



General Issues Committee BUDGET MINUTES

9:30 a.m.

Friday, April 8, 2011

Council Chambers

Hamilton City Hall

71 Main Street West

Present: Deputy Mayor L. Ferguson (Chair)
Mayor B. Bratina
Councillors B. Clark, C. Collins, S. Duvall, J. Farr, B. Johnson,
B. McHattie, S. Merulla, R. Pasuta, M. Pearson

**Absent with
Regrets:** Councillors T. Jackson, R. Powers – Vacation
Councillors J. Partridge, T. Whitehead – City Business
Councillor B. Morelli – Personal

Also Present: C. Murray, City Manager
R. Rossini, General Manager, Finance and Corporate Services
G. Davis, General Manager, Public Works
T. McCabe, General Manager, Planning & Economic Development
J. A. Priel, General Manager, Community Services
Dr. E. Richardson, Medical Officer of Health
H. Hale Tomasik, Executive Director, Human Resources &
Organizational Development
C. Biggs, Co-ordinator, Committee Services/Council/Budgets

THE FOLLOWING ITEMS WERE REPORTED TO CITY COUNCIL FOR CONSIDERATION:

1. CHANGES TO THE AGENDA

The Clerk advised that Arend Kersten, on behalf of the Hamilton, Stoney Creek and Waterdown Chambers of Commerce, had submitted a delegation request. Although the request had not been received in the Clerk's Office at the time of the meeting, the request was announced to the Committee for their consideration.

(Bratina/Partridge)

That the agenda be approved, as amended.

CARRIED

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None declared.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

None.

4. DELEGATION REQUESTS

4,1 Request from Arend Kersten on behalf of the Flamborough, Hamilton and Stoney Creek Chambers of Commerce, respecting Area Rating

(Partridge/Pasuta)

That the Rules of Order be waived in order to allow Mr. Arend Kersten to address the Committee today respecting Area Rating. **CARRIED**

5. CONSENT ITEMS

None

6. PUBLIC HEARINGS/DELEGATIONS

(Whitehead/Duvall)

Councillor Whitehead challenged the Chair with respect to the appropriate time that the delegation should be heard.

Following discussion of the Committee, Councillor Whitehead withdrew his challenge.

7. STAFF PRESENTATIONS

7.1 Area Rating Presentation

- Update of November report FCS0987(a) and original report from November 2009 in the agenda;
- Updated report does not repeat contents from old report; also reprinted Citizens' Forum Report
- Rob Rossini thanked staff – Tom Hewitson, Maria DiSanto and Mike Zegarac
- In terms of what asked to do – provide update of 2009 report, identify financial impacts of citizens' forum recommended model,
- This report provides financial impacts and report compares the two

- Had very lengthy discussions when forum tabled their report and a number of new ideas from Councillors; consultation with each Councillor and tried to build in as many of the alternatives for doing things in this report and will be presented
- A lot of information and will take a while to digest; as a result, the report today has no recommendation; receiving information only
- Providing a high-level overview of the Chamber's recommendations
- Process today is not expecting any decisions; today is to present information, digest, get feedback – April 14 and 15 to complete budget debates and area rating and then final decisions are for April 27
- No recommendations because still looking at all different combinations to land as softly as possible
- This is a very divisive issue so looking to see if previous recommendations are still relevant and still adhere to some principles and moving forward on area rating
- Hope to have recommendations by April 14/15 and get feedback
- Presentation:
- Review of staff recommendations from 2009 report – urban/rural model

Concerns

- Think about parking and revenue from POA; presentation is based on revenues today
- Some services are in appropriate for any form of area rating as they have wide spread societal benefits e.g., police, land ambulance, social services – general agreement at Senior Management Team
- Would be interesting to see numbers i.e., how much suburbs are supporting police and land ambulance and what percentage of services are provided; if area rated how would that shift the tax load between the former area municipalities and the City of Hamilton
- Cannot be done for police as information is not available; cannot commit; information is purview of the HPS Board and therefore, cannot comment on police portion
- If council wanted to pursue from Police, would require formal resolution of Council to Police Services Board
- Brent Browett – land ambulance – can provide information cost per call and cost to provide the coverage; have done preliminary analysis; rural areas will be substantially greater than it already is
- Would like to have information on land ambulance available on April 14th
- No other places in Ontario is social services area rated; land ambulance as well – for policing, does happen in some jurisdictions where different services are provided e.g., Peel Region
- Clark – do not want or need additional information
- Appropriate to area rate where there are significant differences in services

- Major frustrations respecting multi-residential and provision of waste pick up – issue for future discussion
- Stop using average assessment of home and use average value of home in each municipality – Partridge
- Area rating review is premature without completion of the service delivery review – Clark – problematic for residents in his Ward

(Clark/Johnson)

That Staff report back on the economics of increased services e.g., elimination of paid on-call (volunteer) firefighters; increase in demand for recreation centres, economic indicators from the ratcheting up of service levels and subsequent costs for all taxpayers.

(Collins/Merulla) to receive presentation.

Arend Kersten

- Reps of Chambers of Commerce have been meeting regularly to address issue of area rating
- As a result, three chambers have developed an out of the box concept of service rating as opposed to area rating
- Consistent with City building
- Economic development and job creation are cornerstones to addressing poverty crisis Hamilton is facing
- Property taxes in new Hamilton are much higher when compared with neighbouring and competing municipalities
- Have come to conclusion that when it comes to area rating, there is an absence of data and a boatload of perception
- Cannot come to conclusions until quantify perceptions to separate fiction from reality
- Move forward with a comprehensive municipal services review

(Pearson/Partridge) to receive presentation

8. DISCUSSION ITEMS

8.1 Area Rating Options – Update (FCS09087(a)) (City Wide)

(Merulla/Whitehead) receive report.

Look at revenues, where paid parking would be implemented, how that would be determined; staff address
Will require input from Marty Hazell and BIA's and revenues, impacts, enforcement

Need to differentiate – revenue loss being area rated, or cost to maintain the parking lot

Geographic breakdown on parking tickets

There being no further business, the Committee adjourned at 1:12 p.m.

Respectfully submitted

Councillor L. Ferguson
Deputy Mayor

Carolyn Biggs, Co-ordinator
Committee Services/Council/Budgets
April 8, 2011