

Budget 2020

Mayor and Council Questions

Questions and Answers – November 4

Q	<i>What would the budget look like without the proposed Aquatic Centre?</i>
A	Administration developed a scenario assuming the Aquatic Centre is dropped entirely as of December 31, 2019. All else being equal, this <i>could</i> mean: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The 2020 tax rate increase would be 4.15%; 2021 and 2020 increases would be 2.45% and 3.83%, respectively. The 2020 reduction (from the initial 8.48%) would be achieved in large part by eliminating the 2020 transfer to Capital.• The Capital Fund would remain in a relatively stable position for the term of this budget.• This does not take into account that substantial refurbishment of the existing pool is required if it is to remain serviceable.

Questions and Answers – November 14

Q	<i>Page 9 - Budget policies: Are we in compliance?</i>
A	Yes, with the exception of the Solid Waste Management Fund. The Budget Policy states that Council shall establish and maintain a fund balance of no less than 5% of budgeted expenditures in this fund. The need to recognize \$16.1M in additional landfill closure liability costs in 2014 placed this fund in a deficit position, and so annual user fee increases are being used to gradually reduce this liability and move the fund towards compliance.
Q	<i>Page 18 - Budget summary: Gas Tax Agreement & DMAF, does it show up as revenue when we spend it? Is that why GTA is forecasted to be lower? And why DMAF is just little bits?</i>
A	Grant revenue is shown in the year it is scheduled to be used.
Q	<i>Page 18 - Budget summary: Rural & Northern Comm Infrastructure Stream: What's the project?</i>
A	This grant is part of the Investing in Canada Plan stream and is for Paving; this is reflected on page 165 under Funding for the 2020 Paving Program.
Q	<i>Page 18 - Budget summary: We got extra CPI funding this year? What can we use the funding for?</i>

Questions and Answers – November 14

A	<p>The increase is \$653,000 which Budget 2020 recommends be used as follows:</p> <table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 80%;">Accessibility Audit/ Implementation</td> <td style="text-align: right;">\$584,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Asset Management</td> <td style="text-align: right;">\$7,550</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Multi-Purpose Asphalt Surface-Hall Crescent Park</td> <td style="text-align: right;">\$1,450</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Tommy Forrest Ballpark Upgrades</td> <td style="text-align: right;">\$60,000</td> </tr> </table>	Accessibility Audit/ Implementation	\$584,000	Asset Management	\$7,550	Multi-Purpose Asphalt Surface-Hall Crescent Park	\$1,450	Tommy Forrest Ballpark Upgrades	\$60,000
Accessibility Audit/ Implementation	\$584,000								
Asset Management	\$7,550								
Multi-Purpose Asphalt Surface-Hall Crescent Park	\$1,450								
Tommy Forrest Ballpark Upgrades	\$60,000								
Q	<i>Page 18 - Budget summary: Ground Ambulance & Highway Rescue: It always shows as \$0 and then we get \$31k. Do we not show it in the budget because it's not guaranteed?</i>								
A	Yes								
Q	<i>Page 18 - Budget summary: Street Outreach: I thought the Federal govt committed funding for three years so why is it showing \$0? And it appears that the GNWT didn't commit any in 2019?</i>								
A									
Q	<i>Page 19 – Staffing summary: The difference between the 2019 budget and the 2020 budget is actually 5.31 positions but it says only 2.95 (which would be the 2019 forecast vs the 2020 budget). Can we get a breakdown of the remaining 2.36 positions that were added in 2019 and that admin is proposing to remain in 2020?</i>								
A	The 2.95 refers to the difference between the 2020 Budget and 2019 Forecast numbers. The 2.36 reflects the Economic Development Manager that was added in late 2019 (1.00) and the conversion of Community Services casual hours to full-time positions to reduce costs and better adhere to the collective agreement (1.36).								
Q	<i>Page 25 - Mayor & Council: How much is the Citizen Survey?</i>								
A	Budget 2020 includes an allocation of \$35,000 for the Citizen Survey.								
Q	<i>Page 34 – City Clerk Note 2 talks about a 2022 election. Why is it in the 2020 budget? What's the cost?</i>								
A	An allocation for the 2022 election is included in the 2022 budget. The 2020 budget reflects increases associated with consolidating the Communications functions in the Office of the City Clerk.								
Q	<i>Page 35 – HR: How much is allocated to professional development?</i>								
A	The 2020 budget includes an allocation of \$351,000 for professional development and training.								

Questions and Answers – November 14

Q	<i>Page 46 – Corporate Services & Risk Management: Boardroom furniture and additional office equipment. Is the \$45k to replace the boardroom furniture upstairs?</i>
A	The allocation is to acquire secure file cabinets for vital documents, furniture for additional positions, and replacement gallery chairs in Chambers. At the time the budget document was prepared there were plans to establish an additional boardroom but this is now a lower priority given the need to replace the chairs.
Q	<i>Page 48 – Economic Development: We don't anticipate any funding for operating the Visitors Service Center?</i>
A	The 2020 to 2022 O&M Budget is based on the City's contributions to the operation of the Visitors' Service Centre. Any additional expenditures related to the latter will be subject to the external funding.
Q	<i>Page 52 – Community Services Directorate: No federal funding for street outreach in 2020?</i>
A	At this time, there is no commitment however, Administration continues to seek financial support.
Q	<i>Page 52 – Community Services Directorate: Is the sponsorship revenue for 2020 realistic or did we just get one big sponsor in 2019?</i>
A	The sponsorship contractor has achieved success in 2019 by securing sponsorship and advertising sales at the Multiplex and Fieldhouse. These sponsorship contracts carry forward and will be built on year by year.
Q	<i>Page 52 – Community Services Directorate: Is the \$30k for HDIC on top of the \$50k, so a grand total of \$80K?</i>
A	Budget 2020 includes a \$30,000 allocation (expenditure) for the HDIC event. It is anticipated that additional costs will be offset by sponsorships.
Q	<i>Page 53 – Arenas: Projecting decrease in user charges? Any particular reason? I actually appreciate that this number seems more realistic than in past years.</i>
A	The 2020 estimate reflects a trend which is seeing less demand for ice time, particularly the late night slots.
Q	<i>Page 59 – Recreation: \$19k for special events contracted costs and equipment rentals: Is this new? Or on top of a previous amount? If on top, how much is the grand total now?</i>
A	
Q	<i>Page 59 – Recreation: \$28k for the rec guide: Is this just the printing cost? Do we calculate staff time? And do we track how many paper copies are picked up and how many we're left with at the end? I see a lot left-over, so I'm wondering if we can decrease our printing and increase our digital.</i>

Questions and Answers – November 14

A	The \$28K for the rec guide reflects the cost for printing only, staff time is not included. The Department has recently commenced tracking the number of guides produced: three circulations per year, 2,500 per circulation for a total of 7,500 per year. In the Fall session there were approximately 250 guides that were not distributed. For the 2020 Winter Guide, a reduction of 250 in production has been accounted for.
Q	<i>Page 61 – Library: Security services – is it working? Have we seen a decrease in issues? Do staff feel safer?</i>
A	The security services have been successful in deterring issues. Security services began mid-January of 2019. Comparing the number of incidents from February to October in 2018 and 2019 there was a decrease from 99 incidents reported to 73. In one-on-one interviews with Library staff, the Library Manager reports that all staff interviewed feel safer with security on site.
Q	<i>Page 67 – Public Safety Directorate: \$100k for wildland fire mitigation – didn’t we receive Federal funding for it last year and again in 2020? Revenue is showing as \$0.</i>
A	The City, in partnership with YKDFN, has been approved in principle for funding of \$176,143 through the federal government’s Climate Change Preparedness in the North Program. This funding is spread over two years (\$86,143 in 2019-20, \$90,000 in 2020-21)
Q	<i>Page 71 – Fire and Ambulance: Note 1 talks about higher medivac fees in 2019, and according to the Fees & Charges bylaw, we’re going to increase them again in 2020. Why haven’t we captured that in the 2020 revenue?</i>
A	Revenues were slightly below projections in 2019 so the amount of this anticipated revenue was not increased for 2020.
Q	<i>Page 71 – Fire and Ambulance: Note 3: What’s the risk assessment software?</i>
A	The risk assessment software includes user-friendly solutions (Bow Tie & Taproot) to help YKFD identify the cause and effect of particular risks as part of the overall YKFD Risk Management planning. Bowtie will determine what the outcome will be and what action can be taken to mitigate the outcome before an incident happens. Taproot determines the root cause of an incident after it has happened (Health & Safety investigation and corrective action, etc.)
Q	<i>Page 71 – Fire and Ambulance: \$66k for safety equipment, materials, and educational tools. Is this on top of another amount? Why’s it only required for one year (i.e. for something in particular)?</i>
A	Some of this amount is a one-time purchase to enhance YKFD’s public education capacity in engaging children and school students (Freddie the Fire Truck). The remainder is for fire suppression materials such as Class A foam and fire hose, and software to enhance in-house on-line training.
Q	<i>Page 79 – Planning and Development: Note 2: \$50k for Capital Area Committee. Has anybody committed? Last year, we said that the \$50k was conditional on matching funds from other parties, so do we have 2019’s \$\$ still? Can we just carry it forward?</i>

Questions and Answers – November 14

A Council approved \$50,000 in Budget 2019 on the condition that the money be spent only if the other Committee members contributed. It does not appear likely that this will happen in 2019, however the allocation is within O&M and therefore will not be carried forward.

Q *Page 110 – Pool:* The work plan in the budget doesn't align with what was presented to Council in March 2019.
<https://citycentral.yellowknife.ca/en/council/resources/GPC-Agendas-2019/GPC-Agenda-March-11-2019.pdf>

A The Aquatic Centre Project has been evolving over the past several months including the allocation of the \$1.75M identified in the 2019 capital as well as the schedule. Colliers has recently been contracted as the Project Manager representing the City and has committed to reviewing the schedule, budget and methods to move the project forward.

Q *Page 110 – Pool:* In the March GPC memo, it has construction starting in April 2021. It also appears that we're way behind schedule since it had Council reviewing the ACDC report by October 2019.

A Colliers, the firm contracted to represent the City as the Project Manager is currently undertaking a review of the schedule and the design-build methodology. It is anticipated a new schedule will be developed in the coming weeks.

Q *Page 110 – Pool:* How do we anticipate catching up (or do we)? And if we're still working through the things that we were supposed to accomplish in 2019, do we need more funding in 2020 for the pool?

A Colliers is carrying out a review of the schedule and process and will be providing an update in the coming weeks.

Q *Page 110 – Pool:* It shows that we spent \$1.5M of the \$1.75M in 2019. But it doesn't look like we've complete much from this list, so I'm wondering how we spent the \$1.5M?

Contract for Project Manager	\$125,000 annually for project period (2 Yrs. = \$250,000*)
Contract for Bridging Consultant	\$500,000
Geotechnical Evaluations	\$50,000
Environment Assessments	\$50,000
Transportation Studies	\$25,000
Development Committee – Consultations	\$5,000
Stipend - Pre-Qualified Bidders	\$150,000 (3 Qualified bidders @ \$50,000 ea)
Proposal Evaluation	\$10,000
Referendum	\$25,000
Public Information and Communications	\$75,000
Total	\$1,140,000

*This amount will increase to approximately \$562,500 pending project approval

A The City has currently entered into two contracts. TAG has been contracted as the Bridging Consultant and Colliers has been contracted as the Project Manager. Much of the 2019 budget allocation will be carried over to 2020.

Questions and Answers – November 14

Q	<i>Page 112 – Asset Management: Did we approve funding for the asset management roadmap or was that funded with O&M?</i>
A	The Asset Management Roadmap was paid for from funding previously received from FCM’s Climate and Asset Management program.
Q	<i>Page 124 – City Hall Stairs: Will it provide a ramp or just replace the stairs?</i>
A	The allocation will repair the stairs, not replace them. The estimate is based on previously-obtained design and architectural estimates.
Q	<i>Page 134 – Email management solution. Will this help when ATIPP comes in? Will the GNWT possible fund this, if they provide funding to support our transition to ATIPP (highly unlikely, but maybe?)?</i>
A	Proper email management is absolutely essential to preserve the corporate records and history of the City. A suitable tool is required, regardless of whether the City becomes subject to ATIPP.
Q	<i>Page 135 – FDM Software: Does mobile computer-aided dispatch need wifi to work?</i>
A	Yes, these software systems do require a Wi-Fi platform to support these applications.
Q	<i>Page 161 – Multipurpose asphalt surface (Hall Cres): Why isn’t this coming from the land development fund? For the O&M impact, in 2021, is it suggested that we get one more summer student to cover the increase in parks maintenance? (Thank you for including the actual O&M cost for this project!)</i>
A	This project was not a Land Development Fund project. The 2021 O&M impact identifies the additional operational funds required to maintain the surface 12 months per year. In the winter months this will be utilized as an outdoor ice surface and a multiuse surface during non-winter months.
Q	<i>Page 164 – Parking Structure Feasibility Study: Would the study also be able to determine the true cost to the City for street parking (i.e. how much a parking spot on the street actually costs the city in capital & O&M costs/year)? Or is that stretching the scope?</i>
A	The capital project, as proposed in the budget, does set out to determine the capital and O&M costs of a parking structure over 60 years as well as options and models for operation. However, the project does not specifically request the feasibility study to provide the City with the true cost of street parking. Depending on the approach and methodology used by the consultant they may or may not use true cost accounting in their recommendations.
Q	<i>Page 169 – Paving Program: Otto Dr and Enterprise Dr are included in 2019. If the piped water study comes back and determines that we should expand throughout Old Town or Kam Lake, wouldn’t one of the paving projects be wasted? (Perhaps we’ve seen preliminary results of the study and it won’t be the case, but just want to double check.)</i>

Questions and Answers – November 14

A	The piped expansion will provide high level cost estimates to expand into various areas of the City and determine if existing infrastructure can support the expansion or if additional infrastructure (i.e. pump houses and lift stations) is required. The costs and added complications of trying to expand pipes into Old Town are anticipated to make the project too expensive to pursue for the foreseeable future.
Q	<i>Page 175 – Sewage Force Main Upgrade: Does it have to be funded by user fees in 2021 or 2022, or can it be completely paid by other govt grants (i.e. formula funding/Gas Tax/CPI)?</i>
A	The purpose of the Water and Sewer Fund is to pay the costs associated with providing water and handling sewer, so theoretically all related projects should be funded from it. However the City does receive funding from other orders of government to help reduce the funding burden, so some Water and Sewer projects are funded by these grants.
Q	<i>Page 184 – Traffic light upgrades: When are we done this project?</i>
A	This is an ongoing project that invests predictable amounts each year to ensure traffic light technology meets City and safety requirements and remains reliable. The goal is to complete the addition of video detection at each intersection. This will replace the failed, in-ground wire loops that are used for vehicle detection. They will also allow the City to manage the timings and coordination of the traffic lights.
Q	<i>Page 184 – Traffic light upgrades: Currently, Legislatively, we can't do speed enforcement via radar (i.e. by using this technology). In the past, have we asked the GNWT for a legislative change to be able to do that? We could reallocate MED resources (i.e. focus more on unsightly lands, etc), if radar could focus on traffic enforcement.</i>
A	The technology that is being installed is only for traffic detection, to aid with traffic light coordination. If Council considers the use of traffic light cameras for speed monitoring or red light infractions a priority, Administration can endeavour to incorporate the request to lobby for changes into the 2020 work plan and, if legislative changes are forthcoming, expenditures for the acquisition, installation, operation and maintenance of appropriate equipment will be reflected in future budgets. These installations will be in addition to current infrastructure plans.
Q	<i>Page 189 – Trail Enhancement and Connectivity: In the second paragraph, it says that the trail has been adjusted for the new Hospital but the Hospital didn't disrupt the alignment of the trail. The Hospital is closer to the trail, but the trail from the 80's still remains.</i>
A	The trail from the '80's has been adjusted slightly to accommodate for the hospital development. The bollards were adjusted away from the hospital site towards Frame Lake.
Q	<i>Page 189 – Trail Enhancement and Connectivity The \$117k from the Trans Canada Trail Program, what are the funding parameters? Can we use it for the recommended accessibility improvements on the trails (the signs, benches, and parking spots for Niven, Range Lake and Frame)?</i>
A	The funding requirement for the \$117K is strictly to enhance the McMahon Frame Lake Trail by developing the connection as detailed in the capital write up. The accessibility issues are separate from this funding. The Niven and Range Lake trails are not eligible for this funding.

Questions and Answers – November 14

Q	<i>Page 189 – Trail Enhancement and Connectivity – I see that Range Lake Trail is a 2021 capital project. What’s being proposed? If we can’t use the funding for accessibility improvements, could we use it for that instead?</i>
A	The purpose of the project as recommended will make the trail accessible. This trail is not eligible for TCT funding.
Q	<i>Page 207: Long-term debt: If the GNWT closed our funding gap, would we be able to accelerate any of our payments (i.e. do a lump sum payment) or pay a big chunk of it down at once (i.e. if we received our extra \$9-10M for Capital, we could pay most of the water treatment plant off in a year – where we are currently paying \$2M/year to pay down that debt)? Just wondering if there’s a penalty for paying the debt quicker (like how they have a maximum lump sum payment for your mortgage).</i>
A	The City’s loans are in the form of a debt swap, and both the terms and interest rates are fixed. The City can repay any lump sum with advance notice to the bank, however this payment will be subject to penalty determined by the market rate.
Q	<i>Page 208 – Long-term debt: In note 1, it says that as of Dec 31, 2018, the use of debt service was 56.77%. In the chart above the note, it says that the limit is \$15.88M and the actual/forecasted is \$13.95M – with a remaining debt service of \$1.93. This doesn’t seem like 56.77%. Am I missing something?</i>
A	This note will be deleted due to the confusion it is causing, stemming from the fact that MACA calculates debt limits for a given year based on the previous year’s financial statements and the expected revenue for the current year, meaning there is always a one-year gap between the revenues and liabilities.
Q	<i>Page 211 – 10 Year Capital Plan: The Outdoor Recreation Facility, is that the one planned at Con? If so, how realistic is it that we’ll be able to build it in 2023? I thought the remediation is still a long way off.</i>
A	The 10 Year Capital Plan anticipates that the site will be available for development into a recreation facility in 2023.
Q	<i>Page 211 – 10 Year Capital Plan: Community Services Others: What would this include?</i>

Questions and Answers – November 14

A	<p style="text-align: center;">Community Services - Other Capital Projects</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: left;"><i>Project</i></th> <th style="text-align: right;"><i>2020 Budget</i></th> <th style="text-align: right;"><i>2021 Budget</i></th> <th style="text-align: right;"><i>2022 Budget</i></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Accessibility Audit/Implementation</td> <td style="text-align: right;">\$584,000</td> <td style="text-align: right;">\$581,000</td> <td style="text-align: right;">\$567,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Arts and Culture Master Plan</td> <td></td> <td style="text-align: right;">\$75,000</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>City Hall Space Study</td> <td style="text-align: right;">\$75,000</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>City Hall Stairs Repairs/ Upgrade</td> <td style="text-align: right;">\$367,450</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Columbarium Park</td> <td style="text-align: right;">\$100,000</td> <td style="text-align: right;">\$150,000</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Flooring Replacement (Library, Arenas, Curling Club)</td> <td style="text-align: right;">\$150,000</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Multiplex Ice plant Upgrade</td> <td style="text-align: right;">\$595,000</td> <td style="text-align: right;">\$170,000</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Multi-Sport Asphalt Surface - Hall Crescent Park</td> <td style="text-align: right;">\$52,000</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>RIMP Building Structural Assessment</td> <td></td> <td style="text-align: right;">\$75,000</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>Total</i></td> <td style="text-align: right; border-top: 1px solid black; border-bottom: 3px double black;">1,923,450</td> <td style="text-align: right; border-top: 1px solid black; border-bottom: 3px double black;">\$1,051,000</td> <td style="text-align: right; border-top: 1px solid black; border-bottom: 3px double black;">\$567,000</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<i>Project</i>	<i>2020 Budget</i>	<i>2021 Budget</i>	<i>2022 Budget</i>	Accessibility Audit/Implementation	\$584,000	\$581,000	\$567,000	Arts and Culture Master Plan		\$75,000		City Hall Space Study	\$75,000			City Hall Stairs Repairs/ Upgrade	\$367,450			Columbarium Park	\$100,000	\$150,000		Flooring Replacement (Library, Arenas, Curling Club)	\$150,000			Multiplex Ice plant Upgrade	\$595,000	\$170,000		Multi-Sport Asphalt Surface - Hall Crescent Park	\$52,000			RIMP Building Structural Assessment		\$75,000		<i>Total</i>	1,923,450	\$1,051,000	\$567,000
<i>Project</i>	<i>2020 Budget</i>	<i>2021 Budget</i>	<i>2022 Budget</i>																																										
Accessibility Audit/Implementation	\$584,000	\$581,000	\$567,000																																										
Arts and Culture Master Plan		\$75,000																																											
City Hall Space Study	\$75,000																																												
City Hall Stairs Repairs/ Upgrade	\$367,450																																												
Columbarium Park	\$100,000	\$150,000																																											
Flooring Replacement (Library, Arenas, Curling Club)	\$150,000																																												
Multiplex Ice plant Upgrade	\$595,000	\$170,000																																											
Multi-Sport Asphalt Surface - Hall Crescent Park	\$52,000																																												
RIMP Building Structural Assessment		\$75,000																																											
<i>Total</i>	1,923,450	\$1,051,000	\$567,000																																										
Q	<p><i>Page 211 – 10 Year Capital Plan: When do we anticipate having a more accurate O&M number for the new aquatic center? Forecasting O&M that’s \$1.5M more than we currently spend on the pool (plus the debt servicing for the capital) will have a significant tax impact for future years.</i></p>																																												
A	<p>Work will continue throughout the upcoming weeks to review the operational impacts of a new facility however the O&M cost associated with the aquatic centre project will be further developed as the Bridging Consultant moves forward with the development of the Design Plan and into the Design-Build phase. The most accurate numbers will be available once the Design-Build team have submitted their proposals.</p>																																												
Q	<p><i>Page 25 – How much is budgeted for the Citizen Survey in 2020?</i></p>																																												
A	<p>\$35,000</p>																																												
Q	<p><i>Page 69 – How much is the coin counting machine?</i></p>																																												
A	<p>The replacement coin sorting/counting/wrapping machine is estimated to cost \$40,000.</p>																																												
Q	<p><i>Page 71 - \$66,000 for safety equipment and materials and educational tools – all required? Is this on top of money already for this stuff?</i></p>																																												
A	<p>Some of this amount is a one-time purchase to enhance YKFD’s public education capacity in engaging children and school students (Freddie the Fire Truck). The remainder is for fire suppression materials such as Class A foam and fire hose, and software to enhance in-house on-line training.</p>																																												
Q	<p><i>Page 108 – Can we use Gas Tax Funding to pay principal and interest on capital debt (i.e. if we’re not putting \$4.8M towards the pool this year, can we put \$1.7M of that towards debt instead of the \$1.7M from taxes)?</i></p>																																												

Questions and Answers – November 14

A	Gas Tax funding can be used to pay capital debt on projects that are eligible for Gas Tax Funding.
Q	<i>Page 161 – Multi-purpose asphalt surface – why not from the Land Development Fund?</i>
A	This project was not a Land Development Fund project.
Q	<i>Page 162 – How did this project [Parker Park Field Outfield] grow from \$45k last year to \$87k this year?</i>
A	Budget 2020 is the first time the Parker Park Field Outfield project has been brought forward.
Q	<i>Page 202 – I'm wondering if a portion of the Street Outreach Program can come from the downtown development reserve since it serves the downtown so much.</i>
A	This could be done, on Council's direction.

Questions and Answers – November 19		Responsibility
Q	<p><i>Could we deny the School Board requests and raise less so people are taxed less?</i></p>	EDS ✓
A	<p>Current legislation requires Council to grant the School Board request, and does not given them any ability to alter the request.</p> <p>Section 76(3) of the <i>Property Assessment and Taxation Act</i> provides “Where an education body makes a request under paragraph 135(3)(a) of the <i>Education Act</i> of the amount it requires for education purposes, the council of a municipal taxing authority shall, by bylaw, establish an education mill rate for each property class in the education district to raise a property tax <u>in the amount required by the education body</u>.”</p> <p>Taking the underlined portions together, the amount the education body requests under paragraph 135(3)(a) of the <i>Education Act</i> is supposed to be the amount it requires and Council must (shall=must) establish mill rates to raise that amount. In other words the “amount requested” equals the “amount required” and there is no leeway for Council to substitute its own determination of what the education body ‘requires’.</p> <p>This conclusion is further supported by section 135(3)(a) of the <i>Education Act</i> which requires the education body to “determine the amount required and request it of [...] council”. Additionally, section 135(3) requires that amount requested to be determined following a meeting of ‘ratepayers’ (ie the public), therefore there would be no basis for council to substitute its own conclusions on what is required when the education body has presumably already sought public input and essentially played the role that Council generally does of making decisions on behalf of, and following consultation with, the public.</p>	