

Budget 2022

Mayor and Council Questions

Questions and Answers – November 19 th																															
Q	<i>Page 2: What's the annual assessment growth for the past 5 years?</i>																														
A	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Total Taxable Assessment</th> <th>Change in Assessment</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2014</td> <td>\$2,975,442,740</td> <td>43.76%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2015</td> <td>\$3,023,397,320</td> <td>1.61%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2016</td> <td>\$3,079,641,720</td> <td>1.86%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2017</td> <td>\$3,151,950,770</td> <td>2.35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2018</td> <td>\$3,195,009,190</td> <td>1.37%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2019</td> <td>\$3,847,820,760</td> <td>20.43%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2020</td> <td>\$3,867,630,750</td> <td>0.51%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2021</td> <td>\$3,883,007,290</td> <td>0.26%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2022</td> <td>\$3,907,860,000</td> <td>0.51%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>2014 and 2019 reflect General Assessments</p>	Year	Total Taxable Assessment	Change in Assessment	2014	\$2,975,442,740	43.76%	2015	\$3,023,397,320	1.61%	2016	\$3,079,641,720	1.86%	2017	\$3,151,950,770	2.35%	2018	\$3,195,009,190	1.37%	2019	\$3,847,820,760	20.43%	2020	\$3,867,630,750	0.51%	2021	\$3,883,007,290	0.26%	2022	\$3,907,860,000	0.51%
Year	Total Taxable Assessment	Change in Assessment																													
2014	\$2,975,442,740	43.76%																													
2015	\$3,023,397,320	1.61%																													
2016	\$3,079,641,720	1.86%																													
2017	\$3,151,950,770	2.35%																													
2018	\$3,195,009,190	1.37%																													
2019	\$3,847,820,760	20.43%																													
2020	\$3,867,630,750	0.51%																													
2021	\$3,883,007,290	0.26%																													
2022	\$3,907,860,000	0.51%																													
Q	<i>Budget Summary, page 18: Should we update Gas Tax Agreement to Canada Community-Building Fund (As of June 29, 2021, the Gas Tax Fund has been renamed the Canada Community-Building Fund: https://www.infrastructure.gc.ca/plan/gtf-fte-eng.html)</i>																														
A	This change occurred well into the Draft Budget preparation process; the fund references will be updated in the Final version of the document.																														
Q	<i>Budget Summary, page 18: CPI Funding: Difference between Budget & Forecast; is it a capital timing thing (i.e. you include when you spend it vs receive it)? If not, why the difference?</i>																														
A	Revenues received from grants are recognized when expended.																														

Questions and Answers – November 19th

Q	<i>Budget Summary, page 18: Street Outreach: GNWT only agreed for one year?</i>														
A	There is no certainty of this funding at this time, therefore it is not shown in the budget.														
Q	<i>Mayor and Council, page 25: General Services: We spent \$33k (2020) and \$75k (2021), and have \$113k in the 2022 budget. How come? What's the big ticket items in this line?</i>														
A	<p>The Budget 2020 allocation for General Services was \$103k. Actuals (\$33k) were considerably lower because of lower than anticipated Public Relations, Legal Fees, and Governance Strategy spending.</p> <p>The Budget 2021 allocation was \$108k; the 2021 Forecast (\$75k) is below budget, largely due to lower than budgeted Public Relations, and Legal Fees.</p> <p>The big ticket items in this line are Public Relations, Legal Fees, and Governance Strategy allocations.</p>														
Q	<i>Mayor and Council, page 25: Materials: Spent \$80k (2020) and \$68k (2021), and have \$101k in the 2022 budget. How come? What's the big ticket items in this line?</i>														
A	<p>The Budget 2020 allocation for Materials was \$115k; Actuals (\$80k) were lower than budget mostly due to lower than anticipated Travel Expenses.</p> <p>The Budget 2021 allocation was \$87k; the 2021 Forecast (\$68k) is under-budget due to lower Meeting and Travel Expenses.</p> <p>The big ticket items in this line item are Memberships and Subscriptions, Meeting Expenses, and Travel Expenses.</p>														
Q	<i>Mayor and Council, page 25: Would like to reduce our budget by \$100k. Possible?</i>														
A	<p>Budget 2022 currently includes some allocations that may have a discretionary component:</p> <table border="1" style="margin-left: 20px; border-collapse: collapse; width: 60%;"> <thead> <tr style="background-color: #e0e0e0;"> <th style="text-align: left; padding: 5px;"><i>Expenditure Allocation</i></th> <th style="text-align: right; padding: 5px;"><i>Amount (000's)</i></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="padding: 5px;">Public Relations</td> <td style="text-align: right; padding: 5px;">\$42</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 5px;">Governance Strategy</td> <td style="text-align: right; padding: 5px;">\$31</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 5px;">Memberships and Subscriptions</td> <td style="text-align: right; padding: 5px;">\$53</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 5px;">Meeting Expenses</td> <td style="text-align: right; padding: 5px;">\$25</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 5px;">Travel Expenses</td> <td style="text-align: right; padding: 5px;">\$16</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 5px;">Community Grants</td> <td style="text-align: right; padding: 5px;">\$468</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<i>Expenditure Allocation</i>	<i>Amount (000's)</i>	Public Relations	\$42	Governance Strategy	\$31	Memberships and Subscriptions	\$53	Meeting Expenses	\$25	Travel Expenses	\$16	Community Grants	\$468
<i>Expenditure Allocation</i>	<i>Amount (000's)</i>														
Public Relations	\$42														
Governance Strategy	\$31														
Memberships and Subscriptions	\$53														
Meeting Expenses	\$25														
Travel Expenses	\$16														
Community Grants	\$468														

Questions and Answers – November 19th

Q	<i>Community Services Grants, page 29: Breastfeeding Support Group & St-Pat's High School: Why are they showing funding? Legacy projects that finally got funded?</i>
A	The full funding was not utilized by the groups and therefore was returned.
Q	<i>City Manager, page 33: Not a big one, but Materials were \$10K (2020); \$12k (2021), and going up to \$23k in 2022. Why?</i>
A	The Budget 2020 allocation was \$32k; Actuals (\$10k) were under-budget because there was no travel during 2020 due to COVID restrictions. Budget 2021 reflected the fact that travel was anticipated travel in 2021, but the allocation was increased starting in 2022 to reflect a gradual return to more normal levels of travel.
Q	<i>Office of the City Clerk, page 35: Wages & Benefits: With one less employee, shouldn't it be going down more?</i>
A	The Budget 2021 allocation was lower than the Budget 2020 allocation.
Q	<i>Office of the City Clerk, page 35: General Services: Did the associated expenses for Communications get transferred to the Ec Dev Dept?</i>
A	Yes. The General Services allocation was reduced, reflecting the transfer of the communications-related expenses to the Economic Development and Strategy Department.
Q	<i>Human Resources, page 36: General Services – Why the \$200k increase between 2020 and 2022?</i>
A	The Budget 2020 allocation for General Services was \$766k; Actuals were \$512k, mostly due to lower than budgeting spending on professional development (especially the travel component) due to COVID. The Budget 2021 allocation was \$669k, reflecting the expectation of very little travel in 2021. The allocations have been increased incrementally, beginning in 2022, to allow for a gradual return to more normal levels of travel associated with professional development.

Questions and Answers – November 19th

Q	<i>Taxation, Budgeting and Evaluation, page 43: What’s the cost of Assessment? Have we received an increase from the GNWT under the Assessment Authority Agreement? If not, how long have we been receiving the same amount?</i>																														
A	<p>The Assessment Services Contract approved by Council in 2019 reflects the following annual costs:</p> <table data-bbox="310 342 940 695"> <tr> <td>Year One</td> <td>2019/2020</td> <td>\$216,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Year Two</td> <td>2020/2021</td> <td>\$219,600</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Year Three</td> <td>2021/2022</td> <td>\$222,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Year Four</td> <td>2022/2023</td> <td>\$225,600</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Year Five</td> <td>2023/2024</td> <td>\$228,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Year Six</td> <td>2024/2025</td> <td>\$231,600</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Year Seven</td> <td>2025/2026</td> <td>\$235,200</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Year Eight</td> <td>2026/2027</td> <td>\$238,800</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Year Nine</td> <td>2027/2028</td> <td>\$242,400</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Year Ten</td> <td>2028/2029</td> <td>\$246,000</td> </tr> </table> <p>It also includes allocations of \$29,630 for the first General Assessment and \$31,910 for the Second General Assessment.</p> <p>These amounts will be offset by annual contributions from the GNWT. Under the current Contribution Agreement, which was entered into in June of 2018, the City receives \$125,000 per year. Prior to the end of the current Agreement in 2022, Administration will work with the GNWT in an attempt to obtain annual funding that more closely matches actual costs.</p>	Year One	2019/2020	\$216,000	Year Two	2020/2021	\$219,600	Year Three	2021/2022	\$222,000	Year Four	2022/2023	\$225,600	Year Five	2023/2024	\$228,000	Year Six	2024/2025	\$231,600	Year Seven	2025/2026	\$235,200	Year Eight	2026/2027	\$238,800	Year Nine	2027/2028	\$242,400	Year Ten	2028/2029	\$246,000
Year One	2019/2020	\$216,000																													
Year Two	2020/2021	\$219,600																													
Year Three	2021/2022	\$222,000																													
Year Four	2022/2023	\$225,600																													
Year Five	2023/2024	\$228,000																													
Year Six	2024/2025	\$231,600																													
Year Seven	2025/2026	\$235,200																													
Year Eight	2026/2027	\$238,800																													
Year Nine	2027/2028	\$242,400																													
Year Ten	2028/2029	\$246,000																													
Q	<i>Financial Services, page 46: For note 1, shouldn’t there be some revenue in 2022 too (since the program goes until Sept 2022)?</i>																														
A	This portion of the funding was utilized in 2021.																														
Q	<i>Economic Development and Strategy, page 50: General Services – were funds transferred from City Clerk (with the accompanying position that moved here)?</i>																														
A	Yes.																														
Q	<i>Community Services Directorate, page 57: Note 1 – We didn’t receive any funding for Street Outreach in 2020, correct? Or in 2019? I thought the GNWT only gave us funding once and then again in 2021. The note should be updated, if so.</i>																														
A	There is no certainty of this funding at this time, therefore it is not shown in the budget.																														

Questions and Answers – November 19th

Q	<i>Arenas, page 58: Utility – Fuel and Power. We were under budget in 2021 for both line items. Was that because we were closed? We anticipate increasing in 2022 – or is that because we just update all utility line items based on the 2020 budget (and not the forecast amount)?</i>
A	<p>The 2021 forecast is estimated to be under budget, mostly due to the temporarily closure of facilities. It is assumed the facilities will return to more normal operation in 2022.</p> <p>The 2022 to 2025 budget for utilities is based on estimated annual consumption and estimated unit costs for the next three years.</p>
Q	<i>Parks, page 61: Should we show Covid Funding in the revenue, so that it offsets the increase in salaries?</i>
A	<p>COVID Relief Funding has been shown as Grant Revenue where it is being used to offset revenues (e.g. the portion allocated to Business License Relief); however, the portion that was allocated to temporary staffing was distributed to several different divisions so it was more efficient to report it under Fiscal Services. Both Fiscal Services and the departments are part of the General Fund.</p>
Q	<i>Recreation, page 64: Materials – How are we going from \$15k in 2020 to \$92k in 2022? Covid vs post-pandemic activities?</i>
A	<p>The Budget 2020 allocation for Materials was \$93k; Actuals (\$15k) were substantially lower as very few recreation activities took place in 2020 due to COVID. The Budget 2021 allocation was \$90k, with a Forecast of \$89k.</p>
Q	<i>Wildcat Café, page 68: Are we going out to RFP for the Wildcat this summer? Or did the art group get it for a few years? If so, are we just charging them \$6k for the summer?</i>
A	<p>The 2021 Rental Agreement for the WC was for one season only. An RFP will be issued early in 2022 for operation as a restaurant.</p> <p>Revenue generated is dependent on the proposals received. Typically, the monthly rental is budgeted at \$2,000/month. When the budget was prepared there were a lot of unknowns around the affect the pandemic would have on regular restaurant operation which led to a conservative estimate.</p>
Q	<i>Public Safety Directorate, page 72: Note 1 – Is the plan to have this as an annual expense from now on?</i>
A	<p>This will be revisited in 2023. The Northwest Territories Association of Communities (NWTAC) is applying for 10 million dollars from the federal Disaster Mitigation and Preparedness Funding (DMAF) to be used for Fire Smarting in all NWT Communities. We will know whether this funding is approved in February or March. The funding will be accessible to the communities starting in 2023. Yellowknife’s allocation of the \$10 million will be \$2.59 million over 10 years.</p>

Questions and Answers – November 19th

Q	<i>Municipal Enforcement, page 74: Great to see that General Services & Materials are lower in 2022 vs 2020!</i>
A	The General Services allocation in Budget 2020 included one-time funding for ticketing software. The Materials allocation in Budget 2020 included allocations to replace in-car cameras and radar units, and the coin counter/wrapper machine.
Q	<i>Fire, page 76: If we had an increase in calls, why are we showing a decrease in user charges (2020 vs 2021)?</i>
A	Budget 2020 anticipated User Charges revenues of \$1.8M in user charges; 2020 Actuals came in over budget at \$2.5M. Budget 2022 anticipates User Charges revenues of \$2.2M, reflecting the growth in calls, yet maintaining the organization-wide conservative approach to revenue projections.
Q	<i>Fire, page 76: Is the \$12k in software charges for the emergency dispatch software included this year? Is it included here or in IT's budget?</i>
A	This amount reflects the cost for our current Medical Director to extend oversight to the protocols for pre-arrival medical instruction for dispatchers (\$6,000 per year), and the annual licensing fee for the software (\$6,000 per year). The latter is reflected in the IT budget.
Q	<i>Fire, page 76: Note 1: Climate Change Preparedness North grant – what's that being used for?</i>
A	Fire Smarting. Our Federal Grant from Climate Change Preparedness went from 2019 – 2021 and was extended to 2022 (carryover) which is being used for Fire Smarting. Going forward, the Northwest Territories Association of Communities (NWTAC) is putting in the application for the funding on behalf of all of the NWT Municipal Governments. If approved the City will start receiving funding in 2023 of \$2.5 million from NWTAC over the next 10 years for Fire Smarting. We won't know whether this is approved until February or March of this year.
Q	<i>Fire, page 76: Note 4 is missing</i>
A	Note 4: Medical materials and supplies, protective gear and uniforms, and training aids. This was inadvertently cut off in the Draft document, but will be included in the Final version.
Q	<i>Fire, page 76: General Services: How did we go from \$108k (2019) to \$196k (2022)? Plus we only spent \$111 in 2021. What's the justification for the increase?</i>
A	The change is due to increased Medical Director and radio costs, the addition of Emergency Services contracted costs for the Community Risk Assessment, and the introduction of Emergency Management Contracted costs.

Questions and Answers – November 19th

<p>Q</p>	<p><i>Fire, page 76: Materials: How did we go from \$250 (2018) to \$554 (2022)? I believe there's \$100k for Giant Mine training, but that's still \$204k more in a few years.</i></p>
<p>A</p>	<p>The Budget 2018 allocation for Materials was \$265k. The allocation increased to \$322k in Budget 2019, as a \$55k increase in the amount required for Small Equipment more than offset minor reductions in other G/Ls.</p> <p>The allocation increased in Budget 2020 due to increased requirements for Protective Gear (which was previously treated as a Capital expense) and Materials (hose replacement and firefighting foam), and the addition of allocations for uniforms, office overhead, and supply costs for the then-new Emergency Management Division.</p> <p>The Giant Mine expenditures were introduced in 2021, and were the main reason the allocation rose to \$496k in Budget 2021.</p> <p>In Budget 2022, the allocation includes increases to Protective Gear (for new Fire Fighters), Medical Supplies, and Cleaning Supplies, and totals \$554.</p>
<p>Q</p>	<p><i>Fire, page 76: I know folks have been busy, but with an increase in firefighters, it could be offset by appropriate user charges. Any update on this motion:</i></p> <p>Sept 14, 2020: That Council direct Administration to review all current Fire Division fees and report back to Council with full-cost recovery amounts so Council can compare current rates to full-cost recovery rates. https://citycentral.yellowknife.ca/en/council/resources/Council-Minutes-2020/Council-Minutes-September-14-2020.pdf</p>
<p>A</p>	<p>Our data collection systems aren't set up in a way that allows us to track fuel costs per call or to track individual man hours per call. However, we have started working on a work sheet to put together information on unit costs, staffing costs, maintenance and fuel costs per call. As we don't have the software to assist with this, we are doing it all manually and given the pressures on the staff during the pandemic this is not completed at this point. In the short term, we have prepared a breakdown of the 2021 revenues based on types of calls, rates, number of calls and total billing amounts. We can also show, for each type of call, what rate increases of 10%, 20% or 25% will look like.</p>
<p>Q</p>	<p><i>Planning and Development Directorate, page 79: The Development Incentive Bylaw funding was included in O&M in 2020. Is the funding still in the General Fund? Or do we need to include it again? https://www.yellowknife.ca/en/city-government/resources/Budget/2020_Budget/January-10-2020---Complete-Overwrite/7h.-Planning--Development.pdf</i></p>
<p>A</p>	<p>Money in the O&M is one-year funding only and is not carried forward.</p>
<p>Q</p>	<p><i>Planning and Lands, page 81: Heritage Committee Expenses: Still \$30k?</i></p>
<p>A</p>	<p>\$37k is allocated for Heritage Committee expenses in 2022. This is in keeping with previous budgets where a percentage for inflation is added to the previous year budget allocation.</p>

Questions and Answers – November 19th

Q	<i>Planning and Lands, page 81: What's the increase in Materials?</i>
A	The Budget 2022 allocation is \$2k higher than the Budget 2021 allocation, reflecting general cost increases.
Q	<i>City Garage, page 88: General Services - \$219k (2020); \$231k (2021); and budgeting \$35k in 2022. Why?</i>
A	The General Services Budget 2020 allocation was \$32k. 2020 Actuals were \$219k, reflecting higher than budgeted Fleet and Garage Contracted Costs, which were offset by lower than budgeted Vehicle O&M costs. The Budget 2021 allocation was \$33k, and 2021 Forecasted Costs are expected to be \$231k, again reflecting higher than budgeted Fleet and Garage Contracted Costs, offset by lower than budgeted Vehicle O&M costs.
Q	<i>Roads and Sidewalks, page 90: Why the decrease in General Services? From \$367k to \$190k?</i>
A	The decrease is because concrete and asphalt patching costs were moved from to the Capital Fund. Patching is now included in the Paving Program (see page 145), and reflects a budgeted increase to cover the backlog of work that currently exists.
Q	<i>Land Development Fund, page 95: Bullet point one in the description of this Fund's activities seems like the Development and Lands Officer should be funded through the Land Development Fund. I know we need to change the Land Administration Bylaw (and/or Financial Administration Bylaw). As per Financial Admin Bylaw: The City shall maintain a Land Development Fund to account for the financial activities involving all aspects of acquiring, developing and disposing of municipal lands including the following The Development & Lands Officer is required to acquire land, therefore the cost should be covered by this fund and not taxes.</i>
A	The current by-law does not allow for this. It should be noted that not all land being acquired is to be resold resulting in a revenue for the Land Fund. Therefore, the position is not a revenue neutral nor revenue positive position, which would result in revenues for land development in the future. Only the lands acquired for future sale can be acquired through the money in the Land Fund. Lands included in the bulk land transfer that will not be sold by the City are current roads, facilities and lands for future municipal purposes.
Q	<i>Land Development Fund, page 96: We anticipate selling Bristol Commercial area between 2022 and 2024?</i>
A	This parcel remains for sale and the City is hopeful that the land can be sold. To date it has been undersized for proposed uses inquired about and without services the sale of the land is challenging.

Questions and Answers – November 19th

Q	<i>Capital Fund, page 101: MER – What did we buy in 2021? Why was it a million dollars more than budgeted?</i>
A	There are long delivery times on some fleet units so they are not received in the budgeted year. However, since costs are recorded in the year the unit is received it can make the expenditures that year appear to be over-budget, when in fact the “overage” is covered by the previous year’s allocation.
Q	<p><i>2022 Capital Projects, page 103: Do we need to carry-forward these projects:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>Downtown Multi-Purpose Building Study / 50th St. Rev. (\$75k)</i> ○ <i>Columbarium: \$63k</i> ○ <i>Any others that can be removed?</i>
A	<p>The Downtown Multi-Purpose Building Study / 50th Street Revitalization money was slated to be re-profiled to work towards the implementation of the Theia Report. As this report is now dated, Council may want to consider freeing up this money and making a new allocation in a future year.</p> <p>The remainder of the Columbarium funding will be required for the project in 2022. The project was delayed due to shipping issues but is expected to be completed in the spring of 2022.</p> <p>Administration has reviewed the planned carry forwards and confirmed they are required to complete planned and/or in-progress projects.</p>
Q	<i>Community Energy Plan Projects, page 118: WTP Biomass Boiler – no anticipated decrease in O&M?</i>
A	At this time, it is difficult to quantify a reduction in O&M. While there will be a significant decrease in diesel fuel use, this is offset by increased pellet costs as well as increased O&M for the actual boiler. It requires several preventative maintenance tasks such as weekly cleaning shut downs and more in-depth monthly tasks. Part of the design terms of reference of the project is to attempt to better estimate the annual O&M costs of pellet boiler installations.
Q	<i>Fire Hall Equipment, page 123: The total funding request is \$175k but in the description it says \$55k for the Knox Boxes and \$175k for the hydraulic tools. What’s the discrepancy? And for the O&M, is it \$5k more to service and maintain the hydraulic tools vs the old ones? Or was there just no cost to service and maintain the old ones, and now there is going to be a cost?</i>
A	The cost for the hydraulic tools should be \$120k; this will be corrected in the final version of the budget document. The \$5k reflects the maintenance investment recommended for the new tools.

Questions and Answers – November 19th

Q	<i>Land Fund Capital Projects, page 141: Can we get a breakdown of what projects will be done in 2022 for \$3.3M? The write-up talks about projects over the next three years, and I'm wondering what's being proposed next year and for that amount.</i>
A	Some of this is related to bulk land transfer, area development plans (new – Kam Lake) and finalization of existing ADP (Grace Lake south, Enterprise, Engle) and there is another project which at present remains an in camera discussion.
Q	<i>Land Surveying, page 143: Why is Land Surveying not being funded through the Land Admin fund? As per Land Admin bylaw, "Development Costs" means the City's direct and indirect costs of developing a lot or another specific area of land for disposition to the public, and which may include:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>land acquisition;</i> • <i>fees for appraisal, legal services, surveying, planning and engineering designs and project management;</i>
A	This project is to survey the land being acquired for municipal purposes. As it is not land that will be disposed of, it should not be funded from the Land Fund. There are two separate surveying amounts in the budget due to the nature of the Land Administration By-law and the bulk land transfer for municipal purposes.
Q	<i>Paving Program, page 146: Great to see 50th Street (the sidewalks are rough!), and Hagel Dr (the neighbours will be excited!)</i>
A	N/A
Q	<i>Paving Program, page 147: To be clear, there's no W&S work happening in 2022? Just W&S paving?</i>
A	Water and sewer work will be done as part of the Water and Sewer Infrastructure Replacement project on page 158 of the budget. This project also includes the paving associated with the infrastructure replacement.
Q	<i>PH # 4 Water Truckfill Safety, page 149: Why do we need an extra \$150k for this project? Last year, it was listed as a one-year project with a grand total of \$350k.</i>
A	The project became more complicated due to the increased use of the trucked water fill system. There are more users accessing the system thus increasing onsite traffic. This has caused an increase in conflicting uses at the tennis court and RV dumping station. Additionally, the new safety catwalk system required takes up more space than originally anticipated. The tennis court parking is being relocated with a parking lot off Kam Lake Road, completed by internal resources. The RV dump is being relocated to Kam Lake Road and doubled due to high demand and we have installed a second water fill delivery system for increased efficiency for public and City contractor use. Unfortunately, all this overran the original budget and requires additional funding. However, the end result will eliminate all onsite conflicts and will address site efficiency and safety requirements.

Questions and Answers – November 19th

Q	<i>Rotary Range Lake Trail, page 151: Is the plan to blast some of the Range Lake Trail? Or how will we “evenly grade” it?</i>
A	The project will include the addition of a boardwalk to ensure that the grades of the trail are useable by a larger portion of the population. There is no intention of blasting.
Q	<i>Reserve Fund, page 165: Why is there \$20k from the Land Fund going to the Downtown Development Reserve?</i>
A	The \$20K is related to the parking fee revenue from 50/50 lot and it has been transferred to Downtown Development Reserve for future projects that impact the downtown development.
Q	<i>Reserve Fund, page 165: Major Community Facility Reserve: Are we only taking \$751k from this fund for the aquatic center? Or is the plan to take more money from it in future years?</i>
A	Aquatic Centre funding of \$4,359,987 will be carried forward to 2022 and \$2,430,000 will be funded by Major Community Facility Reserve (MCFR). Therefore, the estimated MCFR balance will be about \$300,000 in 2024 after the completion of Aquatic Centre.
Q	<i>Reserve Fund, page 166: How did the Community Grant Reserve grow so much? Is the funding spoken for (i.e. they’re working on finishing their projects and then we’ll pay) or did groups return it all?</i>
A	Due to the cancellation of events and non-acceptance of the funding, the grants are no longer needed and have been transferred to the Community Grant Reserve for use in future.
Q	<i>Page 168: Wahoo! Final year for the Multiplex. Mortgage burn party next year?? JK – but great to see.</i>
A	N/A
Q	<i>Page 171: Should update Gas Tax reference.</i>
A	This change occurred well into the Draft Budget preparation process; the fund references will be updated in the Final version of the document.

Questions and Answers – December 2nd

Q	<i>City Manager, page 33: What's "Staff Succession Planning"?</i>
A	<p>Administration is proposing \$75K in Budget 2022 for a Succession Plan to ensure corporate stability/continuity and development of staff to be able to assume increasingly senior positions at the City. A combination of external hires and promotion from within is essential – bringing in expertise as needed while ensuring we retain corporate knowledge.</p> <p>Succession planning and succession management will look at both (a) key functions where we need to plan for redundancy and ensure there is continuity and corporate knowledge transfer before key staff leave and (b) Individual staff who may be considering moving on (retiring, moving, etc.). It will also include staff development of up and coming staff who are interested and able to assume more senior roles. Retention, including opportunities for advancement within the City, is an important correlation to this.</p> <p>This initiative directly supports Council's Objective 2.2, which includes the requirement to "Develop and implement a plan for City staff retention and succession to manage program and operations impacts."</p>
Q	<i>Fire, page 76: Does it cost anything to continue to have and maintain the -2222 number?</i>
A	<p>The City pays for each of the prefixes associated with the 2222 number, including the cell phone and landline. This amounts to \$12,600.00 annually. This serves not only as our emergency line but as our business continuity plan: if the City's digital phone trunking line fails, the 2222 number is wired right into the building. This is the only cost associated with maintaining the 2222 line.</p>
Q	<i>General: If we wanted to adjust the commercial: residential mill rate from 2.26:1 to 2.13:1, what would the tax increase % be for residential and what would be the % be for commercial?</i>
A	<p>This is a time consuming calculation that involves setting mill rates for both scenarios. It will be done in advance of public consultation around mill rate ratios planned for early in the new year.</p>

Questions and Answers – December 6th (Part I)

Q	<p><i>Solid Waste Management Fund - what impact does it have that our balance for this Fund continues to be \$12.7M in the red, and that this is projected to increase in 2023 and 2024? I realize that much of this is attributed to site restoration/closure annual accrual and amortization. But when we increase revenues through, say, increased user fees at the solid waste facility; or if we increase expenses such as adding another PY position at the solid waste facility - do these revenues or expenses affect our cash flow in some real way?? On paper these changes are dwarfed by the total amount of deficit in this Fund (that it seems unlikely we will ever climb out of). Is there some hard limit to the amount we can actually spend from this Fund - and if so, what is it??</i></p>
A	<p>The Solid Waste Management Fund is maintained to account for the financial activities related to solid waste operations. The goal is to have the associated revenues cover these costs, however requirements to recognize significant landfill closure liabilities have driven the fund into a negative position. For this reason, Budget 2022 recommends that the Solid Waste Fees be increased 10% in each year of the budget.</p> <p>All revenues received from Solid Waste Fees are recorded into this fund, and all expenditures associated with operating this service are drawn from the fund.</p>
Q	<p><i>New PY - Municipal Engineer - can you clarify whether this is the continuation of an existing position (i.e. changing a term position to a permanent position), or a brand new position?</i></p>
A	<p>This recommendation makes the existing term position (created in 2019 and ending December 31, 2021) permanent.</p>
Q	<p><i>Does administration have any proposal for how to spend the Downtown Revitalization Initiative Reserve (\$2.416 Million) and/or the Downtown Development Reserve (which is hovering around \$900K)?</i></p>
A	<p>When Administration began developing a comprehensive plan for the use of these reserves, it became clear that it would be highly dependent on the Community Plan and ensuing Zoning By-law. Therefore, the work was placed on hold pending these initiatives; it is anticipated that it will resume once the new Zoning By-law is in place.</p> <p>Staff will be reviewing the past direction and studies for these two items as well as the Development Incentive project. The intent is to have Planning and Development work together with Economic Development and bring forward a summary of each as well as options to council in Q1 2022.</p>
Q	<p><i>Federal Gas Tax Funds (p.18 of Budget Summary) - why does this fluctuate so much up and down, from \$2.5 Million in 2020 to an expected \$19.4M in 2023? Where do we get the number \$6.14M for 2022? Do we get this amount no matter what, or is it tied to us completing specific projects that have already been agreed upon?</i></p>
A	<p>The fluctuations appear because funding levels vary from year to year and because the revenues are recognized when they are expended.</p>

Questions and Answers – December 6th (Part I)

<p>Q</p>	<p><i>Investing in Canada Infrastructure Program - why is the 2021 forecast only \$60K when we budgeted to receive \$1.35M? Where do we get the number \$3.964M for 2022? Do we get this amount no matter what, or is it tied to us completing specific projects that have already been agreed upon?</i></p>
<p>A</p>	<p>These revenues are recognized when they are expended. So if projects are delayed, the revenue recognition is too.</p>
<p>Q</p>	<p><i>It appears that all of the proposed Capital Projects would be covered by federal or territorial grants, or user fees/ Funds such as the Solid Waste Fund or Land Fund (besides debt to be taken on for the new Aquatic Centre and submarine water line). If we decided not to pursue any of these proposed Capital Projects, where would the money go instead - or would we end up getting a lower amount in grants?</i></p>
<p>A</p>	<p>This depends on the conditions associated with the funding. The Build Canada Funding is very specific to the construction of a new pool, so had the Aquatic Centre not proceeded we would not have received the funding. Similarly, the DMAF money is tied directly to the Submarine Water Supply Line Replacement project and cannot be spent on other initiatives. However, funding like the Gas Tax Rebate is flexible and if it is not spent on one project, it can likely be allocated to another one.</p>
<p>Q</p>	<p><i>Solid Waste Management Plan Implementation (p. 105 of Capital Fund summary) - it appears that almost nothing was spent on this in 2020, \$50K was spent in 2021, and nothing is proposed for 2022, 2023 or 2024. Does this mean we are falling behind on implementing the Plan? Can you remind us when was the last time we got an update on SWMP implementation progress, and refer us back to any progress charts or documents you might have shared?</i></p>
<p>A</p>	<p>The SWF is prioritizing the bigger infrastructure/long-term action items. These items, such as weigh scale installation, a Design, Operations and Closure Plan (DOCP), Cell C design, aggregate crushing and wood chipping are mostly covered under O&M/Capital budgets.</p> <p>The SWMP Implementation puts emphasis on compost program expansion. It does not take into account that a limiting factor for expansion is access to wood to use as a bulking agent. Through infrastructure enhancements and stronger differential tipping fees, the goal is to ensure that discarded wood is sorted out of the waste stream and instead processed for reuse. SWF is working to that end but won't push MFU expansion till we have a better grasp on wood volumes.</p> <p>SWMP implementation work will be done in the upcoming years and will focus on educating the public on differential tipping fees.</p> <p>An update on Waste Management was done in Sept. 2020.</p>

Questions and Answers – December 6th (Part I)

Q	<i>Asset Management capital expenditure (p.111) - can you provide a clear breakdown of what the \$300K is to be spent on in 2022? I understand from the description that part of it is to fund a new PY, is that correct? What about the rest?</i>
A	Yes, the recommended term position will be funded from this allocation. Planned work includes extensive data collection and asset condition assessments, along with a focus on defining and documenting levels of service.
Q	<i>Emergency Medical Dispatch software (p.120) - under Operational Impact (p.122) it says \$12K for medical director; is that an expense that we have regardless, or is it an additional \$12K specifically related to this capital item?</i>
A	This expense is related specifically to this capital item. The cost for our current Medical Director to extend oversight to the protocols for pre-arrival medical instruction for dispatchers is \$6,000 per year, and the annual licensing fee for the software is \$6,000 per year.
Q	<i>MD software (p.120) - It is very difficult to understand from the description where we are at in our ongoing discussions with MACA about how the City dispatch is supposed to interface with the 911 system. The description details some ongoing problems with the interface and the protocols, but it is unclear what is the ultimate goal that we have decided would be ideal. Are we working towards phasing out certain aspects of the City dispatch system that duplicates 911? Are we looking to take over more of what 911 does, possibly getting the GNWT to contract out certain aspects or functions to the City? Is the goal duplication, in the name of redundancy?? Can you provide any insight into this?</i>
A	After ongoing discussions on various matters related to the interface between 911 and 2222, MACA and the City committed in August 2021 to negotiate an MOU related to respective roles and responsibilities, along with operational details. Work has not yet started on this.
Q	<i>Fire Hall Equipment (p.123) - The description says the hydraulic tools cost \$175K, and the Knox Box replacement equipment costs \$55K, but the total requested for 2022 is \$175K. What does this include?</i>
A	The cost for the hydraulic tools should be \$120k; this will be corrected in the final version of the budget document.
Q	<i>Lagoon Control Structure (p.104 capital summary) - there was \$239K carryover in 2020 (only \$42K spent) and \$540K carryover in 2021 (only \$10K spent) - what is the plan to spend that money, and why is an additional \$125K needed in 2022 if there is still the substantial carryover from the past two years?</i>
A	The project has been going through design iterations with our consultant. The original budget was based on the best information at the time. Both 2020 and 2021 saw the design and regulatory permitting progress. This provided more detailed budgets and indicated the need for additional budget in 2022 to complete the work.

Questions and Answers – December 6th (Part I)

Q	<p><i>Lagoon Sludge Removal (p. 104 capital summary) - there was \$425K carryover in 2020 (only \$43K spent) and \$1.725M carryover in 2021 (only \$75K spent) - what is the plan to spend that money, and why is an additional \$950K needed in 2022 if there is still the substantial carryover from the past two years?</i></p>
A	<p>Challenges with the design of the treatment pad and access road led to delays of the project and less spending. The access road needs to be upgraded to accommodate the heavy truck traffic the project will create. The carryover amounts will be used for the treatment pad construction and access road upgrades, the future budgets will be for sludge removal. The overall projected budget is \$8.6M, with ICIP funding covering \$5.625M.</p>
Q	<p><i>Land Fund Capital projects (p.141) - Overall I find this description very confusing. The second paragraph starts with an unfinished sentence? ("2022-2024 will focus on..."). Specifically:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>1. What is the reference in a) to "infill lots in Old Town and Downtown areas" - what is the plan for these lots that will require Land Fund money?</i> <i>2. Are we really planning to develop a new Frame Lake West subdivision within the next 3 years??? Or another "new residential subdivision" (f)?? This seems to conflict with the Community Plan priorities of infill and densification.</i>
A	<p>The “to include” will be removed in the final version of the document to improve clarity.</p> <p>There are two sites in Old Town, and a number within the Downtown, that will be considered for infill. They would require survey for subdivision, marketing plan and appraisal. Due to the servicing in Old Town the consideration would be residential. In the Downtown, mixed used would be ideal. Options being referred to meet the definition of Revitalization Initiative.</p> <p>The Frame Lake subdivision is included in the Community Plan for Commercial development. This may be initiated should a need and justification present itself following COVID economic recovery. This is not planned for 2022.</p> <p>There are opportunities for new residential development adjacent to the downtown, built up areas and in Niven. These are not proposed greenfield development, rather infill on a larger scale than three to five lots discussed earlier. Consideration will be given to opportunities for new housing forms and configurations.</p>

Questions and Answers – December 6th (Part I)

Q	<i>Why can't the \$600K for Land Surveying come out of the Land Fund?</i>
A	<p>This project is to survey the land being acquired for municipal purposes. As it is not land that will be disposed of, it should not be funded from the Land Fund. There are two separate surveying amounts in the budget due to the nature of the Land Administration By-law and the bulk land transfer for municipal purposes.</p> <p>Land Administration By-law No. 4596 (s.10) identifies that the fund is to be utilized for the purchase of strategically identified lands, for the assembly and servicing of lands to be developed and marketed by the City.</p> <p>The \$600 K is for surveying of lands to be held by the City and not marketed for sale and therefore would not contribute back to the land fund. The Land Administration by-law is clear that the fund is not to be used for any purpose other than what is outlined in the by-law (s.10 d)</p>
Q	<i>Paving Program (p.145) - the budget for paving in 2020 was \$3M, and in 2021 was \$2.5M. Why the jump to \$4.075M in 2022?</i>
A	The paving program varies by year depending on streets provided in the program. Patching was also moved from O&M to capital for 2022. The City also received ICIP funding that will cover 75% of 2022 and 2023 paving.
Q	<i>PH#4 Water Truckfill Safety (p.148) - in 2021 \$333K was spent out of the budgeted \$350K. What work has already been completed? Why is an additional \$150K required? Does this mean the project is going overbudget?</i>
A	The project became more complicated due to the increased use of the trucked water fill system. There are more users accessing the system thus increasing onsite traffic. This has caused an increase in conflicting uses at the tennis court and RV dumping station. Additionally, the new safety catwalk system required takes up more space than originally anticipated. The tennis court parking is being relocated with a parking lot off Kam Lake Road, completed by internal resources. The RV dump is being relocated to Kam Lake Road and doubled due to high demand and we have installed a second water fill delivery system for increased efficiency for public and City contractor use. Unfortunately, all this overran the original budget and requires additional funding. However, the end result will eliminate all onsite conflicts and will address site efficiency and safety requirements.
Q	<i>Range Lake Trail (p.151) - how will the trail be graded? Will this require blasting?</i>
A	The project will include the addition of a boardwalk to ensure that the grades of the trail are useable by a larger portion of the population. There is no intention of blasting.

Questions and Answers – December 6th (Part I)

Q	<i>Submarine Water Supply Line (p.155) - While \$1M was budgeted in each of 2020 and 2021, it appears that only \$189K has been spent; there is \$1.8M carryover. What has been completed so far; and will we realistically be able to spend \$2.8M in 2022?</i>
A	While the work completed has not kept to budgeted amounts, the carryover amounts will contribute to the overall project budget. We have recently awarded engineering services so expenditures are expected to increase in 2022. The full carryover and budgeted amounts may not be spent in 2022 but the carryover amounts will contribute to the major construction phase planned in future years. We recommend sticking with this funding approach to reduce the spike in future budgets.
Q	<i>Water & Sewer (p.158) - in 2020 the budget was \$2.5M; in 2022 the budget is proposed to be \$4.225M; and in 2024 it is proposed to drop back down to \$2.8M. Why the fluctuations?</i>
A	<p>The 2020 actuals for 54 Avenue were \$2.5M for the W&S portion of the work, which was under budget. This does not include the paving of the previous year's W&S project on Dagenais Drive. The proposed 2022 budget is to complete Phase 2 of Hordal Road and to repave Phase 1 of Hordal Road.</p> <p>The fluctuations in the W&S program are based on long term projections of what the work might be for that year. Each street varies on complexity and cost.</p>
Q	Water & Sewer (p. 158) - why is it proposed to use "user fees" (I assume this means the Water & Sewer Fund?) to cover part of the costs in 2023 and 2024, but not in 2022?
A	When Administration allocates funding, the most restrictive funding is applied first. In 2022, external funding was available and applied, meaning the project could be funded without the use of User Fees.

Questions and Answers – December 6th (Part II)

Q	<i>p.33 City Manager Budget - how does the \$226K in the budget line for Reconciliation relate to note #2 which has \$150K for Reconciliation work?</i>
A	Expenditure by Activity shows the allocation of time & resources spent by the City Manager on reconciliation-related work amounts to approx. \$226K. Contracted expenses (\$150K) identified in Expenditures by Object would be a part of that.
Q	<i>p. 33 - is the planned \$150K for Reconciliation work over and above existing staff training?</i>
A	No, this amount includes the training. The residential school training for all City staff was paused due to COVID, and the resources to support reconciliation include a portion to seek Indigenous Cultural Understanding training.
Q	<i>p. 33 - is the \$100K for Covid, to be used as contingency across the organization, or just within the City Manager's budget?</i>
A	This is contingency for the overall City, to be used as and where needed. It is held centrally so that it can be spent on whatever COVID operational pressure emerges.
Q	<i>p.35 - similar question to Rebecca - if a comms position was moved out of this department (and \$146K was added to Wages & Benefits in the Ec Dev budget), why were Wages & Benefits only decreased by \$22K from 2020 to 2021 budget, and why are we back up to a greater amount for Wages & Benefits than in 2020?</i>
A	The 2020 Budget for Clerks Wages & Benefits was \$776k. The 2021 Budget was \$687k, reflecting the reduction arising from the position transfer. 2020 Actuals were under-budget due to staff vacancies.
Q	<i>p.99 Capital Fund - following up on my question #6 that I sent last night - it appears that \$1M is to be taken out of taxation to fund Capital projects - which capital projects is this allocated for? I don't see any mention in any of the capital projects listed of taxation being used to fund any of them.</i>
A	The amount on page 99 represents the regular transfer to Capital. During the course of this budget, it is recommended that \$1M be transferred from the General Fund to the Capital Fund.
Q	<i>p. 42 - Why can't the 5 yr term Asset Management Manager position continue to be funded out of the Capital Fund?</i>
A	This can be done, if Council directs Administration to do so. It is not recommended as it reduces the amount of the Capital allocation available to support the Asset Management initiatives.

Questions and Answers – December 6th (Part II)

Q *p.47 - what is the plan for repurposing the City Hall lower boardroom?*

A At this point there is no specific plan for this space once it is vacated by the Visitors' Centre. However, there is a shortage of office space within City Hall and consideration is being given to turning this space into work areas, at least until the Aquatic Centre is completed.

Q *p. 56 - Community Services wages and benefits - why has it gone up 18% between 2020 and 2022 (from \$5.5M to \$6.5M) when PYs have decreased by 2.3?*

A The approved Budget 2020 allocation was \$6,114k, and the approved Budget 2021 allocation was \$6,371, an annual increase of 4.2%.

The recommended Budget 2022 allocation is \$6,531, an annual increase of 2.5%. This reflects annual increments and is lower than normal because it is slightly offset by the P/Y decrease. This decrease is due to a reduction in part-time / casual hours and reflects an overall decrease of less than 1%.

Questions and Answers – December 7th

<p>Q</p> <p>A</p>	<p><i>Planning & Lands - bulk land transfers from GNWT - has this already begun or do we have any indication from MACA as to when this will begin? What factors within the GNWT might the timing of this land transfer depend on?</i></p> <p>There are two parts to this answer.</p> <p>a) The City and the Department of Lands are working on an MOU, it has been drafted and has received legal review on our end. It outlines that land requested by the City will be considered for transfer through a specific process and that process will be within two years of the request from the City.</p> <p>b) The City has made the following priority requests for land to date:</p> <p>P1 City Hall – 3 parcels Landfill Expansion Vacant Land on Gitzel – 2 lots Access Road – Trappers Lake</p> <p>P2 Surveyed Municipal Road parcels Unsurveyed Municipal Roads</p> <p>P3 Lands currently under Headlease(s) and Waterfront Lands</p> <p>P4 Additional lands to be clarified and presented to Council. Growth Management Lands and Special management Reserve lands.</p> <p>Out of the 75% of land within the municipal boundary that is not City owned, we are making application for bulk land transfer of ~ 60% of the lands. The requests are being phased to ensure the staff, consultants (surveyor) and funding is available.</p>
<p>Q</p> <p>A</p>	<p><i>Capital Area Committee (p.81) - do we have any indication from other partners on the Committee that they will be contributing their financial contributions in 2022, or that any projects will begin with funding from the Committee?</i></p> <p>Historically the other partners have not contributed financially and the City \$50K has always been dependent on others paying equal share, therefore to date the money has not been utilized on a project or program.</p>
<p>Q</p> <p>A</p>	<p><i>Public Works (p. 84) - will the addition of another Works Maintainer position result in any decreased contracting costs, and if so, where is that reflected in the budget?</i></p> <p>The position of a Works Maintainer will not result in the decrease of any contracted costs. The need for additional staff is related to increasing service level costs over years of increased development in Yellowknife. More detail is provided in the PY Justification Form.</p>

Questions and Answers – December 7th

Q	<i>Public Works (p. 84) - what was the rationale for making the Municipal Engineer position only a 3-year term, originally?</i>
A	The Engineering Division first hired a term engineer from 2017-2019 through the CWWF funding agreement for a large scale W&S replacement. Once this was completed, Administration brought forward a permanent PY in 2019 for the 2020 budget cycle. The permanent position was denied and made a 3-year term, which is ending in 2022. We are requesting this be made permanent as a full time staff person will be required to manage all the requirements in the new (15 year) water licence, which has significantly more work and reporting requirements than the previous licence. This work cannot be absorbed by the two other engineering staff given current and future workloads.
Q	<i>Solid Waste Management Fund (p.91) - what was the grant for \$201K in 2020?</i>
A	The 2020 grant was for the costs incurred during the Smart Cities Challenge. It covered the expenditures for pursuing that initiative.
Q	<i>Water & Sewer Fund (p.93) - Our budget policy states we should keep this fund balance at least 5% of budgeted expenditures - does this mean 5% of the overall budget expenditures (\$123M), or 5% of Water & Sewer fund expenditures (\$14.5M)?</i>
A	The reference is to 5% of the Water and Sewer Fund expenditures.
Q	<i>Reserves (p.165) - Can you clarify whether we have any policies about keeping a minimum balance in either the Heritage Reserve or Community Grant Reserve?</i>
A	<p>The Financial Administration By-law No. 4206 established the Heritage Reserve “to develop and maintain heritage sites”. Based on the direction from the previous mayor at the time, the City has been transferring unspent Heritage Committee allocations into this reserve.</p> <p>The same By-law established the Community Grant Reserve “to maintain unallocated and/or unspent grant funds for future years.” These balances are transferred prior the end of each fiscal year.</p> <p>No policies exist around balances in either Reserve.</p>

December 6th, 2021 Deliberations Follow – Up

Total Call Volume YKFD

	EMS Calls	Fire Calls	YKFD Total Calls
2016	3768	202	4656
2017	3761	174	4388
2018	3484	162	4281
2019	3348	153	4180
2020	3993	126	4672
2021 (Up to Dec 6 th)	4021	118	5225

YKFD Call Volume Relative to closure of Temporary Day Shelter (Summer 2021)

May 31 st – Sept 17th		
	EMS Calls	Total Calls
2018	1215	1462
2019	1089	1355
2020	1388	1637
2021	1781	1939

Fire Fighter Starting Salary

\$101,300 per firefighter (including benefits)

Fire Division Revenues

Upon further review of the revenues from Ambulance calls in 2021 it appears that the budgeted amount for 2022 is quite conservative. Given response volume we will adjust the final budget to reflect \$2.233M.

Yellowknife Street Outreach

What's the cost of Street Outreach?

2021 = \$373,752

2022 = \$383,133

And do we have an estimate on the # of calls or responses that we get in the downtown core? I.e. do half of the calls come from the DT?

- During September 2021, the most common source of referrals was self-referrals (287 calls); the second most common source of referrals was calls from the public (186 calls).
- The most common pick-up locations in September 2021, were pickups within the **downtown core (260) followed by pickups at public places outside the downtown** core (181). The third and fourth most common pick-up location was Shelters, such as the Salvation Army, Women Centre, Spruce Brough, Bailey House and HomeBase (201).

December 7th, 2021 Deliberations Follow – Up

Request	Response
Administration undertook to provide further information regarding whether the four-year term Development and Lands Officer position could be funding jointly through the Land Development Fund and General Fund.	Administration advises this could be done by adjusting the Administrative transfer from the Land Fund to the General Fund to reflect the increased services provided by this new position in support of land to be sold. To ensure transparency, staff will track the proportion of time spent on Land Administration vs other Planning or Lands work and this tracking will inform the amount of the transfer.
It was suggested that Administration make a notation of committed funds in future budgets eg. \$2.4 million within the Major Community Facility Reserve is committed toward the Aquatic Centre project.	Administration will endeavour to provide more informative Notes in future budget documents to identify where allocations are earmarked but not yet recorded.
Administration undertook to provide information to Council regarding drawing down the General Fund Balance to 15% of Expenditures for 2022 and future years.	This information will be presented during the December 8 th deliberations.