

**1. Please provide further details regarding children services (Landry-Altmann, J)**

Answer:

In April 2019, municipalities received notification of three changes in funding to the 2019 provincial child care funding envelope:

- 1) a requirement for municipalities to now cost share (20%) child care expansion funding (was previously 100% provincial);
- 2) cost share (50%) all administrative expenditures (was previously approx. 80% provincial); and
- 3) a reduction of the cap on administrative expenditures that would be cost-shared with the province (from 10% down to 5%).

The 2020 budget was completed with these parameters. The 2020 financial impact of these changes were to be offset fully by mitigation funding (reserve) available to Children Services. These funds were provided to offset provincial funding reductions and were calculated based on the best estimates at the time.

In September 2019, municipalities received further direction regarding these funding changes, as a result of significant pressure being exerted by municipalities across the province. The funding changes will now be implemented over a three year period beginning in 2020.

- Effective January 2020, child care expansion funding will be provided to municipalities at 80% and municipalities will be **encouraged** to provide their 20% contribution - although it is not mandatory.
- Effective January 2021, in addition to the expansion funding changes implemented in 2020, municipalities will be required to cost share 50% (mandatory) of administrative expenditures.
- Effective January 2022, in addition to the prior two years funding adjustments, the cap on allowable administrative expenditures eligible for cost-sharing will be reduced from 10% of total funding, to 5% of total funding. Any administrative expenditure in excess of this 5% cap will be funded by the municipality entirely.

The Ministry of Education has recently released the allocations for Municipalities for 2020 and there is a further reduction based on newer Census data, and staff are awaiting a technical report from the province to explain the variances. Regardless, the 2020 financial impact on the municipal Children Services budget will be offset by mitigation and staff will be bringing forward options for Council review in 2020 to deal with the impacts in subsequent years once the full impact is known.

**2. Please provide further details regarding reduction of social services budget by \$175,000 (Landry-Altmann, J)**

Answer:

This reduction specifically addresses allowances for infrequent purchases that would not be reasonably included in regular subsidy calculations. For example, these funds enable the purchase of replacement appliances, or they fund personal expenditures like dentures or funerals.

Greater Sudbury's budget for such items is among the highest in the province. Council increased it in 2017 in response to a surge in demand, instead of revising the policy that identified eligible expenditures. Currently, there is increased demand in the Community Homelessness Prevention Initiative (CHPI) program, due to an influx in immigration.

If approved, the reduction in the discretionary budget will prompt the introduction of policy changes that would be presented in the first quarter of 2020. The purpose of these changes would be to align the amount of available funding with the timing and amount of eligible expenditures. Even with this reduction, Greater Sudbury's budget is still one of the highest in the Province.

**3. What is meant by review of crossing guards and will the reduction eliminate the service all together? (Landry-Altmann, J)**

Answer:

Currently there are 31 crossing guard locations. Societal norms have changed and, over the years, these crossing locations have seen a decline in children crossing on foot. This indicates it would be appropriate to review the potential for change based on the Council approved School Crossing Guard Policy (attached). We will provide a further report to Council no later than the second quarter of 2020. This could result in the elimination of the service. Prior to closing crossing locations, Transit and Traffic Staff will review and determine the need to maintain existing service or replace with additional safety mitigation measures for the area such as signage and/or pedestrian crossings signals.

**4. How much does the City have budgeted for the Driveway Culvert Subsidy Program? (McIntosh, D)**

Answer:

The 2020 budget includes approximately \$148,000 for the driveway culvert subsidy program.

**5. Please provide a breakdown of taxes by class. (Kirwan, R)**

Answer:

We have not received the year-end assessment roll to be used for the taxation year 2020. Therefore, the following is a breakdown of 2019 taxes.

Class	Taxation	Percentage
Residential	177,832,000	64.8%
Multi-residential	17,649,000	6.4%
Commercial	54,241,000	19.8%
Industrial	22,989,000	8.4%
Other	1,594,000	0.6%
<b>Total</b>	<b>274,305,000</b>	<b>100%</b>

- 6. Page 67 indicates an increase in \$650K for Environmental Services contracts. What is the cause of that increase? Further to this, on Page. 254 the increased cost in Purchased/Contracted Services in the Environmental Services budget summary is \$777,551. Which is the correct number? (McCausland, G)**

Answer:

Approximately \$285,000 for necessary contractual obligations for the Sudbury Landfill, \$290,000 for waste collection as well as \$75,000 for the processing blue box recyclables. These are multiple year contracts, which are negotiated consistent with the terms and conditions of the contract. Furthermore, the information presented on page 67 is a summary of larger items. Both amounts are correct, however, \$777,551 is the total change in the Purchased/Contracted Services node for Environmental Services.

- 7. Pg.84: Why are the clerk’s hours perfectly divided across the different activity areas at 3,600 each? It seems highly unlikely that that reflects that actual division of work. Are we accurately tracking the division of work? (McCausland, G)**

Answer:

The 3,600 hours is simply a straight line calculation of two FTEs worth of time. We haven't yet taken the step of assigning hours to particular services in say, vital statistics, but we could and will when time and activity reporting is implemented. For now, it reflects two FTEs worth of time devoted to that basket of activities. As you pointed out, 1,800 is used as a proxy, when you take out vacation time and any absences, the real figure is much lower but we used 1,800 fairly universally in the service profile exercise.

- 8. What is the annual operational budget impact of operating Lively and Adanac ski hills? (McCausland, G)**

Answer:

The operating budget impact of ski hills (from the 2020 budget) is detailed below. It is important to note that there is a capital component, not reflected in the operating budget, associated with this service. While capital expenditures are not annual expenditures, these operations do rely on capital equipment that requires periodic investments to maintain service continuity and sustain a state of good repair, and should be kept in mind in any review of the ski hills' operations:

Adanac

- Total revenues - \$415,611
- Total expenses - \$514,566
- Net budget - \$98,954

Lively

- Total revenues - \$10,845
- Total expenses - \$118,070
- Net budget - \$107,225

The City also maintains Capreol Ski Hill as an unofficial sliding hill with the following budget impact:

- Total revenues - \$0
- Total expenses - \$17,307
- Net budget - \$17,307

**9. What was the attendance in 2018 for the Copper Cliff Museum and the Anderson Farm Museum (broken out)? What is the total operational budget impact of each museum? (McCausland, G)**

Answer:

**Museum Operating Budgets:**

Anderson Farm Museum - \$202,381

Copper Cliff Museum \$11,510

Flour Mill Museum \$14,480

Northern Ontario Railway Museum \$6,730

**Attendance (including special events in which City is partner):**

Anderson Farm Museum total attendance 2018: 20,525

Copper Cliff Museum total attendance 2018: 454

- 10. Pg. 180, Office of the CAO: There is clearly a Grant being introduced this year but it is not clearly identified in the pages following. What is the grant/program implied in the budget summary numbers? Pg. 188, Economic Development: There is clearly a grant introduced in the 2020 budget, but I don't believe it is mentioned in the description pages. What is the grant/program implied in the budget summary numbers? (McCausland, G)**

Answer:

On page 66 and 67 of the budget document are two sets of analyses. One for operating revenues and one for expenses. These analyses highlight the major changes between the 2019 approved operating budget and the proposed 2020 amounts.

The Economic Development Division is part of the Office of the CAO. Both page references cited in your question refer to the same item. The change in 2020 amounts represent grants for the Regional Business Centre and the Mining Supply Program. These programs were available in 2019 but their funding was not confirmed when the 2019 Budget was prepared. Both programs' anticipated revenue and related expenditures are included in the 2020 Budget.

- 11. On Page 192 there is a statement that we are seeing "declining revenues" from changes to police enforcement, but then on page 194 in the budget summary revenues are up 25% or \$636K. What is the source of the increased revenue for Legal and Clerk's Services? (McCausland, G)**

Answer:

The source of the increased revenue for Legal and Clerk's Services is for the Red Light Camera program.

- 12. Pg 301; Business Case for Downtown CIP. Can we get a status update on the funds invested in 2019 in the Downtown CIP? (McIntosh, D)**

Answer:

In 2017, City Council allocated \$600,000 to the Downtown CIP. Of this amount \$131,000 has been spent to date and \$331,000 is allocated through signed agreements. \$100,000 was re-allocated by Council to fund a portion of the 2018 Downtown CIP intake. \$15,000 is notionally allocated in draft agreements that have not been executed by the applicant. This leaves approximately \$23,000 in surplus funding.

In 2018, City Council allocated \$5.6 million to the Downtown CIP. This includes \$4.6 million from the City, a request of \$900,000 from the GSDC and \$100,000 from the 2017 Downtown CIP

intake. Of this amount, \$1.5 million is allocated through signed agreements. \$4.1 million is notionally allocated in draft agreements that have not been executed by the applicant.

Further to Council's direction earlier this year, staff will evaluate the effectiveness of the CIP programs and will report these findings to Council in Q1 2020, together with recommendations regarding the future of the CIP program.

- 13. Pg 279; Business Case makes mention of not needing to have an Ontario Land Surveyor on staff and that we will contract out when we require those services. Is there an expected savings by making that change? It appears that the Business Case only reflects an additional cost for the proposed change to remove a Control Survey Assistant for a GIS Editor / Survey Control Asst. (McIntosh, D)**

Answer:

The impact of this change is unknown at this time and will be further investigated next year. Any savings will be incorporated into future budgets.

- 14. Pg 392: In the document 2020 Capital Project Funding Summary by Year - Why are we seeing such a drop in User Fees from 2020 to 2021 and beyond? (McIntosh, D)**

Answer:

Amounts in future periods represent the amounts committed in those years for multi-year projects that were approved in prior periods. Therefore, they do not show the full amount associated with each funding category in the future periods. Instead, they show the amount required in a particular year to pay for projects that were approved in a previous year.

For example, on p. 392 you will note that the 2022 funding plan for "User Fees" anticipates \$2,593,285, and only \$963,008 beyond 2024. This means for projects that were already approved in prior periods, or are recommended for approval in 2020, we need to commit \$2,593,285 of user fee revenues in 2022 to help pay for them. Similarly, those same projects require \$963,008 beyond 2024.

- 15. Economic development page 76 and 77 our goal for business visits was 400-450 but our actual on page 76 was only 200? Is there any major driver of this level of underperformance? (Jakubo, M)**

Answer:

The goal presented is incorrect. The goal for business visits is 250-300.

- 16. Page 224 - Children's services section - the Province has again reduced its funding of a key service from 100% funding to an 80/20 model. The explanation states that staff will be recommending changes to policy to help with this new model. What can we expect in order to continue to facilitate the continued expansion of childcare spaces? (Jakubo, M)**

Answer:

Staff will provide a report at the Community Services Committee Meeting in the first quarter, with an overview of funding with respect to supporting ongoing child care expansion within existing allocations which would remain intact for 2021 due to mitigation. Beyond this available funding, any future expansions would have to be supported through the levy as of 2021. Essentially, Council will have the decision of whether or not to provide a match to the new Provincial formula which is changing from 100 percent to 80/20. The Province has said they would continue to give the 80% even if Councils do not want to add their 20%. If Council is open to considering ongoing expansion, we can build that into our 2021 budget request. We will also provide information in the report of any pressures in the current system for Council consideration.

- 17. Page 294 - Lasalle Corridor - last statement in the alternatives - are there any currently funded projects which Planning could defer in order to reprioritize this business case? (Jakubo, M)**

Answer:

This business case was developed by Planning and Infrastructure Capital Planning staff. If approved by Council, it is anticipated that this work would be led by ICP staff given their Active Transportation Mandate. Currently, neither team has allocated resources to this project. If this project is prioritized by Council, existing planned active transportation and planning projects would be examined to de-prioritize some projects and reallocate existing resources to accomplish Council's priorities.

- 18. Page 326 - Spreader laid patches - I want a list of what work could get done with this \$1,000,000? (Jakubo, M)**

Answer:

The \$1 million dollar business case would provide approximately 25,000 sq.m of large asphalt patches. It should be noted that this is a road maintenance activity and not an asset management strategy. The activity focuses on arterial roads where pothole patching techniques aren't as efficient. If approved, a list will be provided in the spring once the roads have been evaluated.

- 19. Page 329/330 - Valley Twin Pad - This contemplates funding the entire project ourselves with no ICIP funding. If we receive ICIP funding please show us what this business case would look like? (Jakubo, M)**

Answer:

Investing in Canada Infrastructure Program: Community Culture and Recreation Stream

As per City Council Resolution CC2019-299, the City has made application to the Multipurpose Category of the Community, Culture and Recreation Stream of the Investing in Canada Infrastructure Program (ICIP) for the Valley East Twin Pad Multipurpose Sports Complex project.

Under this funding program, the maximum cost-share percentages of the total eligible costs for projects are as follows:

- Federal Contribution 40.00%
- Provincial Contribution 33.33%
- Municipal Contribution 26.67%

Should the project be approved for ICIP funding, the municipal contribution (including debt financing) would be \$11.58M for the project. Full details below:

Total Project Budget	\$28,374,795
Federal Contribution	\$11,349,918
Provincial Contribution	\$9,457,319
Municipal Contribution	\$7,567,558
Borrowing Costs (based on 30 year amortization at 3% interest rate)	\$4,015,178
Total Municipal Costs	\$11,582,736
Annual payments	\$386,901

**20. Page 336 - Electronic Road Patrol - I do not see any efficiency/savings associated with this business case? So is it correct to state that we need more patrol staff anyways and this would only allow them to do a better job of patrolling? (Jakubo, M)**

Answer:

Electronic Road Patrol offers efficiencies in the following areas:

- Integration between the electronic road patrol system and our work management systems (Cityworks). An electronic road patrol system will utilize the GPS data in our vehicles and send the location of the deficiency directly to Cityworks in the form of a work order. Once the work order is received, staff will prioritize the work and ensure a work crew is assigned to complete the task.
- With dedicated Road Patrollers we will be able to realign our Supervisors' duties to ensure they are spending more time in the delivery of services and supervision of staff.

- Better compliance with the minimum maintenance standards. The data provided in our road patrols is often used in the defense of claims that are made against the City. Tighter integration with our work management system will ensure we complete priority work in a timely fashion thereby reduce the risk associated with the claims process.

**21. On p. 64 of the binder the 4th paragraph speaks to an increase in 10% for 2020 because of external debt financing to complete road projects. Can you remind me "what projects" are we referring to related to the statement above? (Lapierre, R)**

Answer:

All projects funded by debt are located on the Capital Project List on pages 395 and 396 of the budget document. All projects funded by debt have an amount in the 2<sup>nd</sup> last column. Details for each project are available in the 2020 Budget by referring to the associated page reference noted on p. 395-396.

**22. Paramedic Service Capital Investments. There will be \$510k for ambulances and \$267k for emergency response vehicles. What other emergency response vehicles would Paramedic Services need besides ambulances? (McIntosh, D)**

Answer:

The purchase of two Emergency Response Vehicles (ERV) would replace two older units. Our ERV respond to 911 calls, they carry all the advanced medical equipment found in an ambulance and are staffed by a single Paramedic. We have an ERV stationed 24/7 in both Capreol and Levack delivering Paramedic care, they also provide balanced emergency coverage to Valley East and Chelmsford when no ambulance is available.. Our Platoon Superintendents (supervisors all certified Paramedics) utilize them supervising the Paramedics and responding to calls and major incidents. They are used by our Community Paramedics to attend calls at residents homes, shelters, and social housing sites. Two are Command units used by our Deputies Chiefs in support of operations and service delivery issues and regular on-call duties. We also maintain a single ERV Support (pickup truck) that supports emergency operations towing our Remote Response Unit (Gator) trailer or our Multi-Causality Incident trailers to major incidents.

While the configuration and minimum equipment of an ERV's are mandated under provincial legislation and standards, the use of ERV's is a local operational decision. The elimination of these units would have an immediate and significant impact our service levels, resulting in increased response times, leaving areas without Paramedic coverage for extended periods, impact the ability to support any response to major incidents and the delivery of our two Community Paramedic programs would be impacted. Greater Sudbury like most Paramedic Services in North America have utilized these units since 2000, they cost 50% less than an ambulance.

Paramedic Services capital purchases are funded through the Emergency Medical Services Capital Reserve Fund, which is restricted for Paramedic capital purchases only. An annual contribution from operating, which is 50% funded by the Ministry of Health and Long-Term Care, offsets the withdrawals for capital purchases from this fund.

**23. Pg.206 of the Budget Binder: We seem to have a consistent cost of approx. \$4M for Purchased/Contract Financial Services. What are those services and what are the cost centres within that line item? (McCausland, G)**

Answer:

Financial Services Purchased Services	
Property Assessment	2,200,000
Water/Wastewater Billing (recovered from water rates)	1,664,000
Audit Fee	100,000
	3,964,000

**24. What do we need 2 seadoos for? (McIntosh, D)**

Answer:

The seadoos support waterfront operations at Bell Park Main Beach and Moonlight Beach.

Existing machines are 2007 and 2009 models and have required a great deal of servicing in recent years.

**25. Pg. 203 - Why does HR have an over-expenditure on Purchased/Contract Services of approx. \$320K (or 64% over budget)? Could you please fill me in on that? (McCausland, G)**

Answer:

This category includes the following expenditures for: Legal Counsel, Invoices - WSIB, Premium - WSIB, ASO Administrative Fees, Job Evaluation/Salary Administration, Physician's Fees, Pay Equity Compliance, and Employee Assistance Program.

With respect to WSIB - invoices and premiums, the Purchased / Contract Services node is actually showing an under expenditure, as these are negative figures. In this line, the City presents the effect of WSIB invoices netted against WSIB premiums, calculated when preparing payroll. The City's WSIB costs are increasing, as are the premiums collected in reaction to the increase.

**26. What is Email Collaboration Mobility and why does it cost \$975,000? (McCausland, G)**

Answer:

Please refer to page 438. This project responds to the direction provided by the 2018 IT Strategy to modernize communication and collaboration tools. Our existing software, such as GroupWise, has been in use for over five years and does not offer the kind of integration opportunities contemporary software now provides. This means, for example, that users cannot integrate email, messaging, calendars and file attachments in ways that are now commonplace. The result is slower responses to inquiries, more personal meetings and related travel, inconsistent document management and missed opportunities for online collaboration.

This project modernizes tools the corporation – including staff, councillors and customers – uses every day for all of its services. Not only will it enhance security, introducing the opportunity to introduce “bring your own device” options and reduce capital spending on hardware replacement, but it will also facilitate new work options that introduces the potential for reconfiguring physical workspaces and reducing the amount of space allocated for each user. It will also include security features to further protect the corporation’s data.

We will have a more productive, collaborative and modern workplace as a result of this project. For example, this will introduce the capacity for mobile work order processing, which will reduce the need for staff to attend a central work location to receive work assignments and/or drop off paper reports describing service accomplishments. Instead, such details could be transmitted electronically to mobile devices that staff would use to record their service efforts. This introduces significant productivity and customer service improvements, which are already commonplace in other private and public sector organizations.

**27. Pg 384: Improvements to Sudbury Landfills. Will the improvements to the Weigh scales enable garbage trucks to bypass the traffic line up so that they can get weighed, dump and get back out to the streets to pick up more garbage? (McIntosh, D)**

Answer:

No, those are structural improvements to the existing scales. However, the project titled, Sudbury Landfill - Upgrades includes a traffic study. We have to complete this study first to review traffic flow in and out of the site, including over the scales. Staff expect a report prior to the 2021 budget process.

**28. Looking over the budget, I was wondering why the PT hours for Economic Development is doubled? 4,634 (2019) and the ask is for 9,583 for 2020. (Lapierre, R)**

Answer:

A number of external government funding sources (such as the Regional Business Centre and the Mining Supply Program) were not confirmed by the time the 2019 Budget was prepared, therefore they were omitted. These programs were ultimately confirmed and provided in 2019, after the budget was prepared, but they are now included in the 2020 document which explains the increased hours.

**29. What are the details surrounding the request for 4 new FTE's for 2020. Why is the request for double the OT hours for 2020. 2019 equals 3,459 and now in 2020 the request is 7,027? (Lapierre, R)**

Answer:

Through negotiations, Five FTEs were included for Transit Services. One FTE would be assigned to Fleet to establish appropriate operational support on weekends and reduce the risk of service gaps or interruptions. Two FTEs would be assigned to Transit Operations for deployment across the system as required to help keep the system running on time. Two FTEs would be assigned to support bus stop/shelter maintenance and bus cleaning.

The new work assignments have more Spare Pieces of work, which are budgeted at OT. When we assign the work, these must all fall within CBA rules. Once everything is assigned, we are left with "Spare Pieces of work" that are not a complete assignment. It is less expensive to pay an operator to come in to do these trips at OT than to assign an 8 hour shift and have them wait around on standby.

**30. I was wondering where I can find a flow chart/org chart for the CAO's office like on p. 189, 211, 237 & 261. (Lapierre, R)**

Answer:

This has been provided in a separate attachment.

**31. As I am going through the budget binder, I noticed a change in FTE's and a request for 24 new FTE's for 2020. Wondering if you can help and provide insight and where and why so many. (Lapierre, R)**

Answer:

Below is a summary of the FTE changes:

- Increase in 1 FTE position for the Red Light Camera Program (approved in 2019). This position is funded on the tax levy.
- Increase in 6 FTE positions (Truck Drivers) approved through collective bargaining. These positions are funded on the tax levy.
- Increase in 8 FTE positions (Distribution and Collection Operator A and B) approved through collective bargaining. These positions are funded by W/WW.

- Increase in 4 FTE positions (Distribution and Collection Relief Operator) approved through collective bargaining. These positions are funded by W/WW.
- Increase in 2 FTE positions (Roads Supervisor and Water/Wastewater Supervisor) as a result of the 18 positions added through collective bargaining. One position is funded by the tax levy, and the other by W/WW.
- Increase in 3 FTE positions as a result of converting waste servicepersons from part-time to permanent as approved through collective bargaining. These positions are funded by the tax levy.

These positions were acquired to enhance service delivery for existing services.

**32. I was wondering what is the estimated cost for the Moose Mine Rd. bridge replacement project. What is the condition of this bridge and could this be a project that is pushed to a future year? (Lapierre, R)**

Answer:

There is a cost sharing agreement in place with a timber hauling company. This agreement is contingent on construction taking place in 2020. The construction cost estimate is approximately \$1.5M.

This bridge was identified for rehabilitation in our work plan and has been subject to site specific investigations in the past couple years. It was scheduled for detailed design and rehab for 2021. Due to increased truck traffic from the lumber and forest harvesting industry, this bridge is deteriorating at a faster rate than is acceptable and the bridge may have to be load rated, if in fact it has not already been load rated. The Ministry of Natural Resources has provided funds to accelerate the bridge design so that the load rating can be lifted to accommodate demand in the forest industry.

**33. On page 244 there is a Key Performance Indicator of “Percent of Paved Lane Km Where the Condition is Rated as Good to Very Good (Customer Service)”. The CGS KPI result is 39.0% exactly for 5 years in a row (2016-2020f). How is it possible that our roads condition rating is the same year-after-year? (McCausland, G)**

Answer:

The City has around 3,700 lane km of roads, of which 3,100 lane km are hard-surfaced and 600 lane km are gravel surface. Given roads are typically designed for a 20 year life before they require major rehabilitation, then it could be concluded that at a rudimentary level, in order to maintain our road asset at current condition, we need to be carrying out pavement rehabilitation on our hard-surfaced roads at a rate of around 155 lane km per year just to maintain the current KPI levels of roads considered to be in a good to very good state.

In 2019, the City completed rehabilitation of around 140 lane km of hard-surfaced roads, which is similar to the lane km of hard-surfaced roads rehabilitated annually in 2016-2018. Since we have rehabilitated just enough lane km of hard-surfaced roads per year to maintain our existing KPI levels, this explains why the overall KPI has stabilized (i.e. it is no longer decreasing, but nor is it increasing yet).

It is also important to note that KPI is a lagging metric, in which the condition improvement of a road is not reflected in the updated KPI until 1-2 years after the road has been rehabilitated. This is because the road improvements are not be captured until the next pavement condition index (PCI) is obtained when we collect actual field data that analyzes the condition of the road surface. The PCI value is used to classify the condition of the road in the KPI categorization.

Finally, given the large number of lane km in the road asset inventory, for us to realize any significant increase in the overall KPI, we will need to carry out even more lane km of rehabilitation per year for a number of years to see any noticeable increase to the KPI value. The proposed 2020 Capital Budget for ROADS adheres to this commitment for road improvements, and by increasing the capital budget available for road rehabilitation in 2020 and beyond, we should start achieving an increase in the KPI for road condition over the next 2-5 years.

- 34. On Page 141 the “Total Cost for Roads - All Functions per Lane Km (Efficiency)” is listed at \$21,958, but on page 247 our same cost is listed at \$20,704 for 2018, \$22,116 for 2019f, and \$21,862 for 2020f. What is the cause of this discrepancy? Which is the correct number? (McCausland, G)**

Answer:

The KPI listed on Page 141 is the 2017 amount. The amounts on pages 141 and 247 are correct.

- 35. On pg. 249 there is a bullet that reads “through partnership with the Independent Energy Supply of Ontario.” Should this instead read the “Independent Electricity System Operator (IESO)”? (McCausland, G)**

Answer:

This is correct. An amended page has been provided.

- 36. As one of the projects in the 2020 Budget is the beginning of an accelerated bus fleet replacement program, and considering the draft CEEP specifically identifies electrifying transit as an action item, have we considered replacing our existing diesel buses with fully electric buses? Have we considered replacing our existing buses with hybrid-diesel buses, or compressed natural gas-powered buses if we are not able to move to fully electric buses at this time? (McCausland, G)**

Answer:

Upon approval of ICIP funding, the first ten buses would be ordered as diesel units. As staff move forward with all procurement of infrastructure and/or fleet, consideration will be given to other types of solutions.

Additionally, staff will be working on an Electronic Vehicle Strategy that will be presented in 2020.

- 37. I just wanted to ask if there is a mistake with the Pioneer Manor budget on page 222. I don't understand how the budget for salaries and benefits is up 5.3% while the staffing complement for FTEs is the same and PT Hours is down 10,300 hours. Is that correct? (McCausland, G)**

Answer:

The decrease in part-time hours is due to the change in short-term disability benefits for CUPE 148 full-time employees as a result of the recent arbitrated award. Under the new collective agreement, full-time employees will receive six Weekly Indemnity days annually, compared to the 18 sick days they were previously entitled. The reduction in part-time hours was used to help offset the cost for the new benefits plan.

Of the \$1.59 million (5.3%) increase in salaries and benefits, \$1.34 million relates to the above-noted change to short-term disability benefits. The remaining \$250K can be attributed to the negotiated general wage increase.

- 38. Reading the budget binder this weekend, I noticed on P.70 you speak of reducing PT hours "to better align with work requirements". I was wondering if you can provide details. (Lapierre, R)**

Answer:

Due to budget pressures to bring the organizational budget to a 3.5% increase for 2020, reductions were necessary to the Paramedic Services budget. The reduction of part-time hours was deemed to minimize the impact to front-line staff and will not impact the service level provided by Paramedic Services within the City of Greater Sudbury.

- 39. The recommended reduction in grant allocation of 50,000 to this organization could be the death knell for the group. Do we have a contract or work plan signed and have we (the City) been provided with a project status report on tasks? If we do agree with the budget reduction - are there plans to pick up shortfalls created by the decrease in funding internally? (Sizer, A)**

Answer:

For the funding, the Social Planning Council (SPC) signs a single-year agreement through the Social Services Section. Historically, this funding has been used by the organization for base

funding. The agreement includes a schedule that indicates the funds are provided for the organization to complete work related to "population health priorities". SPC is required to provide a report each year detailing how the funding was used along with audited financial statements for review before the grant can be issued for the following year.

In reviewing the Grant Agreement for the 2019 Grant which is signed by SPC, Schedule A of the Agreement makes note that "this is a one-time for the 2019 calendar year, to be advanced at such time or times and in such installments...." it should be noted that CGS did not commit to a long term funding agreement with them. Through this agreement SPC would have known that funding would be reviewed on an annual basis and not guaranteed for long term. We have not received the 2019 audited financial statements or project status update for 2019 as it usually submitted in January of the following year.

At this time, the short fall in funding could not be accommodated through internal operational budgets. Social Services programs would not be impacted by this reduction.

**40. Wondering why we are proposing +1 FTE in the communication department. (Lapierre, R)**

Answer:

An increase in one permanent position for the Customer Relations Management software project was approved through the 2019 Capital Budget, and is the increase you see in the document.

**41. I've had a question from a playground association about the reduced fees. When would they be payable? (McIntosh, D)**

Answer:

Should the business case for the creation of new play field user fees for recreational leagues be approved, the fee will be implemented starting in the 2020 season.

Field allocation takes place in the spring and contracts are issued prior to the start of the season (May long weekend). Contracts are payable by the end of June each year, with a reconciliation process (adjustments for actual number of players as per final team rosters) occurring at the end of the season.

**42. I was wondering if you could provide a visual to the reservation logs at both Capreol ice pads for Council, in addition to the utilization stats. (Lapierre, R)**

Answer:

Attached are the ice logs for the 2019-2020 season for Capreol Arena (side 1 & 2).

As per the Valley East Twin Pad Multipurpose Sports Complex report to Community Services Committee on July 8, 2019, utilization for Capreol during the 2018-2019 season was as follows:

- Side one - 37.3%

- Side two - 59.0%

- 43. There is a business case on Pg.323 for Additional Labour Resources for Capital Project Delivery. The business case states that they are needed for Capital Program delivery but does not clearly indicate how the budget increase would be implemented. What roles or services would be impacted by the part-time hour increases? (McCausland, G)**

Answer:

The part-time hour increase will mainly effect Construction Services, with hiring additional inspectors for the construction season. Inspectors perform quality assurance inspections of capital work to ensure adherence to project plans, and specifications. It will also include an increase in administrative staff hours for creating the contract documents and processing payments.

- 44. On Pg.301 of the Budget Binder, there is a business case for the Downtown Sudbury Community Improvement Plan implementation. My understanding is that different aspects of the CIP program have different investment payback periods, with facade improvement payback being very limited. What would be the cost to fund everything except the facade improvements? (McCausland, G)**

Answer:

The Downtown CIP is designed to encourage investment in a manner that is consistent with City Council's goals and objectives to revitalize Downtown Sudbury. The Facade Improvement Program encourages improvements that enhance the quality of the public realm. As noted in Section V of the Business Case on Page 303 of the Budget, the City received approximately \$128,000 in requests, of which \$78,000 was in the form of Facade Improvement Grant requests. If facade grant requests were excluded, the total request would be approximately \$50,000.

- 45. I was wondering if we could share with Council what the financial impact would be if Council would approve a 25% reduction in staff travel across the whole corporation (excluding Council & Mayor accounts) As well I would like to have staff's perspective onto the operational impact this could have. (Lapierre, R)**

Answer:

The financial impact, which excludes outside boards and funded programs, would be approximately \$190,000. Staff respectfully suggest the non-financial cost is much higher.

These funds support costs incurred for professional staff that need to maintain minimum requirements for professional certification. They also support conference attendance and meeting attendance with peers or senior government representatives.

While there are many ways to gain insights into opportunities for innovation or obtain guidance about how others have already addressed issues Greater Sudbury is now managing, personal contact and an ability to develop relationships with peers remains among the most effective ways to accomplish these outcomes. Having a robust network of peers we can use to contact throughout the year for insights or advice is stronger when we meet them in person.

One of our organization values is “Innovation”, and we expect staff to continuously find improvements to meet our communities’ changing needs. Travel costs typically occur when staff are meeting peers or attending events where leading practices are shared, providing opportunities to talk directly with other practitioners and learn how to adapt those practices for use here. The need for innovation here remains high, and funds to support travel are an important aspect of the work required to demonstrate innovation.

An indirect effect of a reduction would be on our success at attracting, retaining and developing staff. Staff want to be part of an environment that is seen to not only welcome innovation, but also expects it. Our current investments in training and travel are not especially high compared to our peers; with our known recruiting challenges and anticipated increase in retirements, it is reasonable to anticipate we need more skills development and increased efforts to retain the employees we have now, not less.

Travel costs are relatively modest compared to our peers, but they are absolutely necessary considering Greater Sudbury’s location and it’s ongoing need for innovation. They are an efficient way to not only support staff development, but also for identifying service and/or policy changes that provide value to the corporation, which exceeds their financial cost.

**46. At the City Council meeting of October 8, 2019, staff was asked to provide additional information about the reports and studies that are required for the Valley East Twin Pad Multipurpose Sports Complex project as per the SPART memorandum of understanding.**

Answer:

On May 1st, 2019, Yallowega Bélanger Salach Architecture (YBSA) attended a meeting of the City’s Sudbury Planning Application Review Team (SPART) in the role of project consultant. As a result of this meeting, no development restrictions were noted. The completion of the following reports are a requirement should Council approve the project, as outlined in the SPART Memo of Understanding:

- Geotechnical & Soils Report to determine soil bearing capacity and water table height of proposed building locations
- Source Protection Plan Section 59 Application

- Stormwater Management Study and Report
- Wellhead Protection Area; By-law considerations, property/parking run off etc.
- Detailed Topographic Survey
- Traffic Study; flow to and from property and its effect on the existing Library, HARC, daycare and residential neighbourhood.
- Analysis of trail conditions and uses in green space to determine amount of disturbance.
- Environmental considerations (carbon footprint, building efficiency, heating/cooling strategies)
- CPTED Design Analysis
- Fire Flow Capacities (Water Pressure Testing)
- Infrastructure and Servicing Upgrades Analysis (water, sanitary, gas, hydro, etc.)

With considerations for the items noted as part of the pre-consultation process, the project budget presented to the Community Services Committee as part of the September 16, 2019 report titled Valley East Twin Pad Multipurpose Sports Complex included the following cost estimates:

- \$2,000,000 for site development and landscaping allowances (includes allowance for structural piles due to high water table)
- \$250,000 for hazardous materials abatement
- \$1,592,301 for professional & design fees
- \$227,472 for other project consultants and studies
- \$3,651,125 for project contingencies and cost escalations

The outcome of these detailed reports and analysis would further outline the technical requirements related to site planning and could have an impact on costing, as the project moves forward into its next phases of development.

Should the project be approved by Council and should there be cost escalations beyond project budgets and contingencies, process for reporting of project variances as per the Capital Budget Policy will be followed.

The advancement of the project to its current state has followed project delivery steps for other similar City projects. This has included the following:

- Community Consultation
- Confirmation of program (building) elements
- Site selection and site schematic
- Establishment of a Class 'D' project estimate

**47. At the City Council meeting of October 8, 2019, requested information on the economic impact of the existing events hosted at the Capreol Arena.**

Answer:

During the 2018-2019 season, the following 5 tournaments utilized the Capreol Arena:

- Capreol Bulldogs Annual Tournament
- Capreol Minor Hockey Annual Tournament
- Richelieu Family Tournament (also utilizes Centennial Arena)
- Valley East Renegades Tournament (also utilizes Centennial, Raymond Plourde and Garson Arenas)
- Valley East Hockey Minor Hockey Association Tyke/Atom Tournament (also utilizes Centennial and Raymond Plourde Arenas)

In order to estimate economic impact of these events, the following assumptions/estimates were made:

1. Tournament organizers were contacted to determine the number of out of town teams
2. Average number of players per team estimated at 12
3. \$154 average spending per visitor trip based on the Greater Sudbury CMA Tourism Profile.

<b>Capreol Arena Tournaments 2018-2019</b>						
	<b>Type</b>	<b>Hours Used</b>	<b>Out of Town Teams</b>	<b>Total Players</b>	<b>Total Visitors</b>	<b>Total Estimated Spend</b>
Capreol Minor Hockey	Youth	61.5	4	168	48	\$7,392
Valley East Minor Hockey	Youth		19	492	228	\$35,112
Valley East Renegades	Youth		31	912	372	\$57,288
Capreol Bulldogs	Adult	21	0	192	-	

Richelieu Family Tournament	Adult		0	372	-	
Totals				2136	648	\$99,792

The estimated economic impact of these events to the City of Greater Sudbury is \$99,792. The economic impact to the area of Capreol would only be a fraction of this total spend as spending for accommodations, shopping etc. could take place in other parts of the City and as events are hosted across multiple arenas in some cases. Economic Development staff have commented that other arena facilities may be able to absorb tournament capacity, and therefore impact of visitor spending would not be completely lost, should Capreol side #1 close.

**48. Where can the City make staffing reductions by attrition throughout the City? (Leduc, B)**

Answer:

The effect of these choices reduce service levels. As the descriptions in the 2020 Budget indicate, many of our services are already at, or exceed, available capacity. If Council wishes to pursue these ideas, it should also provide direction about which services it would like to adjust to address the reduced capacity these choices would create.

**49. How many Engineers are within Growth and Infrastructure? (Leduc, B)**

Answer:

26 Engineers.

**50. How can the City decrease consulting fees throughout the organization? (Leduc, B)**

Answer:

The effect of these choices reduce service levels. As the descriptions in the 2020 Budget indicate, many of our services are already at, or exceed, available capacity. If Council wishes to pursue these ideas, it should also provide direction about which services it would like to adjust to address the reduced capacity these choices would create.

**51. What would be the financial impact of closing all Libraries and CSC's on Sundays while keeping the Main Branch open? What would be the impact of reducing the 11 hour shift to 8 hour shifts on Monday to Friday for all libraries? Saturday hours wouldn't change. (Leduc, B)**

Answer:

As detailed in the Auditor General's report tabled at the Audit Committee meeting of December 3, 2019, the City of Greater Sudbury is proposing to realign its governance relationship with the

Greater Sudbury Public Library to provide increased autonomy to the GSPL Board. This proposed commitment is in response to recommendations of the Auditor General's office, which in turn, are based on provincial legislation. As such, as with the GSPS and PHSD, changes in service levels of this magnitude are best considered in consultation with the GSPL Board and based on a business case analysis. Staff would require further direction from Council to undertake a more detailed analysis but the order of magnitude budget reductions could amount to more than \$150,000 or up to 20% reduction in service hours on both library and citizen services and an impact on tens of thousands of current citizen interactions.

**52. What is the financial impact of having 7 days of operations of ski hills? For clarity, what would be the financial impact of operating Lively for 3 days and Adanac the other 4 with staff working at either ski hill? The combination or mix of days should form part of staff's recommendations. (Leduc, B)**

Answer:

With respect to inquires about service level changes for ski hills, pools and arenas, this is the type of information that we would expect to see through the Core Services Review. Service levels for the provision of these types of assets is part of the scope of work KPMG is currently working on. If Council would like to see these specific questions answered through the Core Service Review or accelerated through staff, we would suggest that we need direction from Council. This work requires more in depth analysis and there are implications beyond operating budgets that would need to be considered.

**53. What is the financial impact of reducing all arenas to 8 hour shifts? What is the financial impact of closing one arena? The arena should form part of staff's recommendations. (Leduc, B)**

Answer:

With respect to inquires about service level changes for ski hills, pools and arenas, this is the type of information that we would expect to see through the Core Services Review. Service levels for the provision of these types of assets is part of the scope of work KPMG is currently working on. If Council would like to see these specific questions answered through the Core Service Review or accelerated through staff, we would suggest that we need direction from Council. This work requires more in depth analysis and there are implications beyond operating budgets that would need to be considered.

**54. What is the impact of closing two pools? The pools in question should form part of staff's recommendations. (Leduc, B)**

Answer:

With respect to inquires about service level changes for ski hills, pools and arenas, this is the type of information that we would expect to see through the Core Services Review. Service levels for the provision of these types of assets is part of the scope of work KPMG is currently working on. If Council would like to see these specific questions answered through the Core Service Review or accelerated through staff, we would suggest that we need direction from Council. This work requires more in depth analysis and there are implications beyond operating budgets that would need to be considered.

**55. It was my understanding that the AMR project was previously reported to be budgeted at \$10 million. The 2020 budget reflects a total cost of \$17 million. Please provide further details of this project and why the total cost has increased. (Leduc, B)**

Answer:

In June Council approved the 3 year Advanced Meter Infrastructure project at a total cost of 17.2 million. The project has 4 subcomponents, namely the meter replacement portion at a total cost of \$4.5 million, the AMI system install at a total cost of \$ 10.4 million, the project management services cost of \$1.2 million as well as funding for internal project support and contingency of \$1.1 million for a total project budget of \$17.2 million.

**56. I don't see the Pioneer Manor Sprinkler System in the budget. Is this item in the 2020 budget? (Leduc, B)**

Answer:

Under the new capital prioritization process, a proposal was submitted for this capital project. The multi-disciplinary team reviewed all capital budget project proposals and made recommendations to address highest priority needs based on an enterprise-wide review of risk, service priorities, spending choices and financing options. The Sprinkler System project was not recommended for the 2020 budget, and is expected to be resubmitted for 2021.

**57. Why is the business case for Pioneer Manor Bed Redevelopment a business case and not in Capital? (Leduc, B)**

Answer:

The original Council Resolution CC 2017-374 called for a business case. There is also a change in service level and as such, a business case is more appropriate as it outlines the change in service level and the incremental costs. The change in service level is to build reduce the amount of basic beds (shared accommodation) and replace with 50 new private beds (private accommodation). This will help generate an extra \$470,000 in annual revenue that will help reduce the municipal share of debt repayment.

**58. The Human League Association Emergency Funding business case proposes that it be funded on the tax levy. Can staff recommend any other funding sources for this business case? (Leduc,B)**

Answer:

The business case did acknowledge that staff looked to see if HCI funding was a possibility. In accordance with the HCI Fund Policy, operational expenses such as staffing costs are not eligible for HCI funding. Furthermore, the request for \$50,000 is beyond the recommended grant thresholds for a single or multi-ward application.

All other existing community grants have been approved by Council with the tax levy being the funding source.

**59. I have a couple of questions regarding the Capital Project on Page 436 for Land Management Information System – Phase 1 Equipment. (McCausland, G)**

- a. **Do the “real time mobile tools” work as a cell phone app, or are they separate and/or proprietary tools that need to be purchased?**
- b. **Does the \$3,266,156 of the Project include the cost of transferring all of our existing data to the new system? Who will be completing that substantial task?**

Answer:

It depends upon the vendor-supplied solution. It would either be an application installed on the individual's mobile device or a mobile friendly website. There would be no additional cost for this; it would be included in the project cost. There is a low priority requirement, which states the ability to print documents while in the field. To satisfy this requirement, a printer would need either to be attached to the mobile device or installed in the field worker's vehicle.

The \$3,266,156 includes the cost for migrating the existing data to the new system. The expectation is the vendor will be responsible for completing this task with the City providing assistance as necessary. The process for migrating the data as well as the roles and responsibilities will be finalized once a vendor is selected, the contract is signed, and a data analysis exercise is completed.

**60. What impact would there be if I proposed an amendment to include the Twin Pad business case into the approved cases; (Lapierre, R)**

- a. **What impact would there be if this was added over and above what is currently proposed?**
- b. **What would staff recommend as a change to stay at 3.5 but include in the Twin pad business case?**

Answer:

The Business Cases identifies a cost of \$567,500 in 2020 which would result in a 0.2% increase to the tax levy (i.e. would change it from 3.5% to 3.7%).

From 2021 on, the business case states borrowing required in the amount of \$27.8M based on 3% interest rate. Annual payments would be \$1.42M per year for 30 years which would equal 0.24% increase based on 2019 approved budget.

Council has received (or will be receiving) options to reduce the net levy impact from 3.5% to 3.0% and 2.5%. Council may consider these options, or direct other service level changes, as a method to include the Valley East Twin Pad Multipurpose Sports Complex business case within the 3.5% tax levy.

- 61. On page 440 of the budget binder, there is a Capital Project entitled Asset Management and Capital Planning Enhancement. It appears that this project budget is for “exploring software solutions for an asset repository, asset reporting, and capital planning tool” for vertical infrastructure. Is the budget entirely for “exploring software solutions”? (McCausland, G)**

Answer:

The budget is for a complete solution including the acquisition, implementation and set-up of the software including loading of current City building condition data into the program. As you know, we are collecting large volumes of asset condition data in response to the O. Reg 588 / 17 which calls for detailed asset plans for assets in all asset classes. The software solution would provide us with a repository for all of this information and would allow us to analyze and report priorities for asset reinvestment or replacement that will be the best use of capital dollars over the life cycle of our buildings and facilities. We have a system like this for core infrastructure like roads, bridges and linear assets. We do not have a system that makes asset condition (and investment requirements) easy to demonstrate to Council and the Community.

- 62. On Pg.475 there is a Water Capital Project called Distribution Support. It appears that this capital budget item is a contingency account, as the description reads “this project provides funding for unforeseen, emergency operational requirements, such as equipment purchase or emergency/urgent system components that exceed the operational budgetary capabilities”. Am I mistaken in my understanding that most of our budgeting includes built-in contingencies, and utilizes reserve accounts when budgets are significantly exceeded? Does this account align with the way we budget across our various departments and activities? Has this project been used in the past, and if so, what kind of items were included in the spending of this account? (McCausland, G)**

Answer:

These funds are not used as a contingency for planned projects. Rather, they are used for emergent projects that occur outside of the scope of planned projects.

These funds would be used to replace and/or affect a major repair to failed infrastructure, which requires a more urgent response and can't wait until the following budget cycle with a scope (cost/size) which would fall outside of the regular operating budget. For instance, there have been costs incurred recently due to the discovery of inoperable/broken watermain valves as well as frozen hydrants in the downtown area that had to be replaced.

**63. In 2019, Fire Services hired 12 F/T positions due to attrition and as a result, O/T hrs. incurred to replace this staffing shortfall would realize a significant reduction. O/T hrs. in the 2020 budget are the same amount shown in the 2019 budget (6,958). Why? (Sizer, A)**

Answer:

Absences drive overtime costs for career suppression. Absences includes, but are not limited to, sick days, vacation days, WSIB, modified work, bereavement leave, and compassionate leave. Absences have been trending upward over the last several years. To date in 2019, the average absences per day is 6 Firefighters and the three year trend for unplanned absences is increasing.

The career suppression staffing level before the introduction of the 12 new recruits in May 2019, was 98 Firefighters. A total of 6 new recruits were to replace retirements, with the remaining 6 going over-complement as a result of unplanned absences, and to reduce the dependence on overtime. The current career suppression staffing complement is 109 Firefighters. With anticipated retirements, the staffing complement is projected to decrease to 104 in 2020.

The 2020 overtime budget of 6,958 hours remains unchanged to address the continued dependence on overtime to manage staff absences.

**64. On page 560 there is a user fee called "Pavement Degradation Fees per Square Meter". What does this user fee refer to? (McCausland, G)**

Answer:

Pavement Degradation Fees are charged by the City to recover its expenses due to pavement cuts or excavations that encroach onto the paved area of the road. It reflects the fact that once the uniform integrity of the road structure has been disturbed, it reduces the service life of the roadway and therefore will require more maintenance. Fees per square metre are charged based on the pavement age (See User Fee Schedule).

**65. Why is the cost for statutory newspaper notices in certain applications \$630 and in others only \$230? Who requires the "statutory notice" be posted, and must it be posted in a newspaper or could it simply be posted on our website? (McCausland, G)**

Answer:

The statutory newspaper notices for land use planning applications are a requirement of the Planning Act and cannot be replaced with a notice on the City's website. Statutory notices must contain certain information and statements, as prescribed in Regulations issued pursuant to the Planning Act. Statutory notices for major applications must contain more information (e.g. statements regarding appeal rights) than minor applications. This difference is reflected in the cost charged to applicants.

**66. Please forward a Station by Station cost breakdown of the Expense item listed on the Fire Services 2020 Budget Summary including Station Maintenance and amortization of Station Assets. As well, the Summary shows Fire Services "Contr to Reserve and Capital" as zero. Is this true or even allowable? Please provide an explanation. (Vagnini, M)**

Answer:

The Fire Services budget is not allocated by station. All expenditure categories, including repairs & maintenance, are based on the overall need of Fire Services and are utilized based on highest need.

Amortization expense is based on the historical cost of the asset evenly allocated over the estimated useful life of a building. Amortization is not included as a budgeted expense as it is based on historical information and may not be reflected of the current costs required to upgrade or replace the assets.

The amount is zero due to the new Capital Budget Policy approved by Council in January 2019. The budget amount for "Contribution to Capital" is now included within "Corporate Revenues and Expenses" as shown on page 174 of the 2020 Budget document as the funds have been combined together and used to fund all capital projects based on highest priority.

The amounts included for 2017 & 2018 "Contribution to Capital" reflect the proceeds of sale being returned to the reserve fund.

**67. Why are parking fees not charged at Pioneer Manor to employees, visitors or tenants? Could parking revenues offset the cost of bed redevelopment? (Leduc, B)**

Answer:

Council has not directed staff to implement a paid parking policy for employees and visitors. For leaseholders, each is allocated 35 parking spaces for their use and they pay a proportionate share for winter maintenance costs. Parking fees are currently only charged in downtown lots.

**68. If a Playground Association offers programs but doesn't charge any participant fees, do they still have to pay field fees? (McIntosh, D)**

Answer:

These types of programs could be considered as Neighbourhood Association delivered on behalf of the City in support of affordable access to recreation similar to outdoor rink activities, learn to skate programs, carnivals, etc. If this was the case, fees would not be applicable. Recreation staff would require more details about the specific programs to review prior to confirming.

**69. Why does it cost the municipality \$17,000 to maintain Capreol Sliding Hill? (Leduc, B)**

Answer:

The decision was made to convert the Capreol Ski Hill to a sliding hill, this was the approved service level. Costs include salaries, energy costs and materials. The facility is groomed by staff with use of equipment and requires regular inspections.

**70. Are there significant dollars designated for bus shelters during and after store hours at our newly created Transit Hubs? Please explain staff's plan and timing for these elements in either the 2019 or 2020 budget. (Bigger, B)**

Answer:

As an interim solution, two shelters along with seating were installed at the New Sudbury Shopping Centre at the end of November. A shelter already existed at the South End Hub (Wal Mart).

An application has been submitted under the ICIP funding program for the detailed design and construction of three Major Mobility Hubs. The total funding requirement is estimated at \$27 million, with \$7 million to be contributed by the municipality and the remaining \$20 million to be split between the provincial and federal governments.

The project includes: determination of optimal locations, configuration and detailed design, as well as construction. If funding is approved, the detailed design phase would be initiated in 2019 with construction to follow. The project has an estimated completion date of 2024.

**71. Staff are recommending replacement of one Ice Resurfacer (Zamboni) per year according to the capital budget. A quick Google search indicates that Zamboni has been selling electric powered zamboni's since 1960. This seems like an ideal environment for electric equipment. Has this been considered by staff? What is the difference in purchase price, and what are the pros and cons, and comparative annual lifecycle cost of electric Zambonis vs gas? (Bigger, B)**

Answer:

Through the City's Fleet Section, a new Request for Proposal for future purchase and supply of ice resurfacers is being finalized. The RFP will include options for electric ice resurfacers.

Based on preliminary research, the capital cost is approximately 33% to 50% more than traditional propane vehicles. The 10 year cost of ownership of an electric ice resurfacer is approximately \$1,000 per year when fuel (propane) savings are considered.

Pros would include reduced emissions in our facilities, resulting in safer environments for spectators and staff. There would be costs savings from a result of not needing to purchase propane. Cons may include some performance issues during heavy use periods (ice installation/removal) and potentially battery life/charging time.

We will be obtaining additional information about life-cycle costs and performance through the RFP process.

- 72. Staff are recommending the replacement of the chiller at the Sudbury arena based on it's having reached a 25 year milestone in it's life. Reference was made to the ability to reuse a chiller. Do we have a backup chiller? How much of the estimated replacement cost relates to installation cost? When is the next planned replacement of a similar sized chiller? Eg. Are we better to purchase, but not install at this time? (Bigger, B)**

Answer:

The chiller could be reused at another arena. Arena Services does not have a backup chiller. The installation for the replacement chiller will take approximately 1 week to install. It would be best to install in the summer to avoid losing the ice. The labour cost to install the chiller is approximately \$50K. It is important to remember that replacement from time of failure would be 6 to 8 weeks and a cost premium of 30% would be added plus loss of revenue. If it is a planned installed no premium and no loss of revenue would be incurred. The lead time for equipment and installation is 14 to 16 weeks for a planned installation.

- 73. Page 420 St Joseph's Parking Lot. Staff are proposing to spend a further \$819,000. What are the implications of deferring further work on this project to 2021 budget deliberations? (Bigger, B)**

Answer:

The \$819,000 budget relates to repair/remediation work required on existing retaining walls as well as the development of a transit lay-by.

A structural condition of the parking lot retaining walls was completed in 2017 and identified the need to repairs to existing retaining walls including corrosion mitigation, replacement of top portion of walls, installation of guards and repair of control joints within a 5 year period. Design work is underway and was part of a 2019 budget allocation. Work can be pushed to 2021 if directed by Council.

The transit lay-by was part of the original concept of the site design and could be delayed until 2021 if directed by Council.

There may be cost escalations for the work identified above if the project is delayed.

**74. Staff are recommending preliminary work on Beatty St. and College St Bridges. What are the implications of deferring further work on this project to 2021 budget deliberations? (Bigger, B)**

Answer:

Deferring any proposed bridge work may require an increase in the frequency of bridge inspections, additional load ratings, emergency repairs and could affect the service level of the assets. By deferring bridge projects there is a potential for a ripple affect on the entire bridge program which may result in delay of bridge projects in the future. This can result in an overall increase in risk including cost and public safety.

**75. Staff are recommending the implementation of an electronic road patrol program requiring proprietary or specialized hand held units. What are the proposed system's advantages over the use more generic "smart phone" technology along with widely available apps such as SeeClickFix which identify the sender, and capture time, date, notes, photos and GPS Coordinates. (Bigger, B)**

Answer:

The solution proposed in the business case integrates with Cityworks, which is the City's Computerized Maintenance Management System. The recommended solution will allow staff to capture a deficiency in the field and create a work order in a single step thereby increase the efficiency of our operations. Other municipalities in the province, for example the City of Barrie, are currently using this software solution. This application is also customized to work with Roads Operations in compliance with Minimum Maintenance Standards.

**76. Previous experience has resulted in infrastructure projects for water mains and wastewater mains planned using full replacement as a default. However, in the actual construction year, a decision is made to instead use no dig / re-lining approaches to extend the service life of the pipes. Avoiding the costs of excavation and road replacement can be viewed as saving money in that construction season, however on the other hand, the use of approved budgeted funds for road repair work and pipe repair work is not maximized in that year during our short construction season. What are the implications of defaulting to the use of no dig / re-lining approaches to extend the service life of the pipes in order maximize the work planned and completed in our short construction season? (Bigger, B)**

Answer:

Watermain lining is an extremely effective trenchless (no-dig) technology for rehabilitating watermains, extending the service life by approximately 50 years. In situations where a section of watermain is in poor condition and the operations and maintenance costs are increasing to a point where work on that section is prioritized, it can either be replaced or rehabilitated (lined). A hydraulic analysis confirms the appropriate sizing for the main. If the existing main size is adequate to achieve required fire flows in the area, then replacement and lining are considered. If the existing main is undersized, then replacement is the preferred option. The other factors that are considered are the priorities for the other assets in the corridor (eg. the road and sanitary sewers), the overall capital cost of completing the required work on all of the assets, and the socioeconomic costs of the work. For example, if watermain work is prioritized, but no other asset work is required, then lining would be preferred, as the capital costs would be less than trenching and paving; and more rehabilitation work can be completed for the same amount of money. As well, if watermain located under an arterial road is prioritized for rehabilitation / replacement, lining work can be completed at night without disturbing the traffic patterns during the day, which replacement (trenching) would require.

Alternatively, if work on the other assets within the corridor has been prioritized, the condition of the overall infrastructure can be improved in a cost effective way by either lining or replacing the watermain. Under local roads, watermain replacement is preferred and under arterial roads, the methodology is determined on a case-by-case basis.

In summary, several complex factors are considered when determining most appropriate methodology for extending the life of water (and wastewater) assets. Defaulting to no-dig applications to extend the service life of the watermain assets is generally acceptable for poor condition watermains that are adequately sized and where no other assets are prioritized for work. This allows the available funding to complete more of the prioritized work. In other circumstances, defaulting to no-dig may not be the most appropriate approach.

**77. I read recently that a Sudbury mining supplier “Total Equipment Services Inc.” had partnered with a company called dynaCERT to use their HydraGEN technology that significantly improves the efficiency of Diesel engines using distilled water. Their claim is to reduce exhaust emissions by more than 50%, while also improving diesel fuel efficiency by 10 to 15%. Is staff aware of this product? Is Fleet Operations adequately resourced to investigate this technology for our fleet? (Bigger, B)**

Answer:

Staff do not have experience with this particular product but are familiar with similar products that have been tested in other sectors. These experiences have not yielded significant benefits. Staff will investigate this particular product in order to ascertain its effectiveness in City operations.

**78. Please provide a detailed list of any council approved projects that are outside the date range presented in the Capital Budget section of the 2020 budget binder. (Bigger, B)**

Answer:

Council approved projects are included in the 2020 Capital Budget and are shown with a "P" in the Index column for previously approved projects on pages 395 and 396 of the Budget document.

**79. Please provide a detailed list of any council approved projects that have not yet been evaluated using staff's prioritization methodology. (Bigger, B)**

Answer:

Projects approved by Council are outside of the staff's prioritization process. The prioritization process is used by staff to evaluate projects for recommendation for approval by Council. Council has the ability to approve any capital projects that they wish to be completed.

**80. Please provide a detailed list of any projects (with their funding status), that had been previously approved by council and are over 24 months. (Bigger, B)**

Answer:

Staff review projects with no activity for the past 24 months as part of the Capital Budget Policy. The list will be provided to Council in Q1 2020.

**81. Can you provide further information on the usage and cost of Onaping Pool? (G. McCausland)**

Answer:

From the July 8, 2019 Community Services Report titled 'Therapeutic Pool Update:

	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	Change (2014-2018)
Onaping	10,043	8,806	7,231	5,532	7,051	-29.79%

Onaping Community Centre/Pool Operating Costs and Cost Recovery Information

Budgeted revenues and expenses for the Onaping Community Centre for 2020 as follows:

Onaping Community Centre	
<b>Total Revenues</b>	<b>\$55,033</b>
<b>Total Expenses</b>	<b>\$302,529</b>
Salaries & Benefits	\$161,565

Appendix 1: Budget Questions and Answers (December 3, 2019)

Operating	\$57,606
Energy	\$83,358
<b>Cost Recovery</b>	<b>18.2%</b>

Estimated revenues and expenses attributed to the Onaping Pool are as follows. This estimate assumes 50% of operating and energy costs would be attributed to pool operations. More analysis should be conducted to confirm.

<b>Onaping Pool</b>	
<b>Total Revenues</b>	<b>\$46,500</b>
<b>Total Expenses</b>	<b>\$183,400</b>
Salaries & Benefits	\$113,000
Operating	\$28,800
Energy	\$41,600
<b>Cost Recovery</b>	<b>25.3%</b>

Onaping Community Centre Capital Costs

From the July 8, 2019 Community Services Report titled 'Therapeutic Pool Update'. Updated Building Condition Assessments (BCAs) were completed on municipal pool facilities in 2018. The BCA's provide an overall condition assessment for each pool, as well as opinions of probable repair costs required in the immediate term (1 to 5 years) and long term (6 to 10 years). Figures represent the estimated cost to maintain facilities in a good state of repair and do not include costs associated with enhancements or building improvements (modernization of spaces or full accessibility improvements). More analysis would be required to determine which capital costs are attributed to the Onaping Pool only.

Facility	Construction Date	Building Condition	1 to 5 year Costs	6 to 10 year Costs	Replacement Cost
Onaping CC	1967	Fair / Poor Condition	\$1,547,200	\$1,247,770	\$11,686,188 to \$14,283,165