phase takes that into consideration?</i> | | | | | | |
| A | It would be very difficult to design a building to meet an O&M target. The \$3.2M is simply based on a square foot cost to operate the RIMP. A new facility will be more efficient in terms of energy use and green energy compared to a facility built in the mid-1980's. | | | | | | |
| Q | <i>Public Safety, Page 126: What items moved to the O&M for the department?</i> | | | | | | |
| A | <table> <tr> <td>Wildland Fire Mitigation Emergency Measures</td> <td>\$150,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Confined Space Equipment</td> <td>\$20,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Battery Powered Positive Pressure Ventilation Fans</td> <td>\$15,000</td> </tr> </table> | Wildland Fire Mitigation Emergency Measures | \$150,000 | Confined Space Equipment | \$20,000 | Battery Powered Positive Pressure Ventilation Fans | \$15,000 |
| Wildland Fire Mitigation Emergency Measures | \$150,000 | | | | | | |
| Confined Space Equipment | \$20,000 | | | | | | |
| Battery Powered Positive Pressure Ventilation Fans | \$15,000 | | | | | | |
| Q | <i>Public Safety, Page 128: Didn't we recently do a fire hall study?</i> | | | | | | |
| A | A Fire Master Plan was prepared and adopted by Council, but it focussed on the Division's operations, not the specifics of the actual Fire Hall Building. | | | | | | |
| Q | <i>Public Safety, Page 131: Did we get new consoles when we put the dispatchers in place? What's the life span?</i> | | | | | | |
| A | New consoles were installed in October 2016. The purpose of the 2019 project is to replace the outdated telephone interface to these consoles with a more robust and reliable server-based solution. | | | | | | |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q | <i>Planning and Lands, Page 134: Could this come from the downtown reserve since it's for the implementation of a façade improvement program?</i> |
| A | The Theia Report, which will be coming forward for consideration in 2019, identifies 12 action items. These action items will be further refined pending Council's Strategic planning process. While most of these proposed initial items can be accommodated within the existing Departmental Budgets, the façade improvement program will require a source of revenue. Upon further analysis for the current uses of the Downtown Reserve, Administration may recommend that the Reserve be used to fund the program. However, there are anticipated amendments to the Development Incentive By-law in 2019 and Administration would like to review any future uses of the Downtown Reserve Fund in a comprehensive manner to ensure that revenue and expenditures are fully transparent and presented to Council in a comprehensive manner. For background information, the Downtown Development Reserve is used to fund future projects that impact the downtown area; as of 2017 25% of parking meter revenue are being transferred to the reserve. |
| Q | <i>Public Works, Page 137: McMeekan Causeway and weight out scale – we plan on doing them in 2019? We didn't do them in 2018 because we didn't have the staff resources to complete?</i> |
| A | A combination of workload and staff turnover in key positions created resource shortfalls during 2018. The engineering for both projects can be completed anytime as these budget amounts would be carried over unless Council directs otherwise. It is recommended that both projects proceed. |
| Q | <i>Public Works, Page 141: Will the public transit review be complete before we go out RFP?</i> |
| A | Yes. |
| Q | <i>Public Works, Page 150: In the budget, can we include the figures for 2020 and 2012 (\$90k/year as per pg 155)? I think it's important to show the ongoing investment needed.</i> |
| A | Based on the administrative ranking approach used to develop Budget 2019, the Traffic Light Upgrades were not considered achievable within existing funding in 2020 or 2021, hence they do not appear on this page. |
| Q | <i>Public Works, Page 156: Why no paving in 2020? It's confusing with 161 showing no paving in 2020, but on page 162 it is. And page 163 has budget for paving in 2020.</i> |
| A | As with the Traffic Light Upgrades, the ranking approach means that no Paving projects are considered achievable in 2020. The maps show the paving programs recommended by Public Works, but other programs ranked higher in 2020 therefore the amounts are not included in the budget. However, Administration anticipates the new funding stream from the federal government to be an option for paving, given it prioritizes roads, solid waste and energy |
| Q | <i>Public Works, Page 159 & 160: We could remove these pictures in future budgets ☺ Save some trees.</i> |
| A | Noted. |
| Q | <i>Public Works, Page 169: Could other organizations in the area tie in like the Side Door, church, etc?</i> |
| A | The current work group is quite complex; it involves three levels of government and is complicated by the distance to the Legislative Assembly. Governance is already going to be tricky. The scope can be expanded to include the possibilities mentioned. Some caution would be required as to where the line would be drawn for inclusion in the project. |

| | |
|---|--|
| Q | <i>Public Works, Page 177: Why the significant increase to the Dagenais project – in terms of money and time? 2018, 2019, and 2020 now.</i> |
| A | The budget allocated in the 2018 budget was not adequate to complete the entire length of Dagenais in one season, so the project was broken into two (2) sections as it is a very long street with a large number of private services. Therefore there will be two (2) water/sewer projects, one in 2018 and 2019. As well there will be two (2) paving projects, one in 2019 and 2020. |
| Q | <i>Public Works, Page 177: Could we look at that new water line refurbish technology? Or are these still CMP?</i> |
| A | Public Works will look at alternative methods of construction. Preliminary investigations show that the technology used to refurbish pipe is not appropriate for all pipe uses. For example, if the pipe outside the liner technology disintegrates, it's not clear that the liner has the structural capacity to support earth loads. More research is required. |
| Q | <i>Public Works, Page 195: Why does funding come from user fees for 2 of the 3 years?</i> |
| A | User Fees are funding the project in 2019 and 2020, but in 2021 all available User Fees will be allocated to other projects. |
| Q | <i>Community Services, Page 202: Do we have an MOU in place with the Bike association yet? Have they used all of their 2018 funding? If so, on what?</i> |
| A | The City and the Club have signed a contribution agreement to disburse the \$25K identified in the 2018 capital budget. These are matching funds and are for the design of the park. |
| Q | <i>Reserves, Page 223: What's the plan with the Samuel Colley Library donation?</i> |
| A | This money was a bequeath to the City for the specific purposes of developing a new facility. It was utilized in the past to assist in the large renovation that was carried out. |
| Q | <i>Reserves, Page 223: How did we overspend in the community grant reserve?</i> |
| A | In 2017, \$2,450 of the Community Services Grant was not used and was transferred to the Community Grant Reserve (as per Council Motion # 0042-17). In 2018, the Grant Review Committee allocated \$1,750 of this Reserve to grants; due to rounding it appears as (\$2K) in the budget document. This left \$700 for the 2019 Budget. There should be a zero balance in the 2019 Budget, but due to rounding in both the 2018 Forecast and the 2019 Budget, it shows as (\$1K). Administration will delete the (\$1K) in the 2020 Budget. |
| Q | <i>10 Year Capital Plan, Page 232: The \$3.4 million for Public safety, it says that it includes "fire hall" but that wouldn't be for anything major correct?</i> |
| A | This is a placeholder amount for the planned expenditures on safety equipment and the Fire Hall over the next 10 years. The actual amounts to be expended over this period will be informed by a Council decision on the YKFD level of service. |
| Q | <i>10 Year Capital Plan, Page 232: Do we still have the funding that we allocated to the Con Mine multi-use area in 2013 (\$90k)?</i> |
| A | In Budget 2013, Council approved a \$90,000 allocation for the "Outdoor Recreation Facility – Design Development" project. This project did not proceed at that time due to land tenure challenges and the capital allocation was carried forward to 2014. In 2014, \$26,250 of this allocation was spent; the remainder was not carried forward. |

Q *10 Year Capital Plan, Page 233: Does the 10 year plan include the cost of reclamation for the 2017 cell when it's done in 2022?*

A The annual Solid Waste Fund accrual expense amounts on page 85 relates to closure costs of Cells A and B (the new landfill). There is no annual expense for the old landfill because the full cost of remediation has already been recognized; however, there will be an adjustment for the old landfill site closure costs this year. The last report on Closure Liability assumed closure of the old site in 2018 which has not happened. The will impact the liability amount as it is based on present value.

Part II

Budget Workshop – November 20th

| | |
|---|--|
| Q | <i>Why is money being borrowed in 2019 when it is expected to result in a surplus?</i> |
| A | This is part of the City's overall long-term debt management plan that strives to make the best possible use of available funding and all other sources of revenue. |
| Q | <i>\$4,000 per year is to be added to the O&M budget for maintenance of the Tommy Forrest Ball Park playground, and this is to be reflected in the Capital project write-up under Operational Impact (Mayor Alty).</i> |
| A | Due to the nature of a playground and the requirement for inspections by a certified inspector, the City will have to ensure it is maintained to the correct standard. The staff priorities will be adjusted to accommodate for this i.e. there may be marginally less maintenance at one of the smaller parks like Hordal or Jeske. |
| Q | <i>\$2,000 per year is to be added to the O&M budget for maintenance of the trail connectivity, and this is to be reflected in the Capital write-up under Operational Impact (Mayor Alty).</i> |
| A | The rudimentary trail marked by bollards and painted foot prints is maintained in summer only. The staff time to maintain the expanded will equate to the same approximate costs. Similar to the playground at Tommy Forrest, a shift in priorities will have to occur. For winter operations this may take away from some staff time that would be allocated to outdoor ice rinks. |
| Q | <i>How often is the main FOTR stage rented out for use other than FOTR?</i> |
| A | There have been five rentals of that area in 2018. Two have been City of Yellowknife functions. |
| Q | <i>How much does FOTR pay for their lease?</i> |
| A | There is no lease in place. There is an Agreement that has been negotiated and agreed upon however the organization has not signed it. There are no payments received from the organization. |
| Q | <i>What are the occupancy numbers for the FOTR stage?</i> |
| A | 1,449 for the Beer Garden area and 5,000 for the site. |
| Q | <i>The Fees and Charges presentation is to be posted on the Council Portal.</i> |
| A | The presentation is now on the Portal. |
| Q | <i>An overview of the City's relationships with the various user groups is to be brought forward to GPC.</i> |
| A | This is addressed in the Fees and Charges presentation that has been posted on the Council Portal. |
| Q | <i>Administration is to contact FOTR to ascertain how much money they have been spending on maintaining the site each year.</i> |
| A | From their application submitted to the Grant Review Committee, the organization has allocated \$23,000 in 2017, \$21,000 in 2018 and \$23,000 in 2019. |
| Q | <i>A column is to be added to the individual Capital project pages to show Carry Forwards.</i> |
| A | The Carry Forward information is entered and maintained in the O&M module of the City's FMW software, while the Capital Write-Ups are prepared in the Capital Plan module. Therefore it will not be possible to pull the Carry Forward information into the individual Capital pages. However, in the future Administration will endeavour to include carry-forward references in project write-ups. |

Q *More detailed Aquatic Centre information is to be brought to GPC.*

A The Aquatic Centre Pre-Design Plan and accompanying memo that were presented to GPC on October 22, 2018 were brought forward for Information Only at the GPC meeting on November 28, 2018.

The exact tax impact will depend on the final project cost and on how Council decides to finance the Aquatic Centre: by borrowing, at the expense of other capital expenditures, by taxpayers, or a combination of the different options.

Based on a detailed analysis, Administration prepared a proposed a long-term plan. Assuming the development of an Aquatic Centre at a cost of \$49.8M with a borrowing of \$34M, and the replacement of the submarine line at a cost of \$28M with a borrowing of \$20M, the following Tax Rate and User Fee increases are recommended:

| <i>Year</i> | <i>Tax Increase</i> | <i>Transfer to Capital Fund</i> | <i>Infrastructure Replacement Levy (per ERU)*</i> |
|-------------|---------------------|---------------------------------|---|
| 2020 | 4% | \$2.2M | \$13 |
| 2021 | 4.5% | \$2.2M | \$14 |
| 2022 | 5% | \$1.5M | \$15 |
| 2023 | 2.8% | \$1.5M | \$16 |
| 2024 onward | 2.8% | \$1.5M | \$17 |

Currently \$12 per Equivalent Residential Unit (ERU), where one ERU is deemed to be as follows, as per Water and Sewer By-law No. 4663:

Residential:

- Single family home/apartment unit (per 2 bathrooms or portion thereof)
- Hostels/Group Homes (per 5 residents)

Commercial:

- Restaurants/Bars (per 10 seats, or portion thereof)
- Car Wash/Laundry (per 100 square feet, or portion thereof)
- Hotels/Motels/Rooming Houses (per 2 rooms)
- Offices & Businesses (per 1,000 square feet)

Institutional:

- Hospitals/Corrections Centres (per bed)
- Schools/Classrooms (per 10 students)
- Churches (per location)

Industrial:

- As determined by the S.A.O.

The Infrastructure Replacement Levy is collected on monthly utility bills.

Q *Pictures of the existing Console and the proposed add-on are required.*

A The two main forms of communications used by the Dispatch Centre are phone lines to communicate with the general public and two-way radio to communicate with emergency responders. Currently these two forms of communications are on two separate systems. They use two separate sets of speakers and headphones. The current budget proposal for 2019 is designed to integrate these two systems into one communication platform. This would mean the dispatchers would be able to communicate on both the phone lines and two-way radio on one system which is a much more efficient process especially during an emergency situation. This is in line with a properly designed dispatch centre.

This is a photo of the proposed system:



Q *What has been spent in the past on the Downtown Façade program?*

A Between 2004 and 2013, a total of \$218,400 was spent on the Downtown Façade program. Details are available in the *Additional Information* document on the Portal.

Q *Does the City have the option of continuing to operate under the terms of the existing transit agreement after it expires in August of 2019.*

A This is the current understanding; it is being confirmed by Legal Services.

Q *An update of the Traffic Studies done on the 44th Street and Franklin Ave intersections, including the actual studies, is required.*

A A review has shown contradicting clauses. Public Works is working with Planning and Legal to determine possible options.

Q *Update the Public Works projects Galleries so they don't include deferred projects.*

A These Galleries reflect Public Works recommendations. Once deliberations are complete they will be annotated to reflect Council's decisions, and these annotations will be included in the final budget document.

| | |
|---|--|
| Q | <i>Add a note to the Paving program so that contractors can see there will be paving under the W&S program in 2020.</i> |
| A | Public Works is coordinating this change. Updated pages will be provided to elected officials and the web publication will reflect the change. |
| Q | <i>What is the tax impact of adding \$2M capital to do paving in 2020?</i> |
| A | All other factors being equal, the tax rate would have to increase by 6.6% to facilitate \$2M of paving in 2020. |
| Q | <i>Are residents able to use Tommy Forrest Ball Park?</i> |
| A | Yes, when there are no ball games, team practices or maintenance activities, the ball park is available for casual drop in use. There are chains on the vehicle gates to ensure that no unauthorized vehicles have access. |
| Q | <i>How much grant funding is provided to FOTR?</i> |
| A | The organization will be receiving \$15,000 annually from 2018 to 2020. |
| Q | <i>What income does the City make on the Folk on the Rocks site?</i> |
| A | In 2018 the City has generated \$1,840. |
| Q | <i>How long is the agreement with Folk on the Rocks?</i> |
| A | The draft agreement indicates it is for the length of the City's lease to the land with five year reviews. |
| Q | <i>What are the head lease / sublease arrangements with FOTR?</i> |
| A | The head lease between the City and the GNWT is for a 30 year term (June 2010 – June 2040); the City pays \$600/year. There is no sublease (pursuant to the Land Administration By-law) signed between the City and Folk on the Rocks. |
| Q | <i>Perform a cost / benefit analysis to see if there are other options for the Folk on the Rocks project (e.g. demolishing the stage and building another one.)</i> |
| A | This request cannot be completed within the time parameters of the budget deliberations. |
| Q | <i>Does emergency back-up power have to be a generator or can other technology be used?</i> |
| A | The City can request that consulting engineers complete an opinion/recommendation on other technologies. |