1. Deputy City Manager	
Submitted By	Ryan Fequet
Details	Honorable Council Members, As our city continues to grow in complexity, ambition, and service demands, the need for robust and responsive executive leadership becomes increasingly vital. I respectfully propose the establishment of a Deputy City Manager role—an essential step in bolstering our governance structure and enhancing our capacity to deliver on Council's strategic vision. Why Now? ?? Operational Demands Are Increasing: Our departments are managing more projects, regulatory requirements, and community engagement than ever before. A DCM would provide dedicated oversight to streamline operations, reduce bottlenecks, and support staff across divisions. ?? Improved Responsiveness & Agility: From infrastructure planning to emergency management, the DCM would allow for quicker decision-making and greater flexibility, ensuring that no priority goes unaddressed—especially when the City Manager is focused on external relations, long-term planning, and the additional strategic initiatives that come with being a Capital City. ?? Enhanced Council Collaboration: A DCM can serve as a strategic liaison between staff and Council, ensuring timely updates, assisting with policy implementation, and reinforcing alignment with Council objectives. ?? Accountability & Performance: By establishing clear lines of leadership and expanding executive oversight, we can more effectively evaluate program outcomes, manage budgets, and maintain transparency with the public. ?? Succession & Talent Development: The DCM role creates a vital pathway for leadership continuity and offers mentoring opportunities for emerging leaders in our municipal workforce. We have experienced two leadership transitions during our term where having this position in place would have resulted in less disruption from other Directors having to shift focus away from their departmental responsibilities to an Acting role. This continues to be true every time the City Manager takes Leave. Investing in Leadership is Investing in Results The addition of a Deputy City Manager is not just a structural enhancement, it's a commitment to proactive leadership, better service delivery, and long-term resilience. I

	urge the Council to consider this position as a forward-looking investment in the success of our city and its people. Respectfully submitted, Councillor Fequet
Estimated Cost	$200,000
Rational	Benchmarked against similar positions within other jurisdictions and best guess from the City's recent competitions and pay grid.
Tax Increases Supported (Yes/No)	Yes

2. City Funded Fire Hydrants	
Submitted By	Rob Warburton
Details	Recent development projects, including a non-profit daycare, have identified an issue with our current approach to fire hydrants throughout the city but specifically in the downtown core. Over the last few years our zoning and uses have shifted to a higher, mixed-use densities and the fire hydrant infrastructure has not been upgraded to match these increased density goals. Currently building permit requires each new development project to install a fire hydrant if they are more than 45 meters from an existing hydrant. However, this means we are adding hydrants on an ad hoc and frankly inefficient basis depending on where the next development occurs, not necessarily what maximizes the area that is covered by this new infrastructure. I see two financial options and one organizational option that I'd like to consider for budget 2026 to address hydrants starting with our downtown zone to maximize coverage and safety in the most cost-efficient way possible One is to approach it as a capital project funded through tax dollars like similar infrastructure projects throughout the city. While the most straightforward way to cost and budget this it does put a burden on the whole tax base to improve what are highly localized improvements. Option two is a Local Improvement Charge for the downtown zone to address this infrastructure gap. This puts the costs on all those that will benefit from this improvement but my concern here is the ability for a relatively small tax base to foot that significant infrastructure costs. The organizational option, that may have budget impacts, is to investigate a working group with the Office of the Fire Marshall to come up with possible measures and approaches that mitigate the public safety risk while utilizing our existing hydrant infrastructure in our downtown.
Estimated Cost	Not Provided
Estimated Cost (Administration)	$750,000

3. Council Approved Fleet Management	
Submitted By	Rob Warburton
Details	Currently we use the asset management approach to fleet management which allows for long-term planning of the Mobile Fleet Reserve, which I wish to continue. However, our approach to Fleet Management on a year-to-year basis is to simply approve the Capital Project Budget for Fleet Management as one lump sum without any detail of what is being purchased or why. This is not to me adequate oversight of expenditures. I propose we set an upper limit <u>over</u> which council approves purchases within the Fleet Management. Happy to discuss what that amount should be, so we aren't debating a pickup truck purchase but do debate a purchase of million-dollar piece of heavy equipment to balance our asset management approach with proper fiscal oversight. For reference we approved $2.314m without any debate last year and then spent over an hour debating $10k for painted bike lanes.
Estimated Cost	Not Provided

4. Community Frant Funding Increase	
Submitted By	Tom McLennan
Details	Proposal Increase Community Grant funding by $46 800 from 2026 onwards. This increase would be split in the current proportions between Multi Year, Sponsorship and Community (although I'm not set on this ratio). This would be a 10% increase overall. Funding Options 1. Straight tax increase of 0.12% 2. Tax increase of 0.09% and reallocation of Council meals funding ($11 000) 3. Tax increase of 0.07% ($25 750) and a reallocation of Senior/Disabled residents Tax Grant through reducing the grant from $2000 to $1900 ($21 050 estimated) 4. Reallocation of Council meals funding ($11 000) and a reduction of the Senior/Disabled residents Tax Grant by $175 to a maximum of $1825 ($36 837 estimated) 5. A reduction of the Senior/Disabled residents Tax Grant by $225 to a maximum of $1775 ($47 362 estimated) Rationale Community organizations do a lot of heavy lifting when it comes to making our city a healthy and enjoyable place to live. It is great that residents, through their tax dollars, help support these organizations. However, this support has not increased since 2016. In this time inflation has increased by 27%. This is forcing the Grant Review Committee to reject some applications, lower the funding allocated to some applicants and hold funding steady across the board despite very reasonable and sometimes necessary requests for increases. While I am comfortable funding this increase through property taxes I would like to bring up the Senior/Disabled residents Tax Grant as an alternative funding method. During the same period from 2016 to now, as our funding for community organizations has increased 0%, the amount allocated towards the Senior/Disabled residents Tax Grant has increased 240% from $124k to an estimated $421k. Pointing this out is not to say that this money is not needed or that it does not count to making our community a healthy and enjoyable place to live. Rather it is to say that the proportionally of how we allocate our grant money has been significantly screwed in the last decade. My first choice to address this would be to means test the Senior/Disabled residents Tax Grant. However, I have been told in the past that this is not possible under the current GNWT legislation. Therefore, the choice for

	Council is to continue to increase the grant funding allocated to one group of residents while, with inflation, essentially decrease funding to community organizations that, in totality, serve the community as a whole or whether to shift this balance a minor amount back towards what has been done in the past. In essence the question is: is a gradual but significant shift in funding towards a particular set of residents the best use of City funds? While I appreciate this is a thorny question I believe it is important to acknowledge the shift in funding Council has signed off on over the last decade. Based on demographic data this trend only looks to continue and therefore it is important for Council to address the issue.
Estimated Cost	$46,800