

This Report contains the recommendations of February 13, 2020, only. A consolidated report is available on the Council Agenda of March 2, 2019.

## **Strategic Priorities and Policy Committee Report**

4th Meeting of the Strategic Priorities and Policy Committee - BUDGET - Meeting to be held 9:30 AM - January 30, 2020, January 31, 2020 (if needed), February 6, 2020, February 7, 2020 (if needed), February 13 and 14, 2020 (if needed)  
February 13, 2020

**PRESENT:** Mayor E. Holder (Chair), Councillors M. van Holst, S. Lewis, M. Salih, J. Helmer, M. Cassidy, P. Squire, J. Morgan, S. Lehman, A. Hopkins, P. Van Meerbergen, S. Turner, E. Pelozza, A. Kayabaga, S. Hillier

**ALSO PRESENT:** B. Baar, A.L. Barbon, B. Card, S. Chambers, S. Datars Bere, J. Davies, A. Dunbar, M. Galczynski, G. Kotsifas, L. Livingstone, S. Mathers, J. P. McGonigle, J. Millson, K. Murray, D. O'Brien, A. Rammeloo, M. Ribera, C. Saunders, M. Schulthess, C. Smith, J. Taylor, B. Westlake-Power, P. Yeoman  
The meeting is called to order at 9:33 PM.

### **1. Disclosures of Pecuniary Interest**

Councillor E. Pelozza discloses a pecuniary interest in Business Case 15 - Subsidized Transit Program, specific to those matters related to the youth bus pass, by indicating that she purchases a bus pass for her son.

### **4. Items for Direction**

4.12 Business Cases for Additional Investment - Administratively Prioritized

**That the following 2020-2023 Multi-Year Budget business cases for additional investment that the Civic Administration has prioritized BE APPROVED:**

xiii. **Business Case 11A – Information Systems – Development Application Tracking Software – 2020-2023 Total: Investment \$3,900,000; Net Levy \$0**

xiv. **Business Case 11B – Information Systems – Human Capital Management System – 2020-2023 Total: Investment \$1,230,000; Net Levy \$732,000**

xvi. **Business Case 13 – Master Accommodation Plan – 2020-2023 Total: Investment \$13,000,000; Net Levy \$0**

xvii. **Business Case 14 – Operations Master Plan 2020 – 2020-2023 Total: Investment \$5,118,000; Net Levy \$0**

xviii. **Business Case 15 – Subsidized Transit Program – 2020-2023 Total: Investment \$3,608,000; Net Levy \$964,000**

**A) Business Case 15 - Subsidized Transit Program - Youth Passes: Total Investment - \$1,020,212; Net Levy \$260,777**

**B) Business Case 15 - Subsidized Transit Program - Balance of Program: Total Investment: \$2,587,788; Net Levy \$703,223**

xix. **Business Case 16 – T-Block Replacement/New Storage Building – 2020-2023 Total: Investment \$901,000; Net Levy \$0.**

**Motion Passed**

Voting Record:

Moved by: M. Salih

Seconded by: S. Hillier

This Report contains the recommendations of February 13, 2020, only. A consolidated report is available on the Council Agenda of March 2, 2019.

That the following 2020-2023 Multi-Year Budget business cases for additional investment that the Civic Administration has prioritized BE APPROVED:

xi. Business Case 9 – Fanshawe College Innovation Village – 2020-2023 Total: Revised Investment \$1,500,000; Net Levy \$0; it being noted that Fanshawe College will be requested to provide annual updates with respect to this project.

Moved by: J. Helmer  
Seconded by: Mayor E. Holder

That consideration of Business Case 9, Fanshawe College Innovation Village BE REFERRED to later in the meeting, to be considered prior to the Land Ambulance Operating Budget.

Yeas: (10): Mayor E. Holder, M. van Holst, M. Salih, J. Helmer, M. Cassidy, P. Squire, A. Hopkins, S. Turner, A. Kayabaga, and S. Hillier

Nays: (4): S. Lewis, J. Morgan, S. Lehman, and E. Pelosa

Recuse: (1): P. Van Meerbergen

**Motion Passed (10 to 4)**

Moved by: M. Salih  
Seconded by: E. Pelosa

That the following 2020-2023 Multi-Year Budget business cases for additional investment that the Civic Administration has prioritized BE APPROVED:

xiii. Business Case 11A – Information Systems – Development Application Tracking Software – 2020-2023 Total: Investment \$3,900,000; Net Levy \$0

Yeas: (15): Mayor E. Holder, M. van Holst, S. Lewis, M. Salih, J. Helmer, M. Cassidy, P. Squire, J. Morgan, S. Lehman, A. Hopkins, P. Van Meerbergen, S. Turner, E. Pelosa, A. Kayabaga, and S. Hillier

**Motion Passed (15 to 0)**

Moved by: M. Salih  
Seconded by: S. Turner

That the following 2020-2023 Multi-Year Budget business cases for additional investment that the Civic Administration has prioritized BE APPROVED:

xiv. Business Case 11B – Information Systems – Human Capital Management System – 2020-2023 Total: Investment \$1,230,000; Net Levy \$732,000

Yeas: (15): Mayor E. Holder, M. van Holst, S. Lewis, M. Salih, J. Helmer, M. Cassidy, P. Squire, J. Morgan, S. Lehman, A. Hopkins, P. Van Meerbergen, S. Turner, E. Pelosa, A. Kayabaga, and S. Hillier

This Report contains the recommendations of February 13, 2020, only. A consolidated report is available on the Council Agenda of March 2, 2019.

**Motion Passed (15 to 0)**

Moved by: S. Turner  
Seconded by: E. Pelozza

That the following 2020-2023 Multi-Year Budget business cases for additional investment that the Civic Administration has prioritized BE APPROVED:

xvi. Business Case 13 – Master Accommodation Plan – 2020-2023 Total: Investment \$13,000,000; Net Levy \$0

Yeas: (13): Mayor E. Holder, M. van Holst, S. Lewis, M. Salih, J. Helmer, M. Cassidy, J. Morgan, S. Lehman, A. Hopkins, S. Turner, E. Pelozza, A. Kayabaga, and S. Hillier

Nays: (2): P. Squire, and P. Van Meerbergen

**Motion Passed (13 to 2)**

Moved by: Mayor E. Holder  
Seconded by: S. Lehman

That the following 2020-2023 Multi-Year Budget business cases for additional investment that the Civic Administration has prioritized BE APPROVED:

xvii. Business Case 14 – Operations Master Plan 2020 – 2020-2023 Total: Investment \$5,118,000; Net Levy \$0

Yeas: (15): Mayor E. Holder, M. van Holst, S. Lewis, M. Salih, J. Helmer, M. Cassidy, P. Squire, J. Morgan, S. Lehman, A. Hopkins, P. Van Meerbergen, S. Turner, E. Pelozza, A. Kayabaga, and S. Hillier

**Motion Passed (15 to 0)**

Moved by: P. Squire  
Seconded by: M. Salih

That the following 2020-2023 Multi-Year Budget business cases for additional investment that the Civic Administration has prioritized BE APPROVED:

xviii. Business Case 15 – Subsidized Transit Program – 2020-2023 Total: Investment \$3,608,000; Net Levy \$964,000

Moved by: P. Squire  
Seconded by: M. Salih

Motion to approve youth bus pass portion:

That the following BE APPROVED, with respect to Business Case 15 - Subsidized Transit Program:

Total investment for youth bus passes: \$ 1,020,212

Net levy for youth \$ 260,777

Yeas: (14): Mayor E. Holder, M. van Holst, S. Lewis, M. Salih, J. Helmer, M. Cassidy, P. Squire, J. Morgan, S. Lehman, A. Hopkins, P. Van Meerbergen, S. Turner, A. Kayabaga, and S. Hillier

This Report contains the recommendations of February 13, 2020, only. A consolidated report is available on the Council Agenda of March 2, 2019.

Recuse: (1): E. Pelosa

**Motion Passed (14 to 0)**

Moved by: P. Squire  
Seconded by: M. Salih

Balance of Business Case 15

That the following BE APPROVED, with respect to Business Case 15 - Subsidized Transit Program:

Total remaining costs \$2,587,788

Net levy for remaining \$703,223

Yeas: (15): Mayor E. Holder, M. van Holst, S. Lewis, M. Salih, J. Helmer, M. Cassidy, P. Squire, J. Morgan, S. Lehman, A. Hopkins, P. Van Meerbergen, S. Turner, E. Pelosa, A. Kayabaga, and S. Hillier

**Motion Passed (15 to 0)**

Moved by: Mayor E. Holder  
Seconded by: A. Hopkins

That the following 2020-2023 Multi-Year Budget business cases for additional investment that the Civic Administration has prioritized BE APPROVED:

xix. Business Case 16 – T-Block Replacement/New Storage Building – 2020-2023 Total: Investment \$901,000; Net Levy \$0.

Yeas: (14): Mayor E. Holder, M. van Holst, S. Lewis, M. Salih, J. Helmer, M. Cassidy, P. Squire, S. Lehman, A. Hopkins, P. Van Meerbergen, S. Turner, E. Pelosa, A. Kayabaga, and S. Hillier

Nays: (1): J. Morgan

**Motion Passed (14 to 1)**

#### 4.13 Business Cases for Additional Investment - For Consideration

**That the following 2020-2023 Multi-Year Budget business cases for additional investment for Council's consideration BE APPROVED:**

ii. **Business Case 5B – Climate Emergency Declaration – Implementation – 2020-2023 Total: Investment \$1,295,000; Net Levy \$1,044,000**

v. **Business Case 17A – Community Improvement Plan – Community Building Projects – 2020-2023 Total: Investment \$160,000; Net Levy \$160,000**

vi. **Business Case 17B – Community Improvement Plan – Land Acquisition – 2020-2023 Total: Investment \$400,000; Net Levy \$400,000; it being noted that the one-time additional funding shall be the 2019 Operating Budget Surplus transferred to the Land Acquisition Reserve Fund**

ix. **Business Case 20 – London Public Library - Collections – 2020-2023 Total: Investment \$600,000; Net Levy \$0; it being noted that the funds are to be allocated for the purpose of an enhanced level of**

This Report contains the recommendations of February 13, 2020, only. A consolidated report is available on the Council Agenda of March 2, 2019.

**targeted purchasing for high-demand materials; and it be further noted that the source of funding shall be the surplus fund forwarded to the budget process; it being further noted that the London Public Library is currently undertaking a variety of efforts with respect to recent increases in collection costs**

**xii. Business Case 23 – Street Light Local Improvement – 2020-2023 Total: Investment \$832,000; Net Levy \$512,000**

**xiii. Business Case 24 – WiFi in Recreation Centres for the Public – 2020-2023 Total: Investment \$155,000; Net Levy \$0; it being noted that the matter shall be funded from the Efficiency, Effectiveness and Economic Reserve (EEE); it being noted that the Parks and Recreation staff, in partnership with the Information and Technology Services staff are to develop a plan for sponsorship and advertising opportunities, in accordance with the City of London's Corporate Sponsorship and Advertising Policy, of the proposed WiFi service with the intent that the revenue generated from the sponsorship and advertising be directed to repay the capital costs for the EEE Reserve**

**xiv. Business Case 25 – Winter Maintenance Program Support - Sidewalks/Bus Stops – 2020-2023 Total: Investment \$2,220,000; Net Levy \$2,220,000.**

**Motion Passed**

Voting Record:

Moved by: J. Helmer  
Seconded by: S. Lewis

That the following 2020-2023 Multi-Year Budget business cases for additional investment for Council's consideration BE APPROVED:

i. Business Case 4B – City of London Infrastructure Gap – 2020-2023 Total: Investment \$17,563,000; Net Levy \$17,563,000

Moved by: S. Lewis  
Seconded by: S. Lehman

That consideration of Business Case 4B BE REFERRED until after consideration of the Land Ambulance Operating Budget.

Yeas: (13): Mayor E. Holder, M. van Holst, S. Lewis, M. Salih, J. Helmer, M. Cassidy, P. Squire, J. Morgan, S. Lehman, P. Van Meerbergen, E. Pelozza, A. Kayabaga, and S. Hillier

Nays: (2): A. Hopkins, and S. Turner

**Motion Passed (13 to 2)**

Moved by: A. Kayabaga  
Seconded by: M. Salih

That the following 2020-2023 Multi-Year Budget business cases for additional investment for Council's consideration BE APPROVED:

ii. Business Case 5B – Climate Emergency Declaration – Implementation – 2020-2023 Total: Investment \$1,295,000; Net Levy \$1,044,000

Yeas: (13): Mayor E. Holder, M. van Holst, S. Lewis, M. Salih, J. Helmer, M. Cassidy, P. Squire, J. Morgan, S. Lehman, A. Hopkins, S. Turner, E. Pelozza, and A. Kayabaga

This Report contains the recommendations of February 13, 2020, only. A consolidated report is available on the Council Agenda of March 2, 2019.

Nays: (2): P. Van Meerbergen, and S. Hillier

**Motion Passed (13 to 2)**

**Amendment:**

Moved by: S. Turner

Seconded by: A. Kayabaga

That Business Case 5B - Climate Change Emergency Declaration - Implementation BE AMENDED to dedicate the amounts to a Climate Change Reserve Fund, with sufficient latitude to allow for funds to be dedicated to projects on an adhoc basis upon Council approval.

Yeas: (4): M. Salih, A. Hopkins, S. Turner, and A. Kayabaga

Nays: (11): Mayor E. Holder, M. van Holst, S. Lewis, J. Helmer, M. Cassidy, P. Squire, J. Morgan, S. Lehman, P. Van Meerbergen, E. Pelozza, and S. Hillier

**Motion Failed (4 to 11)**

Moved by: J. Morgan

Seconded by: P. Squire

That the following 2020-2023 Multi-Year Budget business case for additional investment for Council's consideration BE APPROVED:

That the following actions be taken with respect to Business Case 20 - London Public Library - Collections - 2020-2023 Total Investment \$600,000; Net Levy \$600,000:

- a) a one-time amount of \$600,000 BE ALLOCATED to the London Public Library, for the purpose of an enhanced level of targeted purchasing for high-demand materials;
- b) the source of funding for the above-noted \$600,000 be the surplus funds forwarded to the budget process.

it being noted that the London Public Library is currently undertaking a variety of efforts with respect to recent increases to collections costs.

Yeas: (13): Mayor E. Holder, M. van Holst, S. Lewis, M. Salih, J. Helmer, M. Cassidy, P. Squire, J. Morgan, S. Lehman, A. Hopkins, E. Pelozza, A. Kayabaga, and S. Hillier

Nays: (2): P. Van Meerbergen, and S. Turner

**Motion Passed (13 to 2)**

Moved by: M. van Holst

Seconded by: A. Kayabaga

That the following 2020-2023 Multi-Year Budget business cases for additional investment for Council's consideration BE APPROVED:

v. Business Case 17A – Community Improvement Plan – Community Building Projects – 2020-2023 Total: Investment \$160,000; Net Levy \$160,000

Yeas: (8): M. van Holst, M. Salih, J. Helmer, M. Cassidy, A. Hopkins, S. Turner, A. Kayabaga, and S. Hillier

Nays: (7): Mayor E. Holder, S. Lewis, P. Squire, J. Morgan, S. Lehman, P. Van Meerbergen, and E. Pelozza

This Report contains the recommendations of February 13, 2020, only. A consolidated report is available on the Council Agenda of March 2, 2019.

**Motion Passed (8 to 7)**

Moved by: M. van Holst  
Seconded by: A. Kayabaga

That the following 2020-2023 Multi-Year Budget business cases for additional investment for Council's consideration BE APPROVED:

vi. Business Case 17B – Community Improvement Plan – Land Acquisition – 2020-2023 Total: Investment \$400,000; Net Levy \$400,000

**Amendment:**

Moved by: J. Helmer  
Seconded by: M. van Holst

That Business Case 17 B BE AMENDED to provide one-time additional funding for land acquisition in Business Case 17B, in the amount of \$400,000, be transferred from the 2019 operating budget surplus to the Land Acquisition Reserve Fund

Yeas: (8): M. van Holst, M. Salih, J. Helmer, M. Cassidy, J. Morgan, A. Hopkins, S. Turner, and A. Kayabaga

Nays: (7): Mayor E. Holder, S. Lewis, P. Squire, S. Lehman, P. Van Meerbergen, E. Pelozza, and S. Hillier

**Motion Passed (8 to 7)**

Moved by: M. van Holst  
Seconded by: A. Kayabaga

That Business Case 17B - Community Improvement Plan - Land Acquisition - 2020-2023, as amended, BE APPROVED.

Yeas: (8): M. van Holst, M. Salih, J. Helmer, M. Cassidy, J. Morgan, A. Hopkins, S. Turner, and A. Kayabaga

Nays: (7): Mayor E. Holder, S. Lewis, P. Squire, S. Lehman, P. Van Meerbergen, E. Pelozza, and S. Hillier

**Motion Passed (8 to 7)**

Moved by: M. Salih  
Seconded by: S. Hillier

That the following 2020-2023 Multi-Year Budget business cases for additional investment for Council's consideration BE APPROVED:

xi. Business Case 22 – Smart City Strategy – 2020-2023 Total: Investment \$466,000; Net Levy \$466,000

Yeas: (7): Mayor E. Holder, M. van Holst, M. Salih, J. Helmer, M. Cassidy, S. Turner, and A. Kayabaga

Nays: (8): S. Lewis, P. Squire, J. Morgan, S. Lehman, A. Hopkins, P. Van Meerbergen, E. Pelozza, and S. Hillier

**Motion Failed (7 to 8)**

This Report contains the recommendations of February 13, 2020, only. A consolidated report is available on the Council Agenda of March 2, 2019.

Moved by: M. Salih  
Seconded by: S. Lewis

That the following 2020-2023 Multi-Year Budget business cases for additional investment for Council's consideration BE APPROVED:

xii. Business Case 23 – Street Light Local Improvement – 2020-2023  
Total: Investment \$832,000; Net Levy \$512,000

Yeas: (15): Mayor E. Holder, M. van Holst, S. Lewis, M. Salih, J. Helmer, M. Cassidy, P. Squire, J. Morgan, S. Lehman, A. Hopkins, P. Van Meerbergen, S. Turner, E. Pelozza, A. Kayabaga, and S. Hillier

**Motion Passed (15 to 0)**

Moved by: S. Lewis  
Seconded by: E. Pelozza

That the following actions be taken with respect to "Business Case 24, WiFi in Recreation Facilities for Public Use":

a) "Business Case 24, WiFi in Recreation Facilities for Public Use" - 2020-2023 Total Investment \$155,000; Net Levy \$0, BE APPROVED;

b) the Civic Administration BE DIRECTED to change the Source of Financing for the above-noted Business Case to the Efficiency, Effectiveness and Economy (EEE) Reserve; and,

c) the Parks and Recreation Services staff, in partnership with Information and Technology Services staff, BE DIRECTED to develop a plan for sponsorship and advertising opportunities, in accordance with the City of London's Corporate Sponsorship and Advertising Policy, of the proposed WiFi service with the intent that the revenues generated from sponsorship and advertising be directed to repay the capital cost to the EEE Reserve.

Moved by: S. Lewis  
Seconded by: E. Pelozza

Motion to approve part a)

That the following actions be taken with respect to "Business Case 24, WiFi in Recreation Facilities for Public Use":

a) "Business Case 24, WiFi in Recreation Facilities for Public Use" - 2020-2023 Total: Investment \$155,000; Net Levy \$0, BE APPROVED;

Yeas: (12): Mayor E. Holder, M. van Holst, S. Lewis, M. Salih, J. Helmer, P. Squire, J. Morgan, S. Lehman, P. Van Meerbergen, E. Pelozza, A. Kayabaga, and S. Hillier

Nays: (3): M. Cassidy, A. Hopkins, and S. Turner

**Motion Passed (12 to 3)**

Moved by: S. Lewis  
Seconded by: E. Pelozza

Motion to approve parts b) and c)

That the following actions be taken with respect to "Business Case 24, WiFi in Recreation Facilities for Public Use":

This Report contains the recommendations of February 13, 2020, only. A consolidated report is available on the Council Agenda of March 2, 2019.

b) the Civic Administration BE DIRECTED to change the Source of Financing for the above-noted Business Case to the Efficiency, Effectiveness and Economy (EEE) Reserve; and,

c) the Parks and Recreation Services staff, in partnership with Information and Technology Services staff, BE DIRECTED to develop a plan for sponsorship and advertising opportunities, in accordance with the City of London's Corporate Sponsorship and Advertising Policy, of the proposed WiFi service with the intent that the revenues generated from sponsorship and advertising be directed to repay the capital cost to the EEE Reserve.

Yeas: (10): Mayor E. Holder, M. van Holst, S. Lewis, M. Cassidy, P. Squire, S. Lehman, P. Van Meerbergen, S. Turner, E. Pelozza, and S. Hillier

Nays: (5): M. Salih, J. Helmer, J. Morgan, A. Hopkins, and A. Kayabaga

**Motion Passed (10 to 5)**

Moved by: A. Kayabaga

Seconded by: M. Salih

That the following 2020-2023 Multi-Year Budget business cases for additional investment for Council's consideration BE APPROVED:

xiv. Business Case 25 – Winter Maintenance Program Support – 2020-2023 Total: Investment \$4,220,000; Net Levy \$4,220,000.

Moved by: A. Kayabaga

Seconded by: M. Salih

Business Case 25 - Winter Maintenance Program Support - 2020-2023 with respect to the residential streets portion of the Business Case, in the amount of \$2,000,000 (2020-2023) BE APPROVED.

Yeas: (3): M. Salih, A. Kayabaga, and S. Hillier

Nays: (12): Mayor E. Holder, M. van Holst, S. Lewis, J. Helmer, M. Cassidy, P. Squire, J. Morgan, S. Lehman, A. Hopkins, P. Van Meerbergen, S. Turner, and E. Pelozza

**Motion Failed (3 to 12)**

Moved by: A. Kayabaga

Seconded by: M. Salih

Business Case 25 - Winter Maintenance Program Support - 2020-2023 with respect to sidewalks and bus stoops portion of the Business Case in the amount of \$2,200,00 (202-2023) BE APPROVED.

Yeas: (14): Mayor E. Holder, M. van Holst, S. Lewis, M. Salih, J. Helmer, M. Cassidy, P. Squire, J. Morgan, S. Lehman, P. Van Meerbergen, S. Turner, E. Pelozza, A. Kayabaga, and S. Hillier

Nays: (1): A. Hopkins

**Motion Passed (14 to 1)**

That the Strategic Priorities and Policy Committee recess at this time, and resume following the Public Participation Meeting.

This Report contains the recommendations of February 13, 2020, only. A consolidated report is available on the Council Agenda of March 2, 2019.

The Strategic Priorities and Policy Committee recesses at 4:54 PM, and resumes at 8:25 PM.

That the Strategic Priorities and Policy Committee recess at this time.

**Motion Passed**

That the Strategic Priorities and Policy Committee recessed from 2:30 PM to 2:51 PM.

4.17 Water and Wastewater & Treatment Services

**That the following actions be taken with respect to the 2020-2023 Operating Budgets and 2020-2023 Capital Budgets and associated forecasts for Water and Wastewater & Treatment Services:**

- a) the 2020-2023 Operating Budget for Water Services BE **ADOPTED** as submitted (page 34 - \$356,452,000);
- b) the 2020-2023 Capital Budget for Water Services BE **ADOPTED** as submitted (page 38 - \$200,773,000);
- c) the 2024-2029 Capital Forecast for Water Services be BE **ADOPTED** in principle (page 38 - \$278,507,000);

it being noted that all rates and charges related to the provision of Water Services were increased by 2.5% effective January 1, 2020 as approved by Council on November 26, 2019;

- d) the 2020-2023 Operating Budget for Wastewater & Treatment Services BE **ADOPTED** as submitted (page 44 - \$447,650,000);

- e) the Civic Administration BE **DIRECTED** to take all necessary arrangements with respect to the rates and charges increases of 3.5%;

- f) the 2020-2023 Capital Budget for Wastewater & Treatment Services BE **ADOPTED** as submitted (page 45 - \$364,721,000);

- g) the 2024-2029 Capital Forecast for Wastewater & Treatment Services be BE **ADOPTED** in principle (page 49 - \$571,640,000);

it being noted that all rates and charges related to the provision of Wastewater & Treatment Services were increased by 2.5% effective January 1, 2020 as approved by Council on November 26, 2019.

- h) the following 2020-2023 Multi-Year Budget overviews BE **RECEIVED** for information:

- i. Reserves/Reserve Funds Overview (Page 57)

- ii. Debt Overview (Page 63)

- i) the reconciliations of the tabled budgets to the Public Sector Accounting Board financial statement budget BE **RECEIVED** for information (Water - Page 84 and Wastewater & Treatment - Page 88).

**Motion Passed**

Voting Record:

Moved by: S. Lewis

Seconded by: M. van Holst

That the following actions be taken with respect to the 2020-2023 Operating Budgets and 2020-2023 Capital Budgets and associated forecasts for Water and Wastewater & Treatment Services:

- i. the 2020-2023 Operating Budget for Water Services BE **ADOPTED** as submitted (page 34 - \$356,452,000);
- ii. the 2020-2023 Capital Budget for Water Services BE **ADOPTED** as

This Report contains the recommendations of February 13, 2020, only. A consolidated report is available on the Council Agenda of March 2, 2019.

- submitted (page 38 - \$200,773,000);
- iii. the 2024-2029 Capital Forecast for Water Services be BE ADOPTED in principle (page 38 - \$278,507,000);  
it being noted that all rates and charges related to the provision of Water Services were increased by 2.5% effective January 1, 2020 as approved by Council on November 26, 2019.
- iv. the 2020-2023 Operating Budget for Wastewater & Treatment Services BE ADOPTED as amended (\$447,650,000);
- v. the Civic Administration BE DIRECTED to take all necessary arrangements with respect to the rates and charges increases of 3.5%;
- vi. the 2020-2023 Capital Budget for Wastewater & Treatment Services BE ADOPTED as submitted (page 45 - \$364,721,000);
- vii. the 2024-2029 Capital Forecast for Wastewater & Treatment Services be BE ADOPTED in principle (page 49 - \$571,640,000);

it being noted that all rates and charges related to the provision of Wastewater & Treatment Services were increased by 2.5% effective January 1, 2020 as approved by Council on November 26, 2019.

**Amendment:**

Moved by: S. Turner

Seconded by: E. Peloza

That the wastewater and treatment rates and charges BE INCREASED in the amount of an additional 0.5% for each of the years 2021, 2022 and 2023.

Yeas: (7): M. Salih, J. Helmer, A. Hopkins, S. Turner, E. Peloza, A. Kayabaga, and S. Hillier

Nays: (8): Mayor E. Holder, M. van Holst, S. Lewis, M. Cassidy, P. Squire, J. Morgan, S. Lehman, and P. Van Meerbergen

**Motion Failed (7 to 8)**

Moved by: J. Helmer

Seconded by: M. van Holst

That the Strategic Priorities and Policy Committee recess at this time.

**Motion Passed**

That the Strategic Priorities and Policy Committee recesses at 11:45 AM and reconvenes at 12:32 PM.

Moved by: S. Lewis

Seconded by: M. van Holst

That the following actions be taken with respect to the 2020-2023 Operating Budgets and 2020-2023 Capital Budgets and associated forecasts for Water and Wastewater & Treatment Services:

- iv. the 2020-2023 Operating Budget for Wastewater & Treatment Services BE ADOPTED as amended (\$447,650,000);
- v. the Civic Administration BE DIRECTED to take all necessary arrangements with respect to the rates and charges increases of 3.5%;

Yeas: (12): Mayor E. Holder, S. Lewis, M. Salih, J. Helmer, M. Cassidy, P. Squire, J. Morgan, S. Lehman, A. Hopkins, E. Peloza, A. Kayabaga, and S. Hillier

This Report contains the recommendations of February 13, 2020, only. A consolidated report is available on the Council Agenda of March 2, 2019.

Nays: (3): M. van Holst, P. Van Meerbergen, and S. Turner

**Motion Passed (12 to 3)**

Moved by: S. Lewis  
Seconded by: M. van Holst

That the following actions be taken with respect to the 2020-2023 Operating Budgets and 2020-2023 Capital Budgets and associated forecasts for Water and Wastewater & Treatment Services:

- i. the 2020-2023 Operating Budget for Water Services BE ADOPTED as submitted (page 34 - \$356,452,000);
- ii. the 2020-2023 Capital Budget for Water Services BE ADOPTED as submitted (page 38 - \$200,773,000);
- iii. the 2024-2029 Capital Forecast for Water Services be BE ADOPTED in principle (page 38 - \$278,507,000);  
it being noted that all rates and charges related to the provision of Water Services were increased by 2.5% effective January 1, 2020 as approved by Council on November 26, 2019.
- vi. the 2020-2023 Capital Budget for Wastewater & Treatment Services BE ADOPTED as submitted (page 45 - \$364,721,000);
- vii. the 2024-2029 Capital Forecast for Wastewater & Treatment Services be BE ADOPTED in principle (page 49 - \$571,640,000);

it being noted that all rates and charges related to the provision of Wastewater & Treatment Services were increased by 2.5% effective January 1, 2020 as approved by Council on November 26, 2019.

Yeas: (14): Mayor E. Holder, M. van Holst, S. Lewis, M. Salih, J. Helmer, M. Cassidy, P. Squire, J. Morgan, S. Lehman, A. Hopkins, P. Van Meerbergen, E. Pelozza, A. Kayabaga, and S. Hillier

Nays: (1): S. Turner

**Motion Passed (14 to 1)**

Moved by: M. van Holst  
Seconded by: S. Lewis

That the following actions be taken with respect to the 2020-2023 Water and Wastewater and Treatment Services Budgets:

- g) the following 2020-2023 Multi-Year Budget overviews BE RECEIVED for information:
  - i. Reserves/Reserve Funds Overview (Page 57)
  - ii. Debt Overview (Page 63) and,
- h) the reconciliations of the tabled budgets to the Public Sector Accounting Board financial statement budget BE RECEIVED for information (Water - Page 84 and Wastewater & Treatment - Page 88)

Yeas: (15): Mayor E. Holder, M. van Holst, S. Lewis, M. Salih, J. Helmer, M. Cassidy, P. Squire, J. Morgan, S. Lehman, A. Hopkins, P. Van Meerbergen, S. Turner, E. Pelozza, A. Kayabaga, and S. Hillier

**Motion Passed (15 to 0)**

This Report contains the recommendations of February 13, 2020, only. A consolidated report is available on the Council Agenda of March 2, 2019.

**7. Adjournment**

The Strategic Priorities and Policy Committee recessed at 10:06 PM; it being noted that the meeting will resume at 9:30 AM, Friday, February 14, 2020.

<b>TO:</b>	<b>CHAIR AND MEMBERS STRATEGIC PRIORITIES AND POLICY COMMITTEE MEETING ON JANUARY 30, 2020</b>
<b>FROM:</b>	<b>ANNA LISA BARBON MANAGING DIRECTOR, CORPORATE SERVICES AND CITY TREASURER, CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER</b>
<b>SUBJECT:</b>	<b>2020-2023 MULTI-YEAR BUDGET PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT FEEDBACK UPDATE</b>

<b>RECOMMENDATIONS</b>
------------------------

That, on the recommendation of the Managing Director, Corporate Services and City Treasurer, Chief Financial Officer, this report providing a summary of feedback on the 2020-2023 Multi-Year Budget from public engagement activities undertaken from December 17, 2019 through to January 26, 2019 **BE RECEIVED** for information.

<b>PREVIOUS REPORTS PERTINENT TO THIS MATTER</b>
--

Strategic Priorities and Policy Committee, meeting on January 7, 2020, agenda item 2.1 – 2020-2023 Multi-Year Budget Pre-Tabling Public Engagement Feedback:  
<https://pub-london.escribemeetings.com/filestream.ashx?DocumentId=69741>

Strategic Priorities and Policy Committee, meeting on January 7, 2020, agenda item 2.2 – 2020-2023 Multi-Year Budget Business Cases for Potential Net Levy Reductions:  
<https://pub-london.escribemeetings.com/filestream.ashx?DocumentId=69743>

Strategic Priorities and Policy Committee, meeting on December 17, 2019, agenda item 3.1 – Tabling of the 2020-2023 Multi-Year Budget (Tax Supported, Water and Wastewater and Treatment):  
<http://www.london.ca/city-hall/budget-business/budget/Pages/Get-Involved-with-the-Multi-Year-Budget-Process.aspx>

Strategic Priorities and Policy Committee, meeting on November 5, 2019, agenda item 2.1 – Update on the 2020-2023 Multi-Year Budget:  
<https://pub-london.escribemeetings.com/filestream.ashx?DocumentId=68346>

Corporate Services Committee, meeting on May 28, 2019, agenda item 2.1 – Provincial Budget & Recent Proposed Legislative Changes with Financial Impacts:  
<https://pub-london.escribemeetings.com/filestream.ashx?DocumentId=62852>

Strategic Priorities and Policy Committee, meeting on May 6, 2019, agenda item 4.1 – 2020-2023 Multi-Year Budget:  
<https://pub-london.escribemeetings.com/filestream.ashx?DocumentId=62405>

<b>LINK TO 2019-2023 STRATEGIC PLAN</b>
---

Council’s 2019-2023 Strategic Plan for the City of London identifies ‘Leading in Public Service’ as a strategic area of focus. The City of London’s Multi-Year Budget process is a strategy to maintain London’s finances in a transparent and well-planned manner to balance equity and affordability over the long term.

Additionally, the 2019-2023 Strategic Plan forms the foundation for the 2020-2023 Multi-Year Budget. Council will, through the 2020-2023 Multi-Year Budget process, be able to ensure that its priorities are achieved within the financial parameters that Council establishes during its

term. The 2020-2023 Multi-Year Budget will determine the pace of implementation of the 2019-2023 Strategic Plan.

## **BACKGROUND**

Civic Administration has continued its 2020-2023 Multi-Year Budget public engagement activities since the tabling of the budget. At this stage of the process, this report is intended to provide an update on the additional feedback received to date from December 17, 2019 to January 27, 2020 to aid Council's budget deliberations.

Civic Administration has focused on informing, consulting and involving residents of the City of London through its engagement activities. The public engagement plan emphasized the following elements:

- Ensuring multiple channels are utilized to communicate engagement opportunities;
- Highlighting the various forms of feedback submission available to the community;
- Highlighting how participation and feedback is being incorporated into the decision making process; and
- Consideration of the time and location of events to increase accessibility.

### **What have we heard?**

Since tabling of the budget on December 17<sup>th</sup> and release of business cases for potential net levy reductions on December 18<sup>th</sup>, a number of engagement channels have been utilized:

1. 2020-2023 Multi-Year Budget Business Cases Survey on the City's Get Involved webpage;
2. Budget open houses;
3. Community events;
4. Ward meeting attendance;
5. Advisory committee presentations;
6. Online presence and social media; and
7. Public Participation Meeting

Please note that comments are provided in this report as received and at times edited for presentation, to address privacy concerns or public appropriateness.

### **2020-2023 Multi-Year Budget Survey – Get Involved**

On December 18<sup>th</sup>, 2019, a survey was posted on the Get Involved London website asking for feedback on all the business cases for additional investments and potential net levy reductions. Participants were able to respond either yes or no (signifying support or not) on each of the 34 business cases and were able to leave a comment for each case if they wished.

Please refer to Appendix A for the detailed business case feedback. Over 5,800 responses/submissions across all business cases were received.

### **Budget Open Houses**

Civic Administration held two budget open houses at Goodwill Industries (255 Horton Street East) on January 11, 2020 (10:00AM-12:00PM) and January 15, 2020 (6:00PM-8:00PM). The open houses were structured as informal 'drop-in' sessions where Londoners could learn more about the Multi-Year Budget process and the details of the budget; with stations focusing on maintaining existing services as well as the business cases. Attendees were able to speak to budget staff, representatives from service areas and the City Treasurer. The open houses were advertised on our website, through social media and through 20 radio ads.

In total, we had 52 attendees over the two sessions. Please refer to Appendix B for a summary of feedback received during the public engagement events. Any feedback received regarding specific business cases has also been included in Appendix A.

### **Community Events/Group Invitations**

A couple of community groups invited budget staff to attend their events and discuss the Multi-Year Budget. All invitations were accepted by Civic Administration and include:

- London Environmental Network – January 13, 2020 (6:00PM-8:00PM) – Goodwill

- Industries, 255 Horton Street East
- Urban League - January 16, 2020 (5:30PM-7:30PM) – Chaucer's Restaurant, 122 Carling Street

The format of the sessions was based on the hosts' requests and included presentations as well as question and answer periods.

A total of 96 community members attended these community events. Feedback received from these events, including business case feedback has been included in both Appendices A and B.

### **Ward Meeting Attendance**

Budget staff were invited to a number of ward meetings since tabling of the budget. The meetings attended included:

- Wards 12/14 – Councillors Pelosa and Hillier – January 11, 2020 – 2:00PM-4:00PM – South London Community Centre
- Ward 2 – Councillor Lewis – January 22, 2020 – 6:30PM-8:30PM – Clarke Road Secondary School
- Wards 7/8 – Councillors Morgan and Lehman – January 25, 2020 – 2:00PM-4:00PM – Sherwood Library

The format of the sessions was based on the hosts' requests and included presentations, question and answer periods, as well as drop-in formats. As with other types of events, any feedback received has been included in Appendices A and B. A total of approximately 76 attendees attended the above meetings.

Subsequent to this report, budget staff will also be attending the following Ward Meetings:

- Wards 5/6/7 – Councillors Cassidy, Squire and Morgan – February 8, 2020 – 10:00AM-12:00PM – Masonville Library, Sifton Room
- Ward 1 – Councillor van Holst – February 8, 2020 – 2:00PM-4:00PM – Hamilton Road Seniors Centre
- Wards 4/6/13 – Councillors Helmer, Squire and Kayabaga – February 10, 2020 – 6:30PM-8:30PM – Real Canadian Superstore (825 Oxford Street East), 2<sup>nd</sup> floor

### **Advisory Committee Presentations**

Budget staff presented the 2020-2023 Multi-Year Budget to the following advisory committees:

- Advisory Committee on the Environment (ACE) - January 8, 2020 – 12:15PM-1:15PM
- Cycling Advisory Committee – January 15, 2020 – 4:00PM-5:00PM

### **Online Presence & Social Media**

Civic Administration has continued to leverage the City of London's website to post budget materials, including all tabled materials. Furthermore, inquiries and comments were received via Financial Planning & Policy's email ([budget@london.ca](mailto:budget@london.ca)) as well as any incoming phone calls to staff.

Total inquiries directly to Financial Planning & Policy included:

- 12 emails received
- 3 phone calls received
- 1,430 Budget website visits from 904 unique visitors.

Social Media, specifically Twitter and Facebook, have been utilized to inform residents:

- 28 social media (Twitter/Facebook) posts released
- 280 tweets/postings have been completed utilizing #LdnBudget hashtag;
- We have had a total of 84,588 impressions through Twitter;
- 51,034 views/clicks on Facebook

For a wholesome view of the conversations on Twitter, please use #LdnBudget to view activity. Due to volume, privacy concerns and nature of this channel, copies of tweets have not been replicated in this report. Please refer to Appendix C for a summary of feedback received from

other online/social media mediums.

### Public Participation Meetings

On January 23, 2020, a Public Participation Meeting (PPM) provided Londoners an opportunity to address the Strategic Priorities and Policy Committee (SPPC) in Council Chambers. Written submissions as well as a video recording will be available of the PPM on the City website under the corresponding meeting agenda. The agenda can be found at the following link:

<https://pub-london.escribemeetings.com/Meeting.aspx?Id=108a2058-cf28-4b2d-825f-deb067653c6e&Agenda=Merged&lang=English>

A second PPM is scheduled on February 13<sup>th</sup>, 2020 to begin at 6:00PM at City Hall, 300 Dufferin Ave; 3<sup>rd</sup> floor Council Chambers public gallery.

<b>CONCLUSION</b>
-------------------

As deliberations on the budget begin, this report concludes submission of formally reported engagement feedback received by budget staff to Council members. While public engagement activities will continue during the deliberation period, the focus will be on the 'inform' continuum of the public participation spectrum moving forward. As per the Budget Public Engagement plan, much of the 'consulting' and 'involving' activities have been done up to deliberations. Civic Administration will continue to engage with the community and members that reach out and need assistance or require information. Civic Administration will be encouraging those with feedback and/or submissions to participate at the February 13, 2020 Public Participation Meeting or to connect with Councillors directly.

<b>PREPARED BY:</b>	<b>PREPARED BY:</b>
<b>ZEINA NSAIR, CPA, CGA, MANAGER, FINANCIAL MODELLING, FORECASTING &amp; SYSTEMS CONTROL</b>	<b>MARTIN GALCZYNSKI, CPA, CA MANAGER, FINANCIAL PLANNING &amp; POLICY</b>
<b>REVIEWED &amp; CONCURRED BY:</b>	<b>RECOMMENDED BY:</b>
<b>KYLE MURRAY, CPA, CA DIRECTOR, FINANCIAL PLANNING &amp; BUSINESS SUPPORT</b>	<b>ANNA LISA BARBON, CPA, CGA MANAGING DIRECTOR, CORPORATE SERVICES AND CITY TREASURER, CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER</b>

Cc: Bryan Baar – Senior Financial Business Administrator  
Jason Davies – Manager, Financial Planning and Policy  
Alan Dunbar – Manager, Financial Planning and Policy  
John Millson – Senior Financial Business Administrator

**APPENDIX A – GET INVOLVED LONDON/ENGAGEMENT EVENTS – BUSINESS CASES FEEDBACK**

**ADDITIONAL INVESTMENTS – ADMINISTRATIVELY PRIORITIZED**

<b>Business Case 1 - 60% Waste Diversion Action Plan</b>			
<b>Responses</b>	<b>Total Responses</b>	<b>% Yes</b>	<b>% No</b>
<b>Online Survey</b>	195	69%	31%
<b>Public Engagement Events</b>	37	78%	22%
<b>Comments/ Feedback Received</b>			

- Reduce.
- We can't afford it
- Yes A priority. We have to increase our waste diversion. We're already behind in our composting programs.
- I'm a homeowner. \$20.62 per year for this seems a bargain. Raise my taxes.
- Seems reasonable especially considering the pending landfill capacity issue. I'm curious what the impacts of leaf collection (stop collecting) would have on budget implications as well as reducing garbage collection to 2 which is still not overly limiting.
- Unbelievable that a city this size does not have a green bin program.
- Put off to the future.
- ONLY 60%?? London is growing, its is the Mini Mississauga.
- Will support this very high cost item IF AND ONLY IF - the implementation plan is pushed out to 2022 -- 23 start to "smooth" the higher priority tax increases we are already facing in 1st 2 years of the multi - year budget .
- More efficient to have private corporations do that & contract with city.
- Isn't this provincially mandated?
- Set 2 bag limit. Charge fees for stickers to be purchased for additional bags of garbage. Make landlords near UWO & Fanshawe provide furnished apartments saving garbage. Residents to leave garbage on one side of street - only need 1 empl side loader.
- Stop putting it off. It is only getting more dire and more expensive.
- I believe this is a top priority.
- We need to be focused on attracting investment and new companies to London, along with creating jobs, and providing individual citizens with the ability to provide for their own personal financial empowerment.
- Including composting.
- I would be SO happy to have an organic waste program!!! I live in an apartment and so am not able to compost but I really wish that I could!
- Add in producer responsibility actions--if a business sells it, they take the used product back and all packaging.
- I believe people who do not recycle should be fined - that revenue could be then be used.
- Council declared a climate emergency - this fits with that direction.
- Recycling is a waste, change to reusable containers only.
- I am strongly in favour of green bins and incentives to recycle.
- This is top priority.
- City should continue to provide pickup of larger items - mattresses, furniture, ceramics - but recommend changing frequency to twice per year. Continue with Christmas tree pickup - this is only once per year and guarantees recycling.
- Create a tax on coffee cup, plastic bottles and plastic bags to fund it.
- With recent media reports questioning the effectiveness and actuality of recycling programs, how is the city tackling this (oversight, contractor selection, etc...) to ensure this waste is not entering landfills?
- Small investment for a large return when considering future costs of landfill, land, servicing, etc.
- The hefty energy program should be continued and expanded.
- Make Green Bin also available to apartment buildings as well.
- There should be consideration for inclusion of multi-unit residential in the organics management program.
- There should be implementation in multi-unit residential housing.
- I have become skeptical about how much of my "recycled" material is actually recycled. The city does a good job of listing what is recyclable but I see many cases where

citizens are not strict enough (lids left on jars, food left in containers).

- Seems more \$\$ should be spent.
- Recycling program needed for downtown. Organic waste pick up needed citywide.
- About time, we got green bin program. It's almost embarrassing that we DON'T have one.
- We should be banning some plastics altogether not just looking to achieve waste diversion.
- Green bins are long overdue.
- We need green bins.
- A good use of tax dollars in my opinion. Something needs to be done with waste, lets spend a little more and do it right.
- We moved to London recently from Pembroke where for many years there has been a recycling program that includes green bins. The green bins are needed for a successful waste diversion plan, the sooner the better.
- Organic waste collection is a waste of time and money. No one wants the plastic and garbage infested compost that is generated.
- Now that I live in an area where I cannot compost (I live in an apartment) I am aware of how ridiculous it is that so much of my garbage is actually organic matter that could easily break down given the chance. Recycle organic matter, please.
- We need to focus on less waste to begin with. Packaging is our biggest problem not food scraps. How do we stop packaging from entering our homes in the first place? Teaching people how to compost at home would be helpful. Most do not understand how.
- There is also a huge sum for the technology - an unknown technology - for some 36 million dollars. Why is this not also shown here? I disagree with setting this spending too.
- IF this cost eliminates future landfill costs on a breakeven basis.
- I would pay more taxes for green box to save the life span of landfill sites and hopefully help environment.
- I live in PondMills and a few years back we were on the successful green waste program pilot but the city said it was too expensive to implement. There is so much garbage that is green waste going into our landfill. ☹
- An urgent need. London is significantly behind other Mo.
- Please bring green bin back, we were on the pilot program, it was great as most of our garbage is food scraps from preparing our own vegetables and fruit.
- Other smaller towns in Ontario have this from years ago & no issue with financing it!!!!
- Everybody is responsible for our neighbourhood waste reduction is expensive, we have to share the cost.
- Let's recycle as much as we can.
- I do believe that the plan should occur but not at the expensive of London residents, I do think that the city of London has been given enough funding to support the plan and ensure that it will work effectively. The reason I do not believe that they should.
- I urge you to move quickly to place green bins in every residence in London including apartments and condominiums. We need this sooner rather than later.
- More focus on REDUCING would be great from the City, but recycling/organics management is a great step.
- Already compost, organics management program are nice to have, compared to many must have. We cannot afford this, the well is dry.
- This fits with Councils climate emergency and will save money in the long term.
- I believe that removing the organics from the rest of the trash will slow down the decomposing rate of the trash. It provides the organisms needed to help the decomposing process.
- I already compost my green waste and want to make it possible for all possible green waste to be composted. Pleased that there is a pilot project to recycle styrofoam and other plastics. Do expand and improve these programs. Also, green jobs!
- Educate first.

## Business Case 2 - Affordable Housing Community Improvement Plan

Responses	Total Responses	% Yes	% No
Online Survey	194	75%	25%
Public Engagement Events	34	100%	0%

### Comments/ Feedback Received

- We can't afford to subsidize those that don't want to work.
- If anything, we need more funding towards affordable housing in the city. Should we even consider capping rental rates?
- I'm a homeowner. Those of us who have our own homes should be willing to do our share to help others less fortunate have housing. Raise my taxes.
- More affordable housing, yes!
- There may be other opportunities, such as using a percentage of Community Benefits Charges from new development in the Urban Growth Boundary to fund this CIP.
- I would say that providing more affordable housing will bolster our economy in multiple ways. Giving more people who need a home a safe place to live and making our streets safer in the process. A safer, healthier community.
- Homelessness seems to be a significant issue, if this addresses the issue it seems worthwhile.
- Priority One
- Desperately needed but only if this results in actual homes created.
- Define Affordable houses in \$\$\$\$\$\$. My daughter is looking for a 2 bedroom apartment. She has told me she can't afford any. Landlords rule.
- People, not things should be our priorities over the next couple of years. Housing costs are not going to go down in the foreseeable future...we need to address this issue now.
- I support Affordable Housing but not this poorly designed program. I'm paying 20 % Operations Costs (\$200 K / year) in FTE staffing increases to loan \$1 million per year. The City of London should be BORROWING FOR THE RESERVE FUND at low interest
- A high priority
- long overdue
- I think providing some options for the creation of affordable housing options are important but there needs to be some balance. There are limited funds and citizens are only willing to have taxes increased so much every year.
- Instead of expensive builds, fund subsidies in neighbourhoods across the city. People stay connected, not warehoused.
- After the climate emergency this is the biggest challenge facing London. Please do and spend whatever it takes. I will happily pay more tax.
- There is more than enough affordable units. Having lived in geared to income a few were having their rent reduced and had high paying jobs. Even business owners lived in reduced income
- This is of great importance to our family. Crime and addiction and dwindling hospital beds are all tied into lack of affordable housing.
- There are a lot of incentives given to developers. As a taxpayer I want to make sure that these benefit those looking for affordable housing and not the developers. I agree we need affordable housing but not so that private sector developers profit
- Leave it up to the private sector, make development easier and let the federal government handle housing. The federal government has made a mess of it so they should fix it.
- This should be the city's #1 priority
- One of our highest priorities
- \$772? really? Are these figures in 1,000s? Millions doesn't make sense, but neither does an \$800 request. Is this page missing a note of reference in terms of the currency?
- Need to do MUCH, MUCH more for Affordable Housing.
- In agreement with the initiative and recognize the need for "affordable housing", but do not agree with the administration and implementation of the program.
- Needs to be more
- Ensure Climate Lens is applied to Plan. They work hand in hand.
- New affordable housing units should be built to reflect 'green' building principles and design (e.g., building materials, insulation, energy-efficiency,
- I strongly support this item - with over 30% of renters not in suitable accommodations, I would like to see more dollars devoted to this area.

- This is London's highest priority right now, in my opinion.
- No wonder London has a homeless crisis - This is absolutely ridiculous only .01% (90Cents)of budget is going towards this emergency in our city. The budget for affordable housing should be increased drastically - 10 TIMES =.1% -\$9.- HOUSING FIRST
- Needs to be more private sector as non profits may not have the resources to keep their units in good repair. Non profits will always seek more money and don't seem to operate under the same standards as private
- yes, affordable housing must be a priority.
- Also need to factor in improvements to existing housing units. Some are getting pretty old and run down.
- If it will help with the problem, I have no trouble spending under \$1 a year on it.
- I think we should think outside the box and put some new concepts in place. Which is what we are looking at :)
- How many times are we going to do this before you realize its the same people at City Hall making work..failing...then undoing what they did. Then coming up with a new plan. Wash and repeat. Let developers fix this by taking the shackles off commerce!!
- Without fed and provincial aid, supported housing will fail. You can provide hundreds of affordable units but if the people that are provided the units don' have support for their mental health and addictions, it is doomed to fail. Band aide only.
- Let's put bylaws in place that see all newly built residential areas to include a percentage (30%) of affordable houses. Why should the city pay an incentive, if you want to build in London, these are the guidelines.
- every person needs a decent home; the community as a whole must support it
- Affordable housing should be for couples or families where the adult(s) are working at minimum wage jobs trying to make ends meet to give them a step up. (Censored) that trash units, as we have vividly seen on the news, have no place in these units.
- It is a sad day when a city with the wealth that London boasts has an affordable housing crisis. 5,300 in need of permanent, sustainable housing is an urgent need.
- Why not also charge/have a "penalty fee" for those that don't address affordable housing? Could help offset costs?
- We have too many homeless people in London. Housing first approach works - get it done.
- Yes, especially support non-profit affordable housing projects (not for-profit so much) , and the city should build and manage many more affordable housing projects itself.

<b>Business Case 3 - Back to the River</b>			
<b>Responses</b>	<b>Total Responses</b>	<b>% Yes</b>	<b>% No</b>
<b>Online Survey</b>	196	46%	54%
<b>Public Engagement Events</b>	35	11%	89%

**Comments/ Feedback Received**

- No vanity projects.
- Funds to other necessities.
- Reassign funding already allocated, i.e.: no concrete ribbon.
- Absolute waste of our tax money, concentrate on 'needs' not 'wants.'
- Not a priority. A nice to have but other items take precedent.
- Sorry, we can't afford especially the Forks plan. Few will bother trying to visit it, especially when parking is required. SoHo sounds better.
- This is a frill. We have more pressing needs. Affordable housing!! Free public transit!
- Not in comparison to the needs of housing.
- Support for this project is lacking. There generally seems to be less interest in this park area. Perhaps, more affordable programming (eg winter festival) should be implemented in the park to bring people there first, then an improvement plan to follow.
- Our housing crisis comes before this. No one will want to explore London riverside if they are continually crossing paths with tents, used drugs and half-dressed people—they desperately need our help first.
- As someone who thinks the Springbank dam should have been fixed I cannot support the current back to the river initiative. The ribbon of the Thames seems like an expensive piece of infrastructure with only intangible value that will cost to maintain.
- This is a waste of funding that can be used elsewhere.
- Bring back the Springbank dam so the river is usable.

- Absolutely not, this is just a nice to do and we have many more things we need done to keep the city running. No one needs this eyesore.
- Won't work. What is the romance between London & Thames River? No more projects..its lovely the way it is.
- Waste of money, keep taxes below 1%.
- I would rather eat glass @ a side of fried bugs than support this " investment " - which the London Heritage Advisory Committee voted almost 85 % NO on support level ( I was at the MTG ) . NO one is listening.
- HUGE waste.
- There is already natural beauty with the waterfront. There are more important priorities.
- Get on with it already.
- Don't do anything over the top - basic improvements to the trail and park areas - not look outs and platforms that overwhelm the river.
- Building/developing on a flood plain is silly, and the Forks is fine. Do more for Soho.
- No river so no sense in investing.
- (Censored) no.
- Improving the waterfront is key to having a vibrant downtown.
- No commercial development along Thames.
- The river is smells disgusting in July and August. Why spend money on it. Stop with the pile dreams.
- More serious issues face Londoners then making the river more pretty.
- These budget request blurbs would be better if they included a sentence to discuss the need, and in this case, one sentence to discuss why this is recommended to be skipped.
- London needs stronger relationships with the people that are unable to find a place to live and not projects that aren't directly improving those who need help.
- Very important city building, public square and environmental project
- As year go on we continue to add more and more recreation space and amenities at great costs to create, maintain, and churn over and over to meet never ending expectations, and wants. How about natural / nature based solution. At no cost!
- Waste of time and money
- Definite NO to the Outlook. There is no connection to the natural environment. Too much hardscaping. Do not use any reserve money on this.
- This is not a necessary project. It is spending money on an area which will not show any real benefit to the city. Spend this money to curb our impacts of climate change, increase subsidies for public transit, educating Londoner's on climate change, etc.
- NO especially to the 'Forks' development at this time, unless non-taxpayer funding is found; YES to the elements that are naturalization of the river
- The bridge at the forks in an unnecessary expense! Money could be better spent in other areas. I would support the naturalization of the river in the SoHo area.
- London has nothing iconic to suggest inclusion, diversity, prosperity.....find something for everyone that is postcard worthy. worthy for our
- Major city building initiative at no public cost.
- I love the parks and bike/walking trails along the river, rather than housing/business which only limits access by the majority of Londoners.
- Absolutely not - the LCF can find other ways to fund their personal pet project
- The Forks of the Thames is beautiful as it is - with peaceful gardens and lawns and walking paths.
- "Back to the River" will both unite London and attract tourism revenue. It will remind Londoners of how the sparkling, aqua thread of the Thames River connects London's neighbourhoods, regardless of economic status, nationality or age.
- Who besides the (censored) at the London Community Foundation think this is a priority? A (censored) idea. I don't even have street lights. Do the basics, not these vanity projects.
- This is not something we need. No one is going downtown to stand on a (censored) bridge to nowhere at the Forks. You need to clean-up downtown and get more stores there before anyone would ever do this. This is NOT a priority.
- I don't need a stronger relationship with the Thames river. Other priorities are more important.
- Waste of money, no one is going downtown due to the level of homelessness and unstable people in the area.
- Not a priority let the flex street and core area action plan take root and see where that leads.
- Not a priority at this time.

- Promotes healthier lifestyles which saves money down the road and would indirectly increase property values so is win - win - sin.
- We have long memories of who will vote for this. Our expenses across the board are going up. I get that (censored) wants to bully you guys and go on a power trip. Don't let her. She can keep her campaign donations.
- It is to be remembered that the London Community Foundation is a major supporter in this project. They have set aside 3 million dollars for the Fork of the Thames. Council previously set aside 5 million for this project, plus the 4 million to finish the f.
- A vibrant downtown brings in tourist money for businesses.
- I support cleaning the Thames and not expensive ribbons on which to view a sometimes sad and polluted body of water that could be restored to natural form and allow for the life of creatures presently in danger. It seems hubris to perch over a sad river.
- Stop wasting \$. Leave things as is.
- No i believe that they shouldn't raise taxes because, as I said before, money is the issue in the community and if they raise taxes then that will just make the situation worse and will just put people in a hole in which they cannot climb out of. This will.
- While I support this initiative that will provide environmental support to the river, I do not want to see this at the expense of waste diversion or affordable housing.
- I love this project, dearly. I do. I think it can create great community and get more people outside. I just don't know if it's the best time...and it breaks me to say that.
- Council needs to prioritize and do the must haves like affordable housing, we cannot afford this nice to have. the well is dry.
- Great investment in our City and the health of the River. Do it.
- I think Soho needs the improvements, not the Thames fork section.
- Before we come back to the river we need to clean it up. It smells!
- Do NOT build the walkway to nowhere at the Forks. This concrete boondoggle is bad for the environment, the river, wild creatures and nature-lovers. Do not add any concrete or stone, do not remove trees or green space at the Forks. Use the money elsewhere.
- Definitely NOT
- Definitely not....stop the madness on this one.
- How can it be a tourist attraction when the river is (censored)!!! Get the dam working again and only at that time will there be a tourist attraction.

<b>Business Case 4A - City of London Infrastructure Gap - Part A</b>			
<b>Responses</b>	<b>Total Responses</b>	<b>% Yes</b>	<b>% No</b>
<b>Online Survey</b>	171	62%	38%
<b>Public Engagement Events</b>	35	91%	9%
<b>Comments/ Feedback Received</b>			

- Reduce.
- Cut costs elsewhere to pay for this. Do not give Police Services more than 1.5%
- A priority. We've already stopped the ball on infrastructure and ease of getting around this city. All our major roads should have been widened long ago.... and the fact that infrastructure isn't part of planning prior to development is an embarrassment.
- I don't understand the language you use: eg "infrastructure gap" so I can't judge this. You should offer a third choice so that one doesn't have to accept blindly or reject what may be a good idea.
- For roads not bike lanes that a handful of people use outside the core. Time to licence bike riders we license dogs don't we.
- However, I only support road works for protected bike lanes and public transit improvements.
- And committing to the in and up philosophy rather than developing more currently untouched areas.
- Yes and no, I think that a city should not operate based on debt financing and should close an existing gap in infrastructure funding; however, I think that any construction project should be compared against future maintenance cost before allowing sprawl.
- City finances are NOT planned well. List the services you plan to cut or increase. Let me have a say.
- Part A supportive but not Part B as way to aggressive in tax ramp up.
- Climate change should make this mandatory.
- Should cut back libraries to 5 only - Whiteoaks, Bostwick, Central, Argyle & Stoneycreek. Libraries are a dying business model. Management is fudging their numbers they are on decline.

- Civic governments need to learn to budget in a way that doesn't assume the prov govt will have the same priorities. Better to learn to be more cautious with budget planning and allowing for reserve funds at all times.
- All road widenings must be eliminated. After that the focus must be on projects that reduce carbon emissions not those that induce demand for car travel. Also more sewage treatment capacity is needed.
- Roads are being re-paved needlessly, intersections altered needlessly. Roads crosswalks marked then dug up weeks later. Too much waste and too many workers not doing job correct.
- Thanks (censored) :(
- Cut services to keep taxes down.
- It very much depends on how it is done. Preference is for resources to go towards protected bike lanes and improved transit, not road widening. Particularly concerned about proposal to widen Wonderland Rd.
- The most expensive road expansions should be put on hold.
- Reduce services as required to keep the budget to inflation with is 1.9% not 2.7%. What has happened to all the new tax money from growth. Azure building alone is over \$1 million with no extra costs for the city.
- Priority #2 after all other housing initiatives.
- In one of the documents, we see a proposed investment this year in ~\$900M for lifecycle, ~\$1.2B for expansion and roughly \$200M for service upgrades. I'm concerned about the forward cost of expansion. Please provide a model of impact on future taxpayers.
- Want to see wages for City employees limited to a 1.0% increase.
- Yes and No. Yes if we plan, develop, and maintain functional and basic infrastructure to meet the needs only.
- Scale back Road Widening project is base budget. Stop adding more roadways to infrastructure. Follow the strategic plan.
- No to road widening EXCEPT where it is required for public transit and active transportation. Yes to separation of storm and sanitary sewers.
- NO to road-widening projects that only promote more private vehicle use, and do not reflect improvement of public transit and active transportation (cycle/walk); YES to continues waste water management that separates stage and surface water streams.
- Fully support this!
- Roads are in terrible shape, we need to fix them up.
- This is needed long term. Better to spend now than to spend more later.
- We need better public transit and a city that is safe for pedestrians.
- If this includes road widening, that should not be part of "projected growth", no road widening project has ever made anything other than a minor, short-term improvement in congestion. It doesn't work, there are other ways to move people.
- We can't get further behind on the infrastructure.
- Infrastructure repair, replacement and maintenance is why we pay taxes - use what you have - cut back other, not needed costs.
- Yes, for us middle waged taxpayers, we need infrastructure to get to work & since we need our roadways to get to work to pay for taxes to the (censored) who abuse services, we need infrastructure as a priority! The (censored) are sucking our taxes.
- I support this provided a there is a major initiative to make environmentally acceptable cycling a priority along with pedestrian modes of transportation are accessible to all Londoners, including those with disabilities and the elderly.
- Would like to see more focus on pedestrians, carpooling, transit and bikes though. If transit and/or cycling was better supported by the City, I would stop using my car.
- Agree with investment for roads and bridges, but not nice to have items like further investment in bicycle infrastructure.
- Provided this infrastructure is not to support more sprawl or road widenings I support it. Priority on sewer separation to reduce overflows polluting the Thames.
- Free parking at London's hospitals and downtown is absolutely something to work towards.
- Invest in infrastructure especially what is needed for adaptation to climate change.
- Needs better respect of the job.

## Business Case 5A - Climate Emergency Declaration - Develop Action Plan

Responses	Total Responses	% Yes	% No
Online Survey	195	66%	34%
Public Engagement Events	34	62%	38%

### Comments/ Feedback Received

- Reduce. Manage costs tightly.
- Total waste of money.
- A priority. When it comes to the environment!
- You remember y2k don't you? It's a scam.
- This should be an ongoing initiative (best standards) without council needing to declare a climate emergency action plan.
- You can't spend too much money on climate emergency plans, as far as I'm concerned. We need to be sustainable, yesterday!
- Please!
- We have enough expertise within City. I am opposed to spending on a consultant when I have confidence we could do this as an operating project. Absolutely necessary to do for all Boards and Commissions but we know our City-a consultant might not.
- Perhaps, making current or upcoming public projects more green is the first step instead of a grandiose strategy, which may be overturned by this or the next council.
- Shouldn't have to be a "made in London" strategy. Seems pretty straightforward to follow the blueprints of cities like Vancouver, build less roads, buy ev busses, change the building standard to require higher levels of insulation than currently required.
- There is no climate emergency.
- Council has already decided that there is NO climate emergency based on their decision not to build a light rail system and again when they decided to only build 2 legs of BRT. This is the only project that could significantly improve our GHG emissions.
- Climate emergency??? LOL. Our air is coming from the USA manufacturing. WE have NO manufacturing in London.
- The City has zero business being in this business. As a taxpayer I have seen the aggressive stance other cities like Vancouver is taking and I do not want to live in a nanny state.
- Should be provincially/federally funded.
- Without a plan, the words are meaningless.
- Focus on the housing, homelessness and drug epidemics first.
- Not a priority at all. Given Canada provides a fraction of the GHG emissions of many other countries, this is not and should not be a priority in the top 10. London has far more important things to worry about.
- Most important.
- To reduce the footprint you need to reduce services and programs that are not essential. Sell public golf courses. Focus on key essential programs not fluff.
- Surely there are talented, knowledgeable and skilled enough City staff who can create this plan without retaining a consultant.
- Use as much in-house and citizen input as possible. Do not spend on consultation unless there will be a follow through.
- Maybe the City could stop clear-cutting trees just to have a vacant lot.
- No more road widening. Cancel ones planned and stop launching EAs for this predetermined outcome. No more road widening please.
- Farce, shut AC off at city hall. No parking for city staff, all bud to work. Stop city trucks with one person and empty driving around.
- Canada/London cannot change the temperature of the planet. Period. If you actually understand the science you HAVE TO admit this. Otherwise it's fake virtue signaling and pandering to those who have adopted this as a religion. How dare you.
- Climate change is an emergency but this should be provincial and federal initiatives.
- This is a Federal Issue.
- Stop hiring consultants and create in house positions - the best minds and doers come from the front line staffers - invest in staff education!
- Focus should be on The Core.
- This is just political (censored). Tell the politicians to ride their bikes. (Censored). Reduce (censored) carbon footprint. Change city hall cafeteria to VEGAN, Ban take out containers on city property. Then once.

- Not sure what we expect to get from consultants on this, but surfacing relevant action items should be a priority.
- The biggest area for growth is in reduction of greenhouse gas emissions from vehicle transportation. Car taxes, gas taxes and expansion of transit services needed.
- Looking forward to seeing more on this!
- This action plan to ensure growth is environmentally sustainable is of highest importance on this list of business cases in my mind.
- This should be a priority and the any decisions regarding public transit should be based on environmental impact.
- This is huge! Get on this. We need action!!
- Yes!
- Absolutely support this, but, there should not be two parts to this plan. Planning without implementation means nothing.
- Thanks for taking this on.
- CRUCIAL.
- Of extreme importance!!! Especially expansion of the city into farmland. People will always have to eat, and building on the land that grows our food shows very limited foresight!
- The Climate Change Emergency is the #1 issue we have to face. I expect London to be a leader in confronting the Climate Change Emergency and I expect all projects and other priorities to be reviewed and fitted into the Climate Change Emergency plans.
- This needs to be one of the city's top priorities. Focus on reducing emissions, eliminating food waste.
- Waste of money and effort. Climate change has happened and is happening. We can only adapt and armor our infrastructure to handle the changes in weather.
- The city has grown but the transit system hasn't kept up. Instead, this city has remained driver-focused. Not only is this bad for the environment, it's unsafe for pedestrians and inefficient for everyone.
- I don't think we need a consultant for this. There are a huge array of things that we know should be done. Let's start with that.
- Should have been done already, you declared the emergency in April 2019 I think.
- Allow direct funding of projects by Londoners instead - not another consultant.
- Yes, support doing this as things need replaced during their normal live cycle. Good example is that the rapid transit uses are purchased and the replacement buses should be electric. New construction should also include green solutions.
- Please for the love of (censored)..hire a consultant for this. City Staff will come back with a laundry list of nonsense they got from Twitter that they think will help because (censored) heard it on Facebook. Then we'll go broke putting them in place.
- Ban single use plastic in London including plastic water bottle sales. People will adjust. Out a fork in your pocket/jacket purse.
- Declaring a climate emergency and then spending money to widen roads is irresponsible. If we are a city that has made this declaration, maybe money would be better spent on public transit and biking infrastructure.
- A plan hopefully includes doing all we can to offset climate change in our own jurisdiction.
- City's own staff shouldn't be doing this work.
- Stop the drama. Encourage concrete, simple measures of recycling, respect for the environment. Disgusting to see how dirty our city is with waste! I see people litter, sit in their cars idling...
- If we don't act now, we won't have a future City for our kids/grandkids etc to live and thrive in. This should be top priority, as it takes a heavy investment now to see the impacts long-term.
- Agree we need to develop this action plan, however, its needs to be done over many years so that the economical impact to the overall budget is just slightly above inflation.
- Action on climate is needed to address the defining issue of our time. Council declared an emergency let's act on it!
- According to statistics Canada London has an increasing cancer rate, the other cities have decreased their cancer rates, our air is dirty our river is contaminated. Our health is at risk.
- Urgently needed.
- The only priority is to stop the dumping of human waste into the Thames - this must be a priority.

**Business Case 6 - Coordinated Informed Response**

Responses	Total Responses	% Yes	% No
Online Survey	172	59%	41%
Public Engagement Events	28	85%	15%

**Comments/ Feedback Received**

- Costs too high, rein in costs.
- Too much of our tax money is being spent on those that are (censored), don't want to work and rely on social agencies to support them. How about using some the dollars on servicing those that actually pay taxes?
- A priority! Let's get these people off the streets and into housing & supports. Who want to go to a redeveloped downtown with all the (censored) lying around???
- This sounds like another example of split responsibilities for issues such as homelessness. Is there duplication of efforts?
- AS long as there is no criminalization of people sleeping rough, No police involvement.
- I support this, except the implementation plan is lacking.
- Massively important! Please proceed.
- Expensive, but worthwhile initiative to reduce homelessness within the city.
- No one should be homeless in London. This can be achieved by implementing a vacancy tax on homes that are not occupied over 50% of the time.
- Vital.
- You never tell us HOW they became homeless. Your response above is typical political evasiveness.
- Coordinated informed response..means??? Homeless people are for a reason homeless..but you never find out why! The bigger and more complicated London because, the more homeless will be. You get FREE money from OLG & other sources..but you fail to use it.
- To rich in staff and aggressive on hit to tax payers. Sense an 40 % cost for 80 % solution is a great middle ground to start on . We can't save them all people.
- Priority for me.
- Although the province should be paying for this as it is a mental health issue.
- I would love to see programs who help homeless and in some way to give them chance to get off feet, time limit though so that they don't take advantage of it, rather a 1-year mercy period to improve their life, because some just don't want to change.
- I believe the City should invest in additional shelters which are clean and safe.
- Please build more affordable housing and fund groups like Indwell who are succeeding at this.
- Help people. Stop trying to change the temperature of the planet. You can't and should be embarrassed to even try.
- This would depend on a guaranteed income from prov/fed.
- Give the ability for social action groups to handle this. Funded by charitable donations. Get rid of the red tape and step aside. Government does not know how to fix this.
- Quadruple this funding amount. It is a disgrace to see anyone "living" on the street.
- No idea how \$2,234/year can help move a homeless person into housing. So much more should be allocated for this.
- High priority
- But what does this money do?
- Absolutely NO. Funds wasted on such do not produce results, but instead encourage more to follow the pack, and there is no exit strategy to get the persons or families off the gravy train.
- This is important and very worthwhile.
- We have London cares, Unity house, Center of hope and I'm sure many other programs to help people who find themselves living rough. The housing first policy is helping to increase the cost of damaged social housing stock.
- Everyone complains about these encampments, so I'm fully in favor of doing something about it.
- This funding should go to NGO's that are much more efficient and nimble in providing care and support. Layers of government bureaucracy lead to low levels of people actually helped.
- This is key to any downtown revitalization
- Let's make this happen!
- This benefits us all by making the city more livable and safer and has long term impact

of reducing social service needs.

- Again...city staff is bad at this. This is proven over and over. Hire outside people who can be fired if they don't deliver results. Staff will just come up with work for themselves, then blame "lack of resources" when they fall on their face.
- Band Aide. What are the feds and province bucking-up? This is a health issue. Not for homeowner tax base to fund.
- Yes, if the individuals are being held accountable and monthly inspections are being done on the units.
- Stop the drama! These individuals know nothing about poverty, neither do academics, loud mouths pleading their case. My ancestors ate grass for food when they were starving, bathed babies & children in cattle water troughs! Came to Canada, worked hard!!!!
- This should be a Provincial initiative, I can only afford a tax increase slightly above inflation.
- Londoners need to be more compassionate and help the most vulnerable on our streets. Please do everything you can.
- We need addictions treatment facilities and mental health hospitals and safe institutions for these persons. Housing alone is not the answer. I work in this field.
- How does one balance looking after those here and the influx of others once the word is out that London is the place to come. Where does the need end and does the line we draw change anything?

**Business Case 7A - Core Area Action Plan - Part A**

Responses	Total Responses	% Yes	% No
Online Survey	180	55%	45%
Public Engagement Events	34	71%	29%

**Comments/ Feedback Received**

- Reduce.
- A priority. Let's clean up the downtown and solve some of the issues rather than just put lipstick on the area.
- I support the homelessness proposal, but spending to attract retailers is hopeless. Taxpayers should not be subsidizing the business aspect of downtown.
- Everything you have done so far has attracted the wrong types to the core time to stop.
- This seems like gentrification meant to criminalize poor people. I only support this if it has a social justice framework and no police involvement.
- Yes to all of this - homelessness and health issues, safety and security, creating a positive business environment!
- Again, the implementation of CAAP is supportable in theory, but I still have not seen a detailed action plan to get behind.
- The best way to look at this around to the goal of helping the homeless rather than how to remove them to enhance the shopping experience within downtown. This problem won't have a lasting solution if homeless are preyed upon as a bug to exterminate.
- Safety and security should be a priority as there are areas of the core that do feel unsafe. Addressing the vacancy rate of buildings by taxing landlords may help to fill buildings and create a draw to the core.
- Sounds like a good idea, but it's just not looking at improving outcomes for homeless individuals. There are better ways than to invest in businesses.
- Another waste of money.
- For \$25K..Why is the city encouraging drug use.
- You have lumped a lot of things into this action plan...some I agree with some not. You have spent a lot of money on the flex street...lets focus on the homelessness and health issues now.
- Expense but Part A makes sense. TO PAY FOR THIS PEAK INCREASE IN TAXES @ PROVINCIAL DOWNLOADING \_ Move the Green Bins Recycling program out to start in 2022.
- need provincially/federal funding
- The core already gets so much of our spending and for what? People will come if the private sector offers goods and services people want or need.
- This should be a priority but civic govt has to recognize that everything can't be free for everyone. Also, if you want to attract people to the core, you can't keep taking away parking and treating people who drive vehicles as though they are criminals.
- Downtown is a nightmare and it breaks my heart.

- Too much has already been spent on the core.
- Please find more affordable housing, pay your staff a living wage.
- Councillors are afraid of developers. Stop parking lot renewal, stop tax breaks. Make bylaw that all buildings must have old facade on first three floors. Flex street disjointed not true flex street.
- Get free parking in the core. More people with money to spend will change the core not the government.
- Again, yes, but one sentence naming specific initiatives would invite a more intelligent response.
- London has many centers of commerce, and services which act as a nucleus for the surrounding area. What in the (censored) makes downtown so special? The north end like other areas in London provide satellite centers for commerce, and services supported by area.
- Developers should be required to invest in downtown housing projects before further land on the outskirts of the city is allowed to be developed and certainly agricultural land should not be destroyed for housing.
- Is there overlap in these projects?
- The city needs to enforce police presence in the code to ensure citizens can all enjoy the new Dundas place and encourage investment downtown.
- So much can be accomplished if we can regulate what (censored) does with his buildings. Downtown has so much potential yet we sit on the sideline like good little school children too afraid to upset him. Let's go London.
- No initiative is going to help someone who doesn't want to be helped, safety and security will never be achieved when we have a hands off approach to drug addiction.
- This makes sense if we want to clean-up downtown.
- I vote yes as long as this includes City Hall remaining where it is. It is an important part of our core and a guardian for Victoria Park. Developers would hobble that land up and create some horrible structure that only the elite can afford to live in.
- Downtown London is a disaster. Would never take my family downtown due to the risk.
- This is important to give downtown revitalization a chance.
- The central library should receive funding under this program as it houses many of the.
- Compel (censored) to rent some of his properties out.
- The core needs to be livable and safe to attract people to live there. This in turn will support intensification which will save money down the road.
- More money for "honest conversations" at the Convention Centre. We have this in the budget. Its call "the police". I get they aren't trained in dealing with these people's problems so bump up their budget or the Health Unit for Mental Health pros.
- Even when people can be attracted to the core of the downtown, the core lacks parking options to be able to accommodate the crowds. This can be mitigated by better public transit, but most people I've interacted with across the city, will never use public.
- Clean up downtown! Drug abuse is wrong! Treatment is rehab! You refuse it, a consequence is death! No waste of money for Naloxone. If a cancer patient refuses treatment, a possible consequence is death! Why are you enabling illegal behaviour?
- Livable city core is a safe city core.
- I need more information on this. I love the core and already spend time down there --- is it more an awareness/marketing piece?
- Yes to addressing homelessness and health issues, but I don't ever see people being attracted to the downtown core.
- Our downtown is on life support. Let's bring people back to the core. Let's help those living on our streets by finding them homes.
- Free parking is absolutely necessary. Parking is why many people don't go downtown.
- The Homeless and the mentally ill need a place to live well and for those that can be helped with medication and stability, we might find the clusters less volatile.
- Stop forcing the core on the rest of Londoners.....I will never go downtown.
- Fund outer areas
- Outer areas.
- Make is welcoming and affordable.

### Business Case 8 - Dearness Home Auditorium Expansion

Responses	Total Responses	% Yes	% No
Online Survey	174	30%	70%
Public Engagement Events	32	25%	75%

### Comments/ Feedback Received

- Do not build a Taj Mahal.
- Frill we can't afford.
- A priority. Least we can do for our seniors.
- Yes, but not at the expense of providing better care to residents.
- Sell it or redevelop into a money maker the dearness home can be rebuilt anywhere doesn't need to be on prime real estate.
- Not in comparison to homelessness, housing and climate change.
- Likely better investments needed for this facility than the auditorium.
- Put off to future years. I would rather spend money on improving care..
- Get their own fundraising.
- Get private funding.
- There will be greater demand as our population is living longer...so yes.
- Better to spend on other capital needs that are care related.
- I realize people want this to be a friendly city and build community but it we are not attracting new investment, new businesses, focusing on creating new jobs and an environment where people can have a small business, all the friendliness won't matter.
- 1000's of affordable housing units could be built on the Dearness property. Get shovels in the ground and get homeless people off our streets please.
- I feel there is not need to do this project.
- I thought we has the flex street for this??? Lot of other options. Centennial Hall, Wolf Theater, Grand Theater. We have community veterans. Bostwick, just spend fortune on it.
- What is the demand for events of this scale at this home? What is the existing infrastructure and why is it inadequate? I'm hard-pressed to name private retirement centers or nursing homes with auditoriums.
- Other LTC Homes do not benefit from the ability to levy municipal taxpayers. Expansions should be funded out of Dearness' own reserves.
- Big cost for such a small nucleus of those who will benefit. Look for investment from within or reach out to groups or others as donors. To facilitate if really needed. Want or Need?
- Ensure energy efficiency well exceeds any current standards. We need to reach Net Zero emissions.
- Here's a suggestion: close the Dearness Home, redirect that money to a few other initiatives.
- Don't we want people aging in place? We don't need a bigger auditorium at the seniors home, we need more support for seniors to stay in their homes.
- The grey wave is coming- or already here- and active planning needs to happen to prevent a crisis.
- I don't know enough about this to weight in.
- Quality of life for an aging population matters.
- If this can be done at a reasonable price.
- Should be self-funded or sponsored via fundraising.
- Stuff like this is for Boom Times. We're going into a downturn or maybe a full on recession. Nobody has the money for this!! Backlog this for 2025.
- Find the money from the residents of Dearness. I'm surprised the building has is still operational given the lack of attention to residents from staff.
- This cost should come from the Home's own budget.
- Excellent to support more adult day care spaces.
- While this is a worthy idea, I believe that to small a group of people will benefit if the needs of the larger community are not met.
- Love this, but not in terms of priority. Could this be a Neighbourhood project?
- The dearness lands need more affordable housing on them. Why is all that land mowed and sitting empty. Build apartments on it for affordable housing. At the very least stop mowing it all.

## Business Case 9 - Fanshawe College Innovation Village

Responses	Total Responses	% Yes	% No
Online Survey	183	32%	68%
Public Engagement Events	36	25%	75%

### Comments/ Feedback Received

- Absolutely not!
- Not a priority. Let Fanshawe appeal for funding on their own to other levels of government.
- This is an example of something that is not the responsibility to homeowners to support. They already do so through provincial taxes.
- Hard no.
- Not in comparison to ensuring basic needs of Londoners.
- I believe the biggest issue London has with "Innovation" is a fragmented system between Fanshawe, Western, LEDC etc. I do not support paying for Fanshawe to build a building that will further this fragmentation. Waterloo is a one stop shop, seems to work
- They have other sources of funding (Provincial, revenue generation and donations) and the City has given them more than enough money over the years.
- No money to Fanshawe! They have wealthy students who pay the bills. Why are YOU supported a school, who's majority of students are wealthy.
- Get private funding.
- WE spend \$40 Million on Fanshawe 5 years ago for the downtown campus - that's enough. Fanshawe is internally well financed to cover this investment and has surplus property in the Cuddy RD area to sell to finance.
- Fanshawe should pay for its own building with all the tuition and fees they collect.
- Enough already. This should be provincially funded.
- There are already a bunch of these types of projects/incubators. Why not make the ones we already have more cohesive and have them work together to find where gaps can be filled instead of spending way more money on another one.
- don't put more taxpayer money into colleges or universities - they should fund themselves and not expand facilities that nobody can afford to maintain
- Build it to Passive building standards or don't bother. Be innovative - we are in a climate emergency walk the talk please.
- Provided building is built to passive building standards sure. Innovation centres need to walk the talk on carbon emissions.
- Colleges make enough money from students. I don't want my tax dollars going here!
- Colleges and Training is the Provincial Government's responsibility.
- Again, but what will it do? Someone who wrote this seems to think that the sentence "includes the i4Chub..." is sufficient explanation. But not for this kind of general input forum.
- Colleges have many funding sources, use them.
- Fanshawe College is a significant innovator and will continue to contribute to the city's innovation image.
- Only because it does not impact the levy- too often a city helps an institution get a project like this off the ground only for it to languish in the future with changing priorities and lack of funding.
- No measurable impact to the improvement of line in London as a whole.
- Fanshawe got enough money from Matt Brown for Kingsmills, NO MORE
- \$10 million for Kingsmills and now they want another \$3 million, NO!
- No.
- The \$10 million Kingsmill investment was more than generous but post-secondary needs are not a municipal responsibility
- Should be located in the core.
- This is sooooo small it's an obvious kick back. Try harder!!
- Fanshawe is sitting on almost has a billion dollars. They can pay for it.
- Fanshawe will find the money for this anyways. If approved, Western University will be holding their hands out for something
- Fanshawe's issue not city's.
- Why should city taxpayer dollars pay for Fanshawe's construction? No!
- Those who cannot remember the past are condemned to repeat it. Santayana
- With zero impact financially, why not? Leveraging is important!
- Provided this is a net zero passive building this makes sense. If it emits carbon to

- maintain it then no.
- Nice to have, can't afford.
- Can fund themselves.

<b>Business Case 10A - HDC Funding for Affordable Housing Part A</b>			
<b>Responses</b>	<b>Total Responses</b>	<b>% Yes</b>	<b>% No</b>
<b>Online Survey</b>	171	59%	41%
<b>Public Engagement Events</b>	30	94%	6%

**Comments/ Feedback Received**

- Reduce.
- We can't afford it
- A priority. Housing is a right for all.
- Way more affordable housing is needed in London, do it!
- Don't understand the benefit if it's not showing an expected result of increased stock.
- Apparently, this program has not been meeting basic expectations.
- Not until there is proof that the HDC is improving outcomes.
- Affordable units..aka apartments. I refuse my tax money, which I work hard to provide YOU with, being spent to house others.
- HDC is the best business delivery model to deliver Affordable Housing that I can see , especially when combined with other incentive programs
- About time.
- Yes, but after the LMHC fiasco, there better be tangible results provided from HDC every year to make the case they are more efficient and cost effective than LMHC.
- After the climate emergency this is job 1 for council. Fund it all and get folks off our streets.
- Get rid of red tape and let the developers build to solve the housing problem. The city can't do it efficiently.
- This amount should be greatly increased.
- Is this for administrative overhead?
- Needs to be more.
- Ensure housing is energy efficient. Continue to pursue opportunities where affordable housing is inter-mixed with other housing.
- With the housing crisis the city has, this item is very much needed.
- Yes please! This city is becoming impossible to live in.
- Not sure.
- I hate to see clumps of disadvantaged people living in their own secluded and often unhealthy communities. I would like to see the city subsidize individuals who are in need but do so with existing units (not government housing) throughout the city.
- See previous housing issues questions.
- The deliberate destruction of low-income housing units by (censored) on Grey St, shown on local news station, shows horrific human waste sanitation problems, disrespect of property, while inappropriately condoned by (censored)/others like him!
- Absolutely! Maintain service levels...
- Not sure I fully understand (layman's terms?). Low cost, though, in the grand scheme and it still goes back to housing so sure.
- Yes this is vital to London's future to help our most vulnerable.
- Take control of what is available.

<b>Business Case 11A - Information Systems - Development Application Tracking Software</b>			
<b>Responses</b>	<b>Total Responses</b>	<b>% Yes</b>	<b>% No</b>
<b>Online Survey</b>	173	49%	51%
<b>Public Engagement Events</b>	29	55%	45%

**Comments/ Feedback Received**

- A nice to have but not a priority.
- The only caveat would be if we're not within legislative requirements and the, reluctantly, yes.
- This should have been done 10 years ago. Will generally improve monitoring and processing of workloads and will hopefully have a return on investment.

- Surely there is a cheaper option.
- What is LEGISLATIVE requirements. Your staff never provide consistent & higher level of service.
- Yes...but make sure it is right. Not like the federal gov't Phoenix pay system or the provincial social services database that has to have info "fudged in it" in order to issue correct monthly cheques to clients.
- Please add strong business metrics attached to funding please (Like targeted staff hiring avoidance in the future by implementing this) . I don't see a business case ROI and that would strengthen this initiative
- Is it really necessary?
- Development must fund development - if that is who pays for this then sure.
- Our company recently switched to SAP software and it created a 5-year glitch and PR nightmare for (censored).
- Sounds like more red tape, reduce the red tape. Make site employees accountable. Fire the ones that can't do their job.
- What system does the office have in place? Why now? Software is a very useful tool, but systems quickly become money-sinks.
- Yes to automation.
- I really doubt the plan has been totally vetted, and that the plan moving forward is the most efficient, and its benefits are worth the investment. The inefficiencies of the departments, processes, and management currently do not provide the confidence.
- This will also support the ability to track environmental impacts and speed up service.
- Not sure.
- Only if the staff savings pay this back within 5 years.
- But charge costs back to the developers.
- time to slash redundant city positions & do more with less, like the rest of the workers in the private sector have to do; stop enabling inappropriate, whiny sick time and start effective attendance management strategies.
- We need to keep the tax increase to just slightly above inflation. I am a senior and my CCP and OAS does not cover all these incentives.
- Provided all developments are also run through the climate emergency screening tool as part of the process to help council make informed decisions then sure.

<b>Business Case 11B - Information Systems - Human Capital Management System</b>			
<b>Responses</b>	<b>Total Responses</b>	<b>% Yes</b>	<b>% No</b>
<b>Online Survey</b>	168	36%	64%
<b>Public Engagement Events</b>	30	53%	47%
<b>Comments/ Feedback Received</b>			

- Not at this time.
- A nice to have but not a priority.
- But I'm skeptical of the likely success of this project. So often the promise is not met.
- You can stop using paper with the current system.
- I wish the City, as a public entity, did not use the; language of for-profit businesses.
- I'd need a better set of examples to understand the benefit when other priorities are so much clearer.
- Should have been done 10 years ago.
- Again, there must be a cheaper solution.
- Pure (censored)..you hired (censored), but never do anything except to tell me how great & wonderful City hall is.
- Holistic & corporates? LOL What is HR related functions. They hire & fire people. Hire people good for the job, not because they are (censored).
- Have not seen the justification for this. what is the problem you are trying to solve?
- Why does city hall HR not do Police??
- Security is vital. Ensuring each staff member only has access to the areas they need to access.
- HR works for city not workers.
- If my employer had spoken to other businesses who were using the new software, rather than the exceptional marketing team promising all the same things as in the above description, it would have saved us millions.
- Let's support our planet by reducing paper. Let's reduce unnecessary staff time by

building and integrated HRIS system. Let's support our Smart City initiatives.

- This is completely necessary for the City to modernize it's processes.
- This is a "must have" in order to carry on business.
- Integrating systems is a lofty goal. Consider this a provisional Yes (because of it's breadth of use) and see my other comment about the money-sink corporate systems quickly become.
- City Hall should be able to implement this within current funding - what is the current annual spend, and anticipated savings or reduction in FTE as a result of this investment?
- Can't believe a corporation this size doesn't already have this technology! How do you do without it??
- Seems like as long as HR has it, that should be enough.
- IM projects rarely accomplish what was proposed and are always over budget.
- Not sure.
- Only if funds are recovered through staff savings within 5 years.
- Is HR involved? Hard pass. HR is good for making more work for HR. If anything, you'll have more paperwork to track the reduction in paperwork.
- If this eliminates the non-productive employees, and redundant positions at the City of London, I am all for this. However, the union may disagree.
- Effectiveness of employee management, productive employees is essential. This also needs to be directed to the police force. So irritating to do errands and see 4 to 5 officers sitting in their usual spots chatting, hiding -avoiding the streets to do work.
- I understand the benefit to reducing paper-based processes and how those gained efficiencies can be impactful long-term.
- Can't afford.

<b>Business Case 12 - LMCH Infrastructure Gap</b>			
<b>Responses</b>	<b>Total Responses</b>	<b>% Yes</b>	<b>% No</b>
<b>Online Survey</b>	173	58%	42%
<b>Public Engagement Events</b>	32	94%	6%
<b>Comments/ Feedback Received</b>			

- Too much tax money being spent on those that don't pay taxes. Tell them to get a job please.
- A priority. All items related to housing should be a priority
- Have to maintain existing stock.
- But only as long as this is tracked well and it results in more units being available.
- WRITE proper English. I have no idea what you wrote, except for the amount of money I have to give you.
- Maybe look at donations of goods from building suppliers and organize volunteers to help do some of the work...kind of like Habitat or Humanity.
- LMCH is a money pit - they will never have enough funding until we change the business delivery model to a private sector model. THIS IS NOT THE FUTURE MODEL of affordable housing.
- Been ignored for far too long more important than back to the river!
- We do need to commit some funds to this project. However, in the 1980's Parliament passed a bill that stated homelessness would be solved by 2000. We can help, but reality is life isn't always fair and everything is not equal and never will be.
- Fund more ... why should the poor be stuck in unhealthy housing?
- After the climate emergency - housing the homeless is job one for Council.
- (Censored).
- Tender it to a private company that can manage it competently.
- Amount should be greatly increased.
- Yes, but how will such gaps be anticipated and funded going forward (Verses stopgap requests)?
- Save the housing we already have before we lose it
- Make sure we think long-term affordability. Do not build sub-standard housing. Make it energy efficient and a joy to live in.
- "GREEN" PRINCIPLES NEED TO BE USED IN IMPLEMENTATION.
- Provided the revitalization is done using green design and materials. This long term thinking may not be the most economical, but certainly the best way to upgrade the housing.

- In theory I support this, however please address the management of the sites so that future tenants do not undo the work and cost yet more money.
- We also need to start looking at ways to transition people out of social housing, it should not always be about building more, we need to start building up the people.
- High priority. Providing decent affordable housing for families with children removes concerns about how to put a roof over their heads and focus on education, mental health etc. Other determinants of health.
- Just so we're clear. City staff (censored) this up. We're getting a firm to assess. That assessment will then go back to people who screwed it up the first time? If you use the money saved by the people fired for this...then I'm all for it.
- We already have a lot of money on existing housing.
- This should never have been an issue if the people using this service were ever held accountable.
- why have LMCH not been looking after their properties better over the past decades and only now find a huge deficit - sounds like someone has not been doing their jobs!
- Revitalization of LMCH must include concrete floors, shatter proof industrial windows, industrial strength fixtures...since they will endure horrible abuse but tenants with issues that seem to be permitted to live in & abuse the units!!! Unacceptable!
- Yes, but at a slower rate. The well is dry.
- Take control of what is available.

#### Business Case 13 - Master Accomodation Plan

Responses	Total Responses	% Yes	% No
Online Survey	168	35%	65%
Public Engagement Events	35	43%	57%

#### Comments/ Feedback Received

- No new City Hall.
- A nice to have but not a priority
- But we seem to be forever talking about this and never resolving it.
- But maybe spread it out a bit more - first step is to secure a property - that should have been the MLHU building/Court House - put some of that Back to the River funds towards buying the site - that would ensure we consider the river as important.
- For the size of London, you NEED more locations! With FREE parking. Investment required is mentioned in many of these so called surveys..means????
- I see nothing to support here - no business case (ROI etc) . Other Cities are moving towards a public - private partnership in their City Hall and City Business hubs build outs. The City of LDN is way to CAPITAL focused - like a farmer!
- For 30 years I worked in health care, there is no need for “new bricks and mortar structures” , employees etc. at City could work remotely from their home environment with available technology now a days . Every person working for the city has a “home”
- Study first. Commit later.
- No. We need to attract investment, new companies, create jobs, and allow people to focus on their individual financial priorities. If we keep focusing on everything else, we will never establish a healthy and vibrant economy.
- Right size current space and utilize funds for other priorities.
- Don't waste taxpayers money on a new city hall. You need to reduce the number of staff and if that means cutting programs then do it. We have the highest property taxes and should be much less than Toronto and Kitchener!
- The current City Hall has been in use for well over 30 years. There are homes and buildings in London older than that! There are people living on the streets and living in poverty. Let's deal with the housing crisis London is facing first!
- Do NOT build a new City Hall. I repeat, do NOT build a new City Hall.
- Only to do the study. Not the implementation or decision on a new City Hall
- Maybe consider shrinking the size of Municipal Government???
- Cut city staff until they fit into city hall. Problem solved.
- If anything reductions in staff and therefore office space should be implemented.
- Why not tear down Centennial Hall and build an architecturally significant City Hall combined with a Performing Arts Centre? Reykjavik, smaller than London, has a state of the art performing arts centre called the Harpa Centre that is acoustically great..
- Tear down Centennial Hall and using this space plus Reg Cooper Square build a new City Hall/Performing Arts Centre combo. Hold a competition for an architecturally, attractive and functional building, that will bring people to the city to use and admire.

- Tear down Centennial Hall and Build New City Hall with performing Arts Centre combined.
- Every one emails now even if they are ten feet away. Move to the cheaper locations. Being in one spot does not matter.
- Agreed, this work needs to be done, but finding internal resources to cut a first-draft would be preferable to hiring consultants.
- Requesting/projecting \$137M for city hall replacement without enough detail to make any determination. Cost comparisons between three options aren't included and projected costs are significantly higher than similar projects taken on by municipalities.
- Given budget constraints, I can spending money in a more reasonable way.
- This might not be popular, but it's time. we need to stop renting from (censored) and have our own building big enough to hold everyone
- NO! In today's electronic age, it is no longer required that staff work under the same roof. Explore creative options for renovating and modernizing the current spaces, allow staff to work from home, use libraries and community spaces for meetings.
- Not sure.
- Not at this time
- Should spend half the amount and start by going after items that would create savings to fund the other half.
- NO! NO! NO! If you are running out of space then come up with a Flex Work Space with a desk share. Last time i was city hall i saw a lot of empty cubicles. I'm sure you don't need a dedicated desk for someone's Beta Fish and Kittens Calendar
- It's unfortunate past councils lacked a foresight into the future of the city.
- use the space you have now
- Great idea to look at most effective model.
- I see this as a nice to have. Current facilities are fine. Or look a leasing a building like the Bell centre. Cannot afford the cost of a new building.
- I agree with others - rent space and DON'T build a new city hall - waste of money and I don't want my tax dollars going to that.
- \$125.5 million!! Not at this price.
- Keep up the great work! We want to see you in your office in the new city hall!

**Business Case 14 - Operations Master Plan 2020**

Responses	Total Responses	% Yes	% No
Online Survey	158	42%	58%
Public Engagement Events	27	66%	34%

**Comments/ Feedback Received**

- Can't afford it. Once we have the tax increase down to inflation 1.9% then look at it.
- This is a band-aid for the issues previously identified that where never addressed.
- Master planning is important. Consultants can be an effective tool when that planning requires public input. Where public input is minimal, how can staff take this on as part of their ongoing strategic responsibilities?
- Ensure Climate Lens is applied to all projects. We need to get to Net Zero emissions.
- Upgrades to meet green construction standards.
- All upgrades to meet green construction standards and environmentally sound operating standards.
- Maybe
- Not sure.
- Prioritize and spend half now and half in the next cycle.
- Great to look at efficiencies.
- Make do with what you have. All governments need to realize that they just can't continue to go to the tax well, its dry!
- Now sure what this is??

**Business Case 15 - Subsidized Transit Program**

Responses	Total Responses	% Yes	% No
Online Survey	187	58%	42%
Public Engagement Events	35	83%	17%

**Comments/ Feedback Received**

- Too much focus on those that don't pay taxes. Provide services for those that do.
- Not a priority. Would think some of these synergies should be carried out without a cost but rather savings Incurred by doing so.
- Council has already completely missed the boat on addressing the transit needs of the city, both now and in the future by backing off a light rail system. Claimed to settle on BRT, which was substandard/better than nothing but still all talk and no action.
- Transit should be free (fully funded) and I support a more extensive tax increase for this. I am a homeowner in Byron and will happily pay more in property taxes for free transit.
- I'm a property owner -- I would LOVE for my taxes to rise if it meant a fully free transit program here in London. I don't even use the bus!! But this is the best way to really invest in our city. And better service, hey I'd love to start using bus again.
- Public transit should be free - it is the only way we will get people to use it instead of cars.
- This sounds like a project that should be able to be developed as part of LTC operations. I don't understand the business case.
- Would rather see money put into improved transit services/facilities than additional subsidy. I rarely hear people not taking transit due to its price - its typically safety, speed or convenience.
- No - there should not be across the board-subsidized passes. Only those that demonstrate a need - including and seniors who should also have demonstrate a need for a subsidized pass.
- My kids did the above for work & school! The number of (censored) and (censored) people riding the buses..WOW!!! Your LT drivers suffer a lot from (censored) passengers.
- Only if initiated by London Transit. Many of the council initiated programs have no data to support whether or not they have been successful.
- I don't agree with subsidizing in the first place but know all transit is subsidized. I would prefer that there be one integrated model. I do not agree with free transit for all. Everything costs money. We cannot keep giving everything for free.
- Transit should be free.
- London must treat public transit more seriously, and not look it at as a subsidy for the poor, if it is to thrive and increase ridership.
- It is too expensive for some people to use public transit
- Should model off of some European transit systems -- i.e. students ride free during their school days.
- Transportation is a failure, buses not reliable, no real plan. BRT is a plan for the 1950s look to Europe for way to do it. Industrial area not serviced.
- Goal should be free transit. This would help address Councils two priorities - climate emergency and homelessness | poverty.
- I pay a fortune for property taxes, why can't people pay for a bus ticket that is already highly subsidized. Get rid of the University and College program and have them pay full fare. See who really used the bus.
- NO
- In order to encourage less automobile traffic and greater use of transit systems.
- Environmentally safe means of transportation should be a priority.
- As long as they improve the routes and timing of the buses at each pickup and drop point.
- Transit ridership needs to increase dramatically in Climate Emergency.
- Great idea. Stop road widening and support public and active transportation instead.
- A transit system helps to knit a community together- this is much needed.
- We need this.
- This has been a great help to my family, especially for my high school student.
- Making transit affordable and efficient reduces emissions and therefor will help the city address the Climate emergency.
- This should be part of LTC's regular budget not an "extra."
- Yes, improve transit, aspire to make it more appealing than single occupant cars and parking downtown

- Good idea.
- Important to improve transit. Especially the projects that support rapid transit as this has significant paybacks and cost savings down the road. Would have no problem paying additional taxes for projects that create large savings down the road.
- The city should not be funding this. If it's too expensive, contract it out to a third party company to run. Most people I speak with across the city will never use public transit anyways.
- Good to hear our mayor speak of transition toward electric public transit.
- Seems like this is the LTC's job - not city's BTW the taxpayer should not be subsidizing someone's bus pass costs.
- A good transit program may reduce the use of private cars and so help to protect our environment.
- Interesting how we do not have "bus we have young adult sons-2 have gone thru post-secondary education & both said that their friends simply wanted buses to get them to/from school on time; no need for bus rapid transit!!!!no need for
- Always in support of BETTER transit.
- Transit should stand on its own ticket prices. Rapid Transit should be scraped. Forecast increase ridership due to the Rapid Transit Investment will not materialize.
- Absolutely, make transit affordable. In fact, make it free!
- Yes, low income only.

<b>Business Case 16 - T-Block Replacement/ New Storage Building</b>			
<b>Responses</b>	<b>Total Responses</b>	<b>% Yes</b>	<b>% No</b>
<b>Online Survey</b>	202	45%	55%
<b>Public Engagement Events</b>	27	52%	48%

**Comments/ Feedback Received**

- Yes, get rid of it. It is only costing money year over year.
- Do something with LPH hospital..
- I would not spend a dime on this building. Just sell " as is "as Londoners will be on the hook for" Brownsite Cleanup \$\$ " anyway. I'm not paying twice!
- Reasonable.
- Reduce staff and keep service
- Why did we buy a building in such bad repair. City should lease. City of London has never been good property manager and tend to buy thing in disrepair that costs us a fortune.
- A sentence providing the location and suitable uses for the building would be helpful. I cannot picture this asset.
- Description makes it sound like we should demolish and start over.
- Cost is very low that it barely has an impact.
- If it is just for storage, why does it need to be accessible?
- Not sure.
- Fix it up and use it more efficiently
- No! Renovate and start using it again. You're kidding with this, right? Who is buying this place for market value? When my furnace broke i didn't ask you guys for money to buy a new house. I replaced the furnace - you know....like normal people.
- I am undecided, because I do not know anything about the T-Block building.
- Sounds like a good idea.

## ADDITIONAL INVESTMENTS FOR CONSIDERATION

<b>Business Case 4B - City of London Infrastructure Gap - Part B</b>			
<b>Responses</b>	<b>Total Responses</b>	<b>% Yes</b>	<b>% No</b>
<b>Online Survey</b>	116	32%	68%
<b>Public Engagement Events</b>	34	88%	12%

**Comments/ Feedback Received**

- We can't afford it
- Too vague a description for me to comment.
- Not impressed with what has happened over the past 10 years, so no confidence such funding increase would be well spent...just wasted on paperwork, studies and administration.
- I do not support road widening unless it is for protected bike lanes.
- I voted Yes for Part A - I find this part "B " too aggressive a schedule on cash flow to finance from taxpayers - should be more multi-generational.
- Necessary and fundamental. Not a nice to have, a need to have
- City has more money than what's accounted for. City is always behind at least 1 yr. of tax revenue. Why does it take up to 1 yr. to get a tax bill? Once you issue a building permit question should be asked when is person taking possession & provide tax bill.
- Our city is a mess. Let's figure out roadways and properly engineer this place before we waste more money on projects to be failures.
- Why not concentrate on one year's budget at a time?
- As long as this does not include any road widening, I'm in. Only projects that reduce carbon and pollution please.
- Inadequate description for this kind of feedback mechanism. What is Part B (in a sentence)?
- Dealing with climate change in every way we can is the number one priority. We need action from governments at all levels because leaving it to the free market or general population is not going to end well.
- It would be helpful to have some examples of what this infrastructure gap includes. Is it described more in the 4A description?
- Apply Climate Lens to base budget and there will money to address this. Stop road widenings at UGB.
- Only where investments reflect Climate Change Emergency priorities.
- Funding for (1) Road widening only for public transit and active transit purposes. (2)Separation of storm and sanitary sewers.
- Administratively prioritize building a sustainable city.
- We need to close the infrastructure gap, not let it slide further back.
- use taxes you currently collect to maintain infrastructure -
- Please find cutbacks in other areas and stop gouging the middle class to increase taxes. Infrastructure is important to get us to work so cut back in other areas! Zero tax increase should be the goal.
- Lot of waste in administration. By reducing waste additional revenue could be generated for this.
- Get the sewer situation solved we don't need crap in the Thames every time it rains. Forget the vanity projects. Get down to our real needs.

<b>Business Case 5B - Climate Emergency Declaration - Implementation</b>			
<b>Responses</b>	<b>Total Responses</b>	<b>% Yes</b>	<b>% No</b>
<b>Online Survey</b>	130	41%	59%
<b>Public Engagement Events</b>	35	60%	40%

**Comments/ Feedback Received**

- Total waste of our tax dollars.
- Disagree spending millions and millions more to support a few people riding bikes to work and who soon stop after their bikes are always stolen.
- Very important!
- I would support even more tax increases for a more extensive pathway of protected bike lanes and lighting along the TVP.

- We need funding to combat climate change and deal with emergencies! This is so important!
- Address the building code and force builders to adopt better construction practices. Bikes are cheap to buy at the police auction (get stolen often enough) so bike share shouldn't be necessary. Prioritize the environment in day to day operations.
- Council already decided there is no emergency but not investing in LRT and then reducing 2 legs of BRT. Transportation is by far the greatest contributor to GHG - any other initiatives make little difference
- Need to focus on projects that will benefit the majority, not the few (i.e. bike share program would only benefit a few people).
- I do not support the City of LDN starting this program. In 5 years, this will expand to by - laws blocking a new natural gas furnace ETC TC as I see the aggressive intervention template starting in other communities.
- As long as it is, back ended following the development of the plan.
- Are you kidding?
- Need transportation infrastructure investment to encourage change.
- In my opinion, this is extremely important. We have to take the lead and guide residents to change their habits. It appears that a lot of people seem to be waiting for others to make changes while they quietly live life as usual.
- Pedestrians (who have a zero carbon footprint) are so badly treated by the City, that they should be given consideration. People walking are slipping and falling on icy sidewalks, which have been filled in when bicycle lanes are cleared - very unfair!
- Yes, this is important work. All funds saved from less mowing and no more road widenings can supplement this crucial work.
- There is no point of making declarations on any subject unless funding for projects that support the objective of the declaration is provided.
- There is no point in making declarations unless funding for projects that support the declaration's objective(s) is provided. The climate crisis demands strong action by the city.
- Insufficient. Climate emergency measures require reduction of city sprawl, reduction of motor vehicle traffic, green energy generation, corporate waste reduction (alongside encouraging consumers). If we're declaring emergency, let's treat it like one.
- Absolutely. Times that average taxpayer impact by 20 and give this the attention it deserves. I've been fortunate to live / work / and visit in many other municipalities and London needs to kick into high gear to make up for lost time on this front.
- Very important to proceed and provide funding.
- We are in a climate emergency. It is important to walk the talk and put some resources to education and reducing our GHG emissions.
- Should likely be doubled or tripled.
- CRITICAL.
- ABSOLUTELY CRITICAL!
- Administratively prioritize Business Case 5B.
- This is the most important issue facing the city now. Without climate change mitigation and adaptation, there is little need for long range civic planning. London must be addressing the Climate Emergency now in this multi-year budget across all areas.
- Prioritize cycling infrastructure before a bike share program. Why would people want to use bike share with little to no 'all ages and abilities' cycle paths?
- I support a lower amount, for electric charging stations.
- We know how to conserve energy. We are doing it. We want more efficient things but can't afford them because of paying taxes to send out mailers to tell us to turn the thermostat down a degree. You going to tell us about paper straws too? WE KNOW!!
- The bike lane thing downtown is a disaster. Not used, clogs traffic. Lose it.
- Let's make the city safe for biking, before offering a ride share.
- If you feel this is important find the money from another budget item - do not keep raising taxes in Climate Change's name.
- Absolutely no dollars for bike lanes! The current ones are not used! They consistently use of roads, when there are designated bike lanes & they tell you to (censored) when you call them out on it. As a senior, it is awful to see the waste of money! Cannot afford.
- If there is no plan then how you came up with this number?
- Go for it. These programs sound good and are needed now. And green jobs!

### Business Case 7B - Core Area Action Plan - Part B

Responses	Total Responses	% Yes	% No
Online Survey	129	37%	63%
Public Engagement Events	34	68%	32%

### Comments/ Feedback Received

- I have mixed feelings about the core. Yes, help the homeless. No, stop trying to resurrect retailing downtown, it's a lost cause and wastes dollars.
- Sadly, over past 40 years, have watched millions of dollars thrown away on the Core Area to attract people, when the true reasons "why" people avoid the core is ignored by the city and politicians year after year as no one wants to accept the truth.
- I am concerned with gentrification. How are you going to make this socially just?
- Too many items/issues lumped into this category. I personally don't support spending money on the core area.
- Too expense when combined @ Part A - which I voted yes for. Way too heavy a burden on taxpayers.
- Stop pouring money into something that has no end point. Many millions for what end?
- ALL AVAILABLE FUNDS SHOULD BE USED TO HELP THOSE WHO NEED IT MOST. EVERYONE DESERVES FAIR TREATMENT, A SAFE HOME AND A SAFE PLACE TO REST/GET FOOD/SHOWER/HELP ETC.
- I've thoroughly read the core area action plan and know that we can do better for our \$ than some of what was hastily proposed. There are many free or inexpensive ways to help the local businesses without requiring additional funding.
- There must be resources for this to work, so please fund.
- Too much has already been spent on the core.
- City Council should put more emphasis on the continuing problem with homelessness and forget about plans for a new city hall.
- After the climate emergency addressing homelessness and poverty are top priorities. The two go hand in hand.
- London needs a vibrant, healthy downtown core in order to be a successful city. Much has been done towards this goal but more work is necessary.
- "Other activities"? Insufficient context to make a decision. Even one sentence about what this would fund would provide for informed feedback.
- Urban sprawl is a problem for many reasons. There are some noteworthy ambitious developments like West 5 but I don't like that it essentially creates it's own town outside of the City.
- I do not agree with free parking downtown during construction. Make it a free bus pass instead. Create incentives for people to take transit instead of the car. It should never be cheaper to take the car than to take the bus.
- Implementing socially significant and health and safety issues, not window dressing.
- WHERE ADDRESSING SOCIAL JUSTICE AND HEALTH AND SAFETY CONCERNS, AND NOT MERELY 'WINDOW DRESSING.'
- I am in favor of the entire plan. I am in particular support of these items -#43- free municipal parking, #48- I have seen where public/private funding in other cities has paid big dividends, #61-
- We don't need things like "kindness meters" and metal trees to fix the downtown. We need full stores and police on the street.
- How about we try part a first. I don't think public art is what we need to clean-up downtown.
- Let's do part A and see how that works first.
- Great. Money for "honest conversations" and "speaking truth to power" Are we paying for another "study."
- We just spent \$ 22M on a new roadway - let's see what impact this has on the Core.
- I recently went to the core area a few weeks ago. While parking on the new Dundas Street, I saw a drug deal going on in front of the library! Seriously!??? The (censored) are rampant& no police to intervene as they are chatting in parking lots!
- Yes, if at a slower pace.
- We need free parking in London downtown and at hospitals. We need more institutions and supported housing for mental health and addictions. These persons do not simply need housing. Many cannot look after themselves.
- Agree with above however there is no solution in sight for homelessness. Every intersection in city has people asking for help due to no work or homelessness. Very poor handling by city regarding this in my view.

- Stop the core chant.
- Yes, but maybe not more work on Dundas Place and "revitalizing" the core. Do invest in the others on the list.
- Community Housing is an important responsibility of all citizens. And this project provides good local green jobs!
- Too much being spent on a core that is a haven for (censored) and criminals. Parking remains a deterrent. Why shop downtown when malls are free?

<b>Business Case 10B - HDC Funding for Affordable Housing - Part B</b>			
<b>Responses</b>	<b>Total Responses</b>	<b>% Yes</b>	<b>% No</b>
<b>Online Survey</b>	121	44%	56%
<b>Public Engagement Events</b>	33	91%	9%
<b>Comments/ Feedback Received</b>			

- Think the "size" of units and location of affordable housing needs to be revisited. Also, if built to support other cities homeless at the expenses of London's citizens.
- Money should go to development of new stock, not more talking about it.
- Strong supporter of both Part A & Part B and HDC model where we partner to build and have zero maintenance or admin costs after turnover. This is the model of the future NOT LMCH.
- Affordable has many definitions however.
- Maybe start by getting vacant units ready in a more timely fashion so there aren't families and people waiting while 40-50 units remain empty, consider a tiny homes community for the harder to reach people on the streets, and please continue 2 invest here
- I'm still concerned about the effectiveness of the HDC in delivering our affordable housing strategy. I'd need more information about that the 'additional funding' would be used for, and how \$2800 would be helpful.
- Yes this is a top priority along with addressing the climate emergency.
- HDC hasn't proven the ability to do anything yet. Give money to book.
- Given the small impact on the tax levy, this seems a worthwhile endeavour.
- Unclear need. What is the existing inflationary funding? How does it compare to COLA? What is being requested above that and why?
- To me this is a key issue in London especially now with how the cost of housing has increased to the point people cannot afford homes combined with the multi-year backlog of people trying to find a place to live.
- These projects need additional funding to ensure they are built to a green standard. Making them highly energy efficient will reduce operating costs and save money in the long term. It will also save on the health care costs from air pollution.
- Can't be more?
- All new units must reflect green construction principles of design and building.
- All new housing units must be environmentally sound and reflect green standards in construction, maintenance and operation.
- Reluctant "Yes", but only to see this bomb and see these 150 units cost \$400K/unit because of red tape. You want affordable housing? Stop saving crumbling buildings for Heritage (censored), and let (censored) run wild. "Supply and demand" . This isn't hard!!
- based on how poorly run the Housing file is being run I would not want to see any new money directed here until ex housing units are repaired and put into the housing pool
- Start trimming the budget and zero tax increase.
- The addictions help needs to come first. Housing First is not a good model. We need more residential treatment and supportive living for addictions and mental health.
- Very disappointed in this. Lot of corruption it seems in this area. Sorry.
- I support city-owned and -built affordable housing, and non-profit. Do not rely on for-profit developers.
- Especially support publicly-owned and non-profit affordable housing. Do not rely on for-profit developers.
- Shorten waiting times for dispute resolution at the rent tribunal hearings. Help landlords deal with problem tenants and make these problem tenants accountable and don't reward them with money and free housing.

<b>Business Case 17A - Community Improvement Plan - Community Building Projects</b>			
<b>Responses</b>	<b>Total Responses</b>	<b>% Yes</b>	<b>% No</b>
<b>Online Survey</b>	120	32%	68%
<b>Public Engagement Events</b>	31	74%	26%

**Comments/ Feedback Received**

- Can't afford it
- I have no idea what items this is for.
- Community engagement is critical -- don't skimp/be penny-wise pound (censored).
- Focus should be on housing and climate.
- these make little difference
- We just have to preserve that 25 % of the City of LDN job doing nothing without this program (LOL).
- A little money. But not sure what it delivers.
- Again, there must be another way to find \$160, and what difference will the \$160 make to the program/projects?
- budget for what is needed.
- "Will support a variety of small-scale projects and initiatives" such as what?
- Let the private sector pay for this, isn't that what BIAs are for?
- Let's focus on downtown right now
- This is too vague.
- We can't have everything we want - not every project can nor should be funded.
- You must clean up the (censored), (censored), drug deals downtown -- otherwise, it is a waste of money. The enabling mentality needs to end. It is not appropriate for society to say it is OK to use illicit drugs, to (censored) on public streets/property.
- This is important.

<b>Business Case 17B - Community Improvement Plan - Land Acquisition</b>			
<b>Responses</b>	<b>Total Responses</b>	<b>% Yes</b>	<b>% No</b>
<b>Online Survey</b>	115	35%	65%
<b>Public Engagement Events</b>	31	74%	26%

**Comments/ Feedback Received**

- Defer.
- Should not happen until the City of London pay staff salaries/benefits the same as public business...such as insurance companies and banks. Citizens can't afford such high paid civil servants/staff.
- Although I do NOT support more parking lots. The city should encourage green travel via transit, walking and cycling.
- Only if it's intended for housing.
- These serve current residents so absolutely yes to parks and community centres.
- As long as the land is acquired at current land prices; and that any work done is kept to minimum (planting of grass and trees and pathways) at a reasonable price. No exorbitant architectural features, planter boxes, metal trees etc.
- NO, I'm not buying land from a reserve fund I support @ my taxes for this program. Find another way.
- Sure. As long as the terms of use are flexible.
- Focus on the housing, homelessness and drug epidemics first.
- I believe London needs to be more aggressive now to secure lands for our the future of the City. That being said, how will \$400 help?
- Please stop building and finding parking lots immediately. This takes us further away from building a sustainable, non car centric city.
- If anything, we should be looking to sell excess.
- We need to own the cost and deliver on community improvement.
- As long as the money is going to be used to have city owned parking and not leasing or allowing impark to run parking lots.
- Only for Park N Ride lots to use Transit. Plant more trees.
- In my mind- the CIP is a must.
- I am very concerned of all the parking the city is losing at the Middlesex Health Unit... we

need to acquire more downtown parking. There is no reasonable parking downtown! If you want the downtown core to thrive we need parking. London is a city of drivers.

- No new parking lots, instead public transit integration, bike parking.
- Why the sense of entitlement? Infrastructure is important & should be a priority. Schools have school grounds--play areas; we need to be mindful to use the areas we have now. Acquisition of new areas will need more money to maintain them; not a wise plan!
- Yes to community centres or parks. Even though I drive a car I don't want to encourage car use by providing more parking lots.
- Stop the land grab. Let's deal with what we have instead of encouraging urban sprawl.

#### Business Case 18 - LMCH Co-Investment with CMHC

Responses	Total Responses	% Yes	% No
Online Survey	114	37%	63%
Public Engagement Events	33	85%	15%

#### Comments/ Feedback Received

- First, LMCH needs to adopt smaller sizes and costs of housing units provided resolved, and at lower costs, not like in the past where reckless spending and millions wasted on too big, townhouses, etc. for small families.
- These buildings are literally falling apart. The City needs to stand by their word and invest in housing for our most vulnerable citizens. It would be devastating to see our city leave a huge portion of our community members behind.
- I like the 60 - 40 split @ CMHC. Requires scope more than just targeting energy efficiency targets.
- Makes good use of CMHC funds and improves existing housing.
- Concentrate on what is needed; our province is deeply in debt; therefore we should be more cognizant of avoiding wasting money.
- As long as LMHC is being ran by people who know what they are doing.
- Yes, but how does this offset or intersect with other needs/requests for supporting our public housing stock.
- Good to see green requirements have been built into this case.
- (Censored). If you want more "Yes" answers you should add lines about "Hiring outside of city staff". Not sure why these people get multiple attempts.
- Work with other levels of government. London can't do it alone.
- LMCH can't run its present housing stock let alone take on more units - where has the money gone they have received over the last two decades???
- Zero tax increase. Find dollars from other areas. Difficult to watch the deliberate destruction of low-income property on the news and having to repair the destruction with hard-earned money! How deplorable! Society needs to say that this is not OK!
- Still need intensive mental health and addictions help put in place so that social housing units don't continually get destroyed.
- YES, very important. And green local jobs!

#### Business Case 19 - LMCH Operating Staffing and Security

Responses	Total Responses	% Yes	% No
Online Survey	113	33%	67%
Public Engagement Events	33	79%	21%

#### Comments/ Feedback Received

- With our huge Police Services costs, have them take care of security instead of sitting around in their cars or at a desk doing nothing. Not impressed by Police Services salaries/benefits and costs to citizens with what is witnessed daily in city.
- Not if it results in more criminalization of poor people. Security guards can replicate racism and class bigotry.
- This organization is running on fumes. The demographic of tenants + the amount of daily work + the degeneration of assets etc. is not something 60 something staff can properly manage. Tenants need more attention than simply being handed keys.
- LMCH is considered by most taxpayers as a "money pit" and a long broken model for service delivery. I will support IF AND ONLY IF the City of London & Middlesex contract out - privatize the with a leading rental management company for deliverables.
- Maybe, just maybe, if the people hired treated people better, issues would arise less often.

- Please please include more social workers/peer supports rather than police the situation.
- Make sure the staff you already have are proficient and productive; more isn't always the answer.
- LMCH deserves the resources it needs to do a good job with the right leadership.
- Make the housing a joy to live in and people will treat it better.
- Housing first model is what is causing safety concerns, crime and victimization is better left to the police, not community patrols and crisis intervention.
- If it will help police not have to do so much non police calls then it makes sense.
- This will also reduce impact on the police budget.
- Why are you asking now for input on an operational improvement audit from 2017? Doesn't sound like it was valued at the time if you're only now considering implementation.
- A guy sleeping in a chair or out having a smoke? We have the police. When they aren't in a Tim Hortons parking lot - tell them to hang around these buildings.
- Private security does not work. Move funding to LPS.
- These are operational costs to be paid by rents not taxpayers.
- The enabling of inappropriate behaviour needs to cease. Strict criteria for individuals for LMCH housing. Society should not be tolerating individuals who are a threat to other tenants' safety!
- We need to make some tough decision so that tax increase are only slightly above inflation.
- Why there is no accountability with tenants in communities housing? People destroy property and no one ask questions about this. No proper enforcement here.
- Security, no staffing.
- Fund security, no staffing.

#### **Business Case 20 - London Public Library - Collections**

<b>Responses</b>	<b>Total Responses</b>	<b>% Yes</b>	<b>% No</b>
<b>Online Survey</b>	121	32%	68%
<b>Public Engagement Events</b>	33	36%	64%

#### **Comments/ Feedback Received**

- Finally a proposal that includes taxpayers and not those that contribute no tax dollars.
- I am a regular library user and check the New Items listings regularly. I'm afraid though that I see quite a number of purchases of materials of dubious value or importance. I often wonder what checking the library does on the borrowing of individual item.
- Library costs are tooooooo high for what is offered and provided to a small percentage of London citizens. Think they should be closed as their costs not supportive of what is needed.
- Libraries are a city's backbone. Give them whatever they need!
- The value of collections to close the gap between socioeconomic levels is huge.
- LPL deserves a huge increase in funding. Their staff are underpaid and their building need an upgrade.
- Strong supporter here.
- Been growing. not clear as to need
- Cut Libraries to 5, Whiteoaks, Central, Bostwick, Argyle & Stoneycreek. Libraries are a dying business model. Do not invest in libraries - The internet / info is accessible in the palms of our hands.
- The library is essential for all.
- The library is fantastic.
- How are current collections investments prioritized? I see value in providing zero-cost-per-use access to entertainment and educational materials (e.g. Marvel movies to biographies), but the spend could be infinite. How is the limit determined?
- Love our library in my neighbourhood, but reduced wait times for a book aren't a priority right now.
- Electronic resources are expensive but very popular among library patrons. Libraries remain a vital source for information and they need a proper collection budget.
- Our library system is over-funded, with excessive purchase of computers and 3-d printers for example.
- Decrease the number of libraries in the city. Other agencies can provide access to the internet for job search initiatives. Children have access to libraries at school. Keep the central library close the rest to create a central, efficient library hub.

- Current service is fine
- Yes! I use the library a lot and want this important resource to be available to all.

**Business Case 21 - Regeneration of Public Housing**

Responses	Total Responses	% Yes	% No
Online Survey	127	48%	52%
Public Engagement Events	32	97%	3%

**Comments/ Feedback Received**

- I'm getting confused by the number of similar sounding items on housing in this list so this is a weak Yes.
- Watched all social housing units in my area quickly be destroyed and looking like a bomb went off, as citizens have no appreciation, pride or consequence to abusing such support. Re thinking social housing needed...size, # of rooms...not same old.
- This is an obvious investment need. The buildings are over 50 years old and quickly falling apart. How many audits need to show the critical state of public housing before our city does something about it?
- Why can't the City organize groups of volunteers to go in and do some repairs/painting etc. I am sure there are a lot of retired people with great skills who could do this work, and would help keep costs down. City costs for everything are too high.
- Yes - but would prefer STRONG METRICS - PERFORMANCE Measures attached to this funding.
- Tiny homes community! Get empty/vacant units ready for new tenants to move in asap.
- The people who need subsidized housing should be encouraged to take better care of these properties.
- Spend it wisely and don't let private corps get rich off taxpayer dollars.
- Provision of affordable housing should be a key objective. Funding should also be sought from provincial and federal governments which I assume is being done.
- Yes, we need to own the ongoing cost of maintaining infrastructure and use that painful realization to better inform spending decisions about increasing this spend. Deferral/pretending it doesn't exist doesn't do any of us good.
- Housing is needed for everyone and something needs to help end the amount of homeless here in London. If these building fall too far into ruin it means more people without homes.
- Essential. The Finish model for providing social housing should be looked at as it engages with the tenants through part ownership in the housing units.
- Continue projects where public and affordable housing is inter-mixed. Not isolated.
- Providing that green design and building materials are used.
- All regeneration investment MUST reflect environmentally sound and green building standards.
- The city has to have this in face of the crisis we have in affordable units.
- How many different ways can we ask for Money to pay for LMCH repairs.
- Improve the huge wait times for hearings and resulting orders from the rent tribunals. save the mental and physical abuse of landlords by government intervention and meddling with private property rights. We will only loose landlords as this continues.
- I guess so. Can you please get new people to do this though? If people did the job properly they might not need "revitalization" so soon.
- Without support from province and feds, undefinable. Not just a municipal issue.
- Use rent money not taxes.
- Zero tax increase; find funding from other programs/areas and start trimming costs.
- Yes, but at a slower pace
- While this is a needed cost, I worry about the destructive nature of some of these residents. I have personally seen how some of these properties are treated and oversight needs to addressed. A rent reduction for good maintenance by tenant might be worth.
- Yes, very important. And green local jobs!

**Business Case 22 - Smart City Strategy**

Responses	Total Responses	% Yes	% No
Online Survey	110	24%	76%
Public Engagement Events	25	60%	40%

**Comments/ Feedback Received**

- Waste of money.
- Sounds like an opportunity for pie in the sky thinking such as is happening with the Google project in Toronto with endless meetings and speechmaking.
- I would rather have a green, socially just city.
- Not enough info to understand the benefit.
- This is a nice to do not necessary in a year with a budget problem.
- London Economic Development should already be doing this within their existing budget envelope.
- No idea what this means or is for.
- It's not clear what this proposal even means!?
- Really; I had always thought I lived in a smart city!!!
- Sounds like a massive waste
- Pretty fuzzy. Are we talking access to data? Digital customer service?
- We do not have the resources to intelligently pursue.
- Yes but prioritize higher than Climate Emergency
- What the (censored) is this? Sounds like a bunch of empty buzz words.
- What does this even mean?
- This should have explained what a "smart city" is.
- There's so much we need to do before 'smart city strategic thinking'. Get people out of their cars, get downtown functioning, get vacant (censored) space in use.
- Unclear.
- I have no idea what you are proposing based on that paragraph above.
- Just a fancy slogan - do not waste my \$\$\$ on this.
- Sounds good.
- Another nice to have.
- No 5G technology without an in depth study of health risks.

<b>Business Case 23 - Street Light Local Improvement</b>			
<b>Responses</b>	<b>Total Responses</b>	<b>% Yes</b>	<b>% No</b>
<b>Online Survey</b>	120	36%	64%
<b>Public Engagement Events</b>	37	73%	27%
<b>Comments/ Feedback Received</b>			

- Not at this time.
- However, the use of new LED lights which replaced the previous type may be more efficient but they have a sharp cut-off which in old North for example means that only the road is lit, the sidewalks are dark and unsafe. Something better is needed.
- Not important, but how can CoL cost share a service that provides health and safety to a resident. Residents already pay property taxes!
- As someone who lives on an unlit street, it's a nice-to-have, not a must-have.
- This is a basic city service one should expect to get from paying taxes.
- The streetlights that are out there now are not bright enough...not like they used to be. I find it more difficult to see when driving at night, even on the lit London streets.
- YES - IF & ONLY if the 60 - 40 cost split is achieved in the final approval - residents have to have skin in the game.
- Do not see it as a critical need. We are supposed to be reducing energy use!
- Please put streetlights onto McClure Drive - is a hazard.
- Dark Street can attract mischief makers; let there be light.
- Dark streets are targets and dangerous
- Streetlights negatively impact our wildlife and ecosystems. Unnecessary cost for this budget cycle and goes against climate emergency declaration. I believe the ACE cmte has done some dark skies strategy that provides more research and info.
- All new street lighting must be energy-efficient, and of a design that does not contribute to light pollution.
- New lighting should be energy efficient. Minimum contribution to light pollution should be considered.
- How is Back to the River an administrative priority and streetlights aren't??? Do the basics first!!!
- If homeowners want lights they should pay for the costs entirely - other taxpayers are not responsible for their lights.
- Agree, would help with safety.

- Another nice to have.
- Lighting helps keep neighborhoods safer.
- Please make sure the lights are shaded so the light does not go up.
- The new lighting is harsh and ugly. And a waste of money.
- Nelson Park area.

#### Business Case 24 - Wi-Fi in Recreation Facilities for the Public

Responses	Total Responses	% Yes	% No
Online Survey	122	32%	68%
Public Engagement Events	34	47%	53%

#### Comments/ Feedback Received

- Research shows many would benefit from less use of smartphones and other devices. The City should spend dollars encouraging such use.
- Good idea...and supports why no need for expensive library services as information available on internet.
- People who "need" connectivity have data plans.
- Not a priority compared to housing.
- Taxpayer money isn't for free internet. Get a data plan if you need Internet on the go.
- Embarrassing that we don't already do this - although seems like a nice to have - but his reflects badly on London. Instead of investing in "strategies" that we can't afford implement these easy-to-do items.
- Need to keep up with the times, and providing this service would benefit a lot of people.
- Sorry, the public should not subsidize this.
- This is a waste of money when we have housing needs in our community. Individuals should provide this themselves.
- Spend taxpayers money wisely.
- (Censored) no. This is appalling to even consider. Focus on the recreation
- Libraries have WiFi
- Providing a network is like providing lights and electricity and floors and walls, it needs to be done universally and the cost recovered appropriately.
- Think LTC ... to increase ridership.
- This is a no brainer, every other city we go to has free wifi in the arena.
- Had WiFi in the arena I was at in Toronto this weekend for a tournament, embarrassing we don't have this in London yet.
- Lambeth Community Center please!
- Lots of free wifi through businesses, wouldn't consider this a higher priority than some other items here.
- People are far too addicted to their screens, it is a mental health hazard already- especially for children.
- Its not the taxpayers job to fund Instagram posts.
- people should pay for their own wi-fi
- This is not an essential service! Focus on use of taxpayer dollars on essential services and this certainly is not!
- Another nice to have.
- With free public WiFi the library will not have to provide the in-home service at a huge savings.
- This would be a very valuable service, supporting low-income residents as well as being convenient for all users.

#### Business Case 25 - Winter Maintenance Program Support

Responses	Total Responses	% Yes	% No
Online Survey	146	46%	54%
Public Engagement Events	39	71%	29%

#### Comments/ Feedback Received

- Follow Provincial guidelines, no more holes.
- Maintain current standards which are adequate.
- I am a senior who should get out walking every day, but last winter for example ice was untreated and allowed to build up for weeks on end. I fell and broke my shoulder in summer on a broken sidewalk in old North which was left in unsafe condition for yea.
- If people invested in a pair of boots with grip, and not wear summer shoes, no needs for

such obsessive snow clearing from bus stops and sidewalks. Enjoy walking in the snow...not paranoid of getting snow on folks feet.

- Based on my experience, the current operations standards are not adhered to. Not willing to throw more money at it.
- Sidewalks and bike lanes especially!
- Yes, the current snow clearing processes don't nearly meet the demands of the city! Up the game!
- But more tactically, e.g. concentrating on north-facing streets where the sun isn't present.
- Require residents to shovel the sidewalks in front of their homes. This would save millions, promote physical activity - MANY other cities do this already.
- But why has the city build so many medians in their new street designs...which will make it harder for snow removal, and therefore make it more costly? Why doesn't anyone ever consider this when designing new streets, instead of going for the "look"?
- I strongly believe the snow maintenance standards we have are sufficient. The Operations Team just needs to spend the Budget it has instead of turning over the annual surplus to the city to pay down debt.
- Huge cost for the change. Not sure you can afford the stand by costs and enough contractors to do this.
- Consider new methods, like sweep and brine, rather than the often ineffective and environmentally more costly plow and salt.
- I feel what we have is good. Homeowners in London should be made to clear the sidewalks in front of their homes, like in every other city in the province. For some reason no one is expected to do this here.
- Bring in mandatory sidewalk clearing for residents. Set up a volunteer/for hire website to help taxpayers do this. Downtown businesses used to clear walks much better.
- Absolutely not. The City does a great job of snow removal and to spend this money when other more pressing needs are required is wasteful.
- Safer roads and sidewalks save dollars in healthcare costs and lost time at work.
- Please stop filling in the sidewalks by clearing the bicycle lanes! Please sand the sidewalks and not use harmful salt.
- The number of seniors in London is rising this is necessary.
- Bike lanes need to be plowed.
- Our snow removal (censored).
- But only the sidewalks and bus stops - NOT the roads. Need to reduce spending on roads and cars.
- Yes and no. What is the current threshold and what is our success at delivering on that service-level? How will this help increase transparency in delivering on the service level?
- Sidewalks along arterials should be in the same condition as the adjoining streets, let's finally start acting the goal of making the city more pedestrian friendly.
- First/last mile on transit ride, aging in place, active transportation, people with disability. So many reasons to do this. Need way above min provincial standard and not just in core.
- Priority should be on sidewalk clearing to support active transportation.
- This supports active transportation (e.g., walking safely) and use of public transit.
- As a newcomer to the city I have struggled with the current guidelines as even with less than 5cm it can be a struggle to walk and run for exercise. In other cities, I lived the property owners had the sidewalk responsibility- I would suggest this.
- Side streets and sidewalk plowing are not done very well.
- Snow removal and salting on side streets is deplorable. IF you do not live on a bus route your chances of getting stuck or having icy ruts till spring thaw are extremely high. The street E of Wilfred Jury school is a prime example.
- Sidewalks!!!
- Stop plowing the bike paths. It is for just a handful of people and requires huge manpower and energy consumption. This would save a lot of money.
- This business case ties in to several Strategic Priorities and Plans.
- This seems like this should be a necessity and not something that is being asked for feedback. The streets and sidewalks are a necessity that need to be cared for by the city and should be part of the regular budget. This should already be taken care of!
- Let's just improve sidewalks for now
- Yes, yes and three times yes. Helps most vulnerable, disabled. Also keep the north and south branches of the TVP as clear as you do the west branch so that more people can consider using it more.

- Sorry (censored), but this is a horrible idea. I get the nice old lady (censored), but we're talking about 2 inches vs. 3 inches. An extra inch is ruining people's lives?
- Roads and rinks...that is the job of municipal tax dollars.
- Greater sidewalk cleaning! It's been 5 days since the last winter storm, walking in my neighborhood (argyle) as an able bodied person is treacherous. How about bike lane clearing as a priority to. The city needs to change it's thinking about cars!
- We get snow in the winter - bare asphalt or concrete is not a given until spring melt or winter thaw - we can live with a bit of snow on the roads and sidewalks.
- Excellent service has been noted to date! No changes indicated.
- Another nice to have. The current program works well.
- So many streets do not have sidewalks so there is a need to have safe streets to walk in. Added salt to the roads would also cut down on the number of plow trips per street.
- Yes and No: Streets, yes, public sidewalks, yes, homeowners should be responsible for those sidewalks.
- Sidewalks.

## POTENTIAL NET LEVY REDUCTIONS FOR CONSIDERATION

<b>Business Case 26 - Eliminate Curbside Christmas Tree Collection</b>			
<b>Responses</b>	<b>Total Responses</b>	<b>% Yes</b>	<b>% No</b>
<b>Online Survey</b>	131	46%	54%
<b>Public Engagement Events</b>	12	100%	0%
<b>Comments/ Feedback Received</b>			

- If u have the means to go buy and transport a real tree, you should have the means to drop it off.
- If you can bring your tree home from the lot you can take it to the EnviroDepot.
- This is (censored). The Christmas tree industry should be supported.
- What are families without cars supposed to do? Encouraging real trees is better for the environment -- cutting this will mean more plastic trees.
- Clearly an unnecessary luxury. If people can go buy it then they can take it to a compost location.
- I believe less people are using real trees and if they do, they can usually afford the cost of disposal or they can be burned in firepits.
- Consumers got the tree home, they can get it to the enviropot. I would support the elimination of leaf collection as well similar to grass clippings which should compost in place.
- It's not that tough to take a tree to the depot.
- This isn't a need.
- Our city is so behind with a sustainable recycling program and we struggle with garbage waste. We can easily look into adopting practices that our neighbouring cities have implemented.
- If you don't pick them up....there're going to be left all over the place. People are too lazy anymore to take them to a depot..
- People should be encouraged to stop killing trees in the name of Christmas anyway. Why should I pay for having your tree picked up?
- Stop picking everything up at the curb! People want a real tree, they can dispose of it. They got it home so they can get it to the recycling depot.
- They will just get dumped somewhere and staff will end up collecting them anyway.
- Why?
- Let's stop cutting trees down. I have a reusable one.
- Don't need this - people can drive their trees to the EnviroDepots or leave in backyard to compost for animal habitat.
- Bring back the drop off spots. Not sure why this was taken away.
- Will there be an increase for enforcement? Will trees litter yards and alleys? I'm all for reducing waste collection costs, possibly by self-disposal. But accommodate human nature, as folks demonstrably litter in absence of handy solutions (see parks).
- If persons have the ability to purchase and pick up the tree, then they can arrange for removing it.
- If someone can transport the tree to their home they can deliver it to an enviro depot.
- Consider supporting community and service groups to offer a tree pick up service.
- The City should encourage community-based non-profit groups (eg., Scouts, churches, etc.) to provide fee-based tree-collections
- Having so many people driving to an EnviroDepot.
- Do we do special pick-ups for other religious holidays? If you can get a tree home, you can take it to the dump or compost it afterward.
- EnviroDepot is not walkable to most homes in London, meaning that individuals without cars would not be able to have live Christmas Trees.
- How is it more environmentally friendly to have thousands of people drive their Christmas trees to the enviropot and wait in line (burning gas) to drop them off?
- City should provide tree removal and add the cost to the property tax bill so that homeowners don't have to drive to a depot but can have their tree taken away at a cost. Or sell a tree tag that property owners can attach to the tree so it is picked up.
- Why did you stop the additional collection points? I remember one in Byron at Springbank.
- This is only one matter - there should be user fees for anything above basic trash disposal, with stricter limits to reduce unnecessary waste and costs.

- Keep them until spring pick up.
- Please consider charges for picking up furniture curbside. Why are we picking up old couches and mattresses at curbside for free? Charge a \$10 admin fee minimally to tag this furniture. Hundreds of thousands in income.
- if you can get it home...you can get it to the depot
- People are able to get it home right? They can drop it off too. I know some people will just ditch it on the road so just announce a huge fine if you are caught by webcam ditching your tree.
- Good plan.
- This would encourage artificial trees and environmental issues of plastic trees in the landfills vs real trees. Tree farms reduce carbon employ workers and the trees are easily biodegradable. Artificial trees are replaced every 6-8 years End up in l.
- City tree collection and composting is the most efficient and environmentally friendly option, avoiding many cars going to the enviropots. Some people are not able to take trees to the depot. Leaving dead trees on private property may be a fire hazard.

#### **Business Case 27 - Eliminate Planned Security Enhancements**

<b>Responses</b>	<b>Total Responses</b>	<b>% Yes</b>	<b>% No</b>
<b>Online Survey</b>	124	24%	76%
<b>Public Engagement Events</b>	12	67%	33%

#### **Comments/ Feedback Received**

- Reduce library staff.
- To spend on library acquisitions but then not protect those investments is counter-productive.
- I do not support additional security, I support addition library staff, including some trained in mental health and addictions.
- Give libraries whatever they need to succeed! We need them!
- Cuts to security at the Central library is not worth the savings. I have personally experienced many times where security was needed because of belligerent people, physical and verbal assaults on others in and around the library and the main passageway.
- Having been to the central library to use the labs (which are great by the way), it does need the extra security. It may have more impact to have improved mental health outreach and possibly police presence instead of paid security staff.
- This is a necessity beyond Library patrons, but for the betterment of the downtown core.
- Staff and public are handling the fallout of opioid addictions, homelessness.
- I want my libraries to be safe. Enough said.
- Turns out this location was not such a smart idea, eh. CBC should contribute to the cost.
- Bit confused by voting yes no on these ones? Yes eliminate or yes keep?
- A safe library is more important than a lot of other stuff getting funding considerations.
- Safety of staff is very important.
- Why should the library get extra protection that we don't get on Dundas Street. While you are at it. Get rid of the free parking. People can take a bus downtown for free library services.
- Additional security is NEEDED especially at Central.
- What is the nature of the incidents? Why is "more bodies" the solution? Are we talking book theft? Patron-on-patron violence? The mall experiences a vagrancy problem that reflects larger social issues we need to solve. How is mall ownership stepping up?
- The security should be increased.
- Using the library card as a swipe card to gain entry to the library and this will help to see if the library is worth the money to stay open.
- Central Library needs to continue to be a safe place of all residents of the city.
- Security should not be on the cutting area. The libraries are too important to just say (censored) to security.
- Close the central branch altogether. Put the funds into helping homeless people instead.
- Safety should never be cut. Both patrons and staff would be put at risk if this would be cut.
- Please do not eliminate additional security, both patrons and staff need to feel safe and an added guard would help keep Central safe.
- Security is necessary or the problem will get worse.

- Important to keep public institutions safe so would pay extra tax for this
- Close smaller less used branches.
- What are we paying the police for? Increase their presence and the (censored) will scatter. I know, I know...they are busy. I'm sure there's a Timmy's parking lot that can use one less cop "doing paperwork". You pretend we don't see them parked there!!
- Perhaps if we focus more on homelessness and provide free public transit, this will only be required for a short period of time.
- Provide whatever security is needed to make LPL safe and accessible for all.

<b>Business Case 28 - Eliminate Planned Increase in Staffing</b>			
<b>Responses</b>	<b>Total Responses</b>	<b>% Yes</b>	<b>% No</b>
<b>Online Survey</b>	120	32%	68%
<b>Public Engagement Events</b>	11	64%	36%
<b>Comments/ Feedback Received</b>			

- Definitely.
- I have been to many of the public libraries in London and I believe the staffing is sufficient and can even be reduced. A library doesn't need so many staffs.
- Absolutely not. A vibrant city needs staff who are paid livable wages.
- Staff at the library have already been spread thin and have had to work with less. If factored in, vacations and sickness where some locations do not get replacements, and this great community service and resource is not meeting the public demand already!
- The fact the library brought this up willingly is pertinent to that they're aware of the impact it will have on their ability to serve the public. It appears this could be cut for this cycle.
- Additional staff are required to assist patrons to navigate government processes and ensure no one gets left behind in a digital world.
- Put it off a few years but not so much that it impacts hours.
- It's a bit early to make this decision in 2020 for 2023.
- Library staff supports the community in so many ways, make this investment a priority.
- Libraries are crucial support please staff them up.
- Libraries are critical community centres. We should be cutting from police, not libraries.
- Reduce services if you have to. Hire more competent people that can for more efficiently.
- I would to understand the existing staff ratio, what is desirable, where we are today, and why this needs fixing. E.g. presently LPL has 1:1M staff ratio. Successful libraries demonstrate x ratio. These staffers will provide shifts and branches.
- The library provides a range of services that go far beyond lending books. Adequate numbers of staff to continue to support and develop these services is essential.
- If the current staff worked harder and stopped browsing social media, they would get more done.
- Close some smaller less utilized branches.
- Pay now, or pay later. Low bodies = overtime for existing employees.
- I don't want to get rid of the library, but lets be real. We don't need more people to help watch people read the newspaper.
- LPL is a wonderful community resource, providing valuable services. Increase staffing and programs. I save hundreds of dollars a year on books alone. Glad to support literacy and appreciation of culture and learning.

<b>Business Case 29 - Promissory Note Forgiveness</b>			
<b>Responses</b>	<b>Total Responses</b>	<b>% Yes</b>	<b>% No</b>
<b>Online Survey</b>	113	32%	68%
<b>Public Engagement Events</b>	11	73%	27%
<b>Comments/ Feedback Received</b>			

- Library.
- I support the promissory note forgiveness but and confused about the wording of this question!
- Perhaps alternate arrangements could be made for the planned payments to both reduce their budget and still ensure the money is eventually repaid.

- The city and its public services should already be working together to prevent additional incurred costs to their individual budgets. Previously approved Council decisions should not be rescinded, creating more loss of time and money. Not justifiable.
- All part of the same team...
- it is all consolidated anyway
- They need to find the funds within their budget & pay the money back as promised. Poor management
- Or forgive a portion of the note.
- Indifferent
- Make the Library accountable and if they have to cut service so be it. We can't afford it. They could charge \$20 for library cards. Why does everything have to be free.
- The city shouldn't make interest on money borrowed by another essential city services. ..when that city service gets its money from the city.. seems counterproductive.
- What? Why? Bostwick is a phenomenally successful center in terms of patron use. How did we get into this without adequate finances? How is the YMCA helping carry this burden? How does shuffling money between the city/library help? Not clear.
- This question is worded funny - but I support the library!
- Seems redundant
- The shouldn't have built this if they couldn't pay for it. It should absolutely stay on the books.
- City Library should be supported as much as possible, should be seen as information stewards.
- Forgive half of it.
- Make it up by closing some older less used branches.
- Forgive the note, let the library have the money and forget the interest. LPL is part of the city, not a separate for-profit entity, and Council already approved the expenditure. This promissory note is just an accounting trick.

#### Business Case 30 - Wi-Fi Hotspot Lending Program

Responses	Total Responses	% Yes	% No
Online Survey	116	25%	75%
Public Engagement Events	10	80%	20%

#### Comments/ Feedback Received

- Elimination
- Do not eliminate this program.
- This would not hurt someone like me, with a fairly comfortable income. It would impact poor people. Come on! Really?
- It's a luxury item, not an essential need; therefore eliminate it.
- Cutting services to the most vulnerable people in this city should not even be on the table. Internet service is essential for everyday life and only makes it worse for those who can't afford it. It is a way of life and will marginalize lower income folks.
- Without knowing the technical details of the program (IE: is the access fully unrestricted?) I can't support the program one way or the other.
- Because people have to come to the library if they can't afford a connection and they are filling out government forms with their personal info available for everyone to see.
- Depends on whether community /recreation centres get public access to wifi then this wouldn't be needed.
- Province should fund for school children.
- With on-line classes mandated for high school students in the future, libraries will be looked at for solutions. Keep looking for solutions but don't stop the program.
- Yes please keep this program
- Should be funded by one of many local internet companies.
- I think we should keep this and get rid of the WiFi in Community Centres (business case # 24). People should be able to use internet in their own homes and this gives the least able to afford internet dignity in using it in their own home.
- There is free internet available in lots of places. This is actually a bizarre program. No reason the lady going to Fanshawe can't use the Fanshawe internet.
- No wifi hotspot lending is essential in today's world do not eliminate
- Only have it available to the patrons in the library not to take it home.
- The library is too important a resource to be having its funding cut in this manner. I would look elsewhere- the Police Service eats up way more resources. I know it is important

but at 8 times the level of other programs in some cases?

- This service is important for enabling those who cannot afford home internet access to fully participate in society (i.e. complete online forms, take e-courses, etc.). This is not a frill.
- With the province talking about forcing eLearning down peoples throats this becomes a more important service to provide.
- I support all library programs.
- But should get private sector to fund most of this. Discounts from Telco's and some advertising.
- There is free wifi in most public places. Keep in main branches only.
- Not the city's job to fund social media posts.
- Re-word this. Are you getting rid of the Wifi or continuing it? This is telling you what wifi is used for and could go either way. I see it says 'reduction" but it it "yes" to the reduction or "No" i don't want the reduction?
- I am in favour of publicly owned Internet services at low cost to users. Sounds like this is the next best thing to postal internet. Keep it!

#### Business Case 31 - Multi-Residential Sector Fee Increase for Waste Collection

Responses	Total Responses	% Yes	% No
Online Survey	114	45%	55%
Public Engagement Events	12	67%	33%

#### Comments/ Feedback Received

- Increase the cost
- It should be mandatory for high-rise buildings to comply.
- Large apartment corporations in the rental business make enough money to afford to contribute to their waste and recycling collection. This is a sound proposal for increasing fees.
- If the savings are put towards waste diversion in the multi-residential buildings I think this is worthwhile (i.e. organic waste collection).
- I think this fee increase should only be made to non low-income housing. Most high rises have these sorts of fees built into 'condo' fees, that may not be there for residents who can barely afford their rent.
- This just passes cost by other means.
- Long overdue. In many other cities, collection is paid for by the building owners from private contractors. Also should up dumping fees.
- If I understand this correctly the City provides this service for free? Apartment owners should be paying to get rid of their garbage. Other businesses pay so should they.
- In many cities the building owner is responsible for the cost of garbage & recycling. They are making good money on rent and should be paying.
- This is a great idea! The city pickups are probably still cheaper than commercially owned garbage pickups, and businesses that own high-rise buildings can afford an increase on their collection fees + might incentivize them to increase recycling!
- So long as the rates are competitive.
- Charge more for bin rentals.
- Who writes these questions, they are far too confusing. The potential reduction is to increase waste collection fees? An increase in revenue is not a reduction.
- Multi-units already pay higher property taxes than single family, although they use less services. eg. look at the length of road used for apartments. A single family home may use 50' of road/sewers; a multi-unit might use 300' of road for 100+ units.
- Tie it to amount of garbage to encourage reduction & recycling.
- Put more responsibility on the building owners.
- 100% agree. Why should homeowners subsidize millionaire income property businesses?
- 100%. Why are homeowners subsidizing apartment buildings?
- Are they paying property taxes? Go get their garbage within your budget.
- Garbage collection and recycling should be paid for by all taxpayers, not just the owners (and residents, ultimately) of the buildings. If these buildings don't recycle and garbage is not collected, we all suffer. Increase recycling!

### Business Case 32 - Exhibitions and Programs Reduction

Responses	Total Responses	% Yes	% No
Online Survey	111	28%	72%
Public Engagement Events	12	67%	33%

#### Comments/ Feedback Received

- The museum is not used or visited by many Londoners and there is no need to spend more on this at these difficult times.
- It's a luxury, not an essential.
- As always, the Arts suffer the ax at budget time. Museum London and their programs provide good service and education to London, it's schools and LIFE in general for Londoners.
- The Museum is operating on a minimal basis to start with. Programming is mostly for children, which is mostly self-funding. The Museum has already reduced how many exhibitions it strikes annually.
- The museum provides invaluable services to the City. Storage and display of our municipality's rich history and culture must be preserved. Cutting this budget would be detrimental to our growing cultural heritage.
- I think museums are important but when I stack exhibitions against housing or accessing government services I can't do it.
- There are other sources of funding the Museum can rely on - including donors. They should not have undertaken such an elaborate and expensive construction project if they couldn't even support the collections inside.
- Who goes there?
- Why are we cutting library and culture, so far the minor cuts. Why not look for inefficiencies in City Hall? Draw people to the Forks with great programming.
- Museum isn't a place we have gone in 20 years
- Museum London might be able to apply for grants from foundations to make up this revenue.
- Reduce them, we obviously are in a financial disaster and can't afford them.
- What are these budget pressures? Too vague. Need a specific...such as provincial downloading, contractor fee increases...what?
- A couple less exhibits at the museum is not the end of the world. Save that money.
- Exhibitions and programs should not be reduced.
- This public space should be made more use of - such as holding events with small fees and also charging a small fee for non-residents.
- They should increase fees.
- They should be sustainable without tax dollars.
- Cut an executive salary for their 14 hours a week they spend and charge more for the wine & cheeses.
- Do NOT cut LPL programs or services! The value for money spent is high. These are 'green' local jobs too.

### Business Case 33 - Reduce Road Network Improvements for Minor Streets

Responses	Total Responses	% Yes	% No
Online Survey	111	18%	82%
Public Engagement Events	11	64%	36%

#### Comments/ Feedback Received

- If we want to encourage walking, especially by frailer seniors, then our sidewalks must be maintained and repaired. In old north a number of corners have broken and missing concrete and curbs. They present a hazard. Do not reduce this item.
- Seriously? This makes neighbourhoods safer for people who are walking. Why would you ever consider dropping this.
- We have to maintain our infrastructure, not only for logistics of commuting and safety but also for appeal and attracting new residents.
- Essential services such as this should not be cut and every Londoner deserves to have roads, sidewalks and curbs that are kept up to date for safety and security; not just the fancy neighborhoods!
- While I disagree with how roadwork is completed in this city (from planning to the companies hired to do the work) having drivable roads in a city with a second-class

transportation system is necessary.

- This is a basic city service that should be maintained over some of the new investments.
- This is badly needed, especially the sidewalks which are heaving and uneven in many neighbourhoods.
- Please maintain our streets again was confused by yes no on this?
- Our roadwork program is awful. Poor planning and execution.
- Roads are basically a disaster anyways. Why start fixing them now. Just stop putting in speed bumps. We have enough potholes.
- Hiding our "infrastructure debt" by pushing it off is not helping. See the proposed \$1.2B in new infrastructure that we'll eventually have to pay for. We need to own the downstream cost of development and make better decisions about avoiding those costs.
- If you don't maintain the minor streets for pavement rehabilitation, curb repairs, sidewalk upgrades with new sidewalk connections there could be a lot of lawsuits coming to the city from personal injuries to car repairs.
- Road widening projects should be reviewed in light of the Climate Change Emergency and funds should instead be directed to transit, active transportation, and infrastructure for pedestrians and cyclists, not automobiles.
- Have you driven streets in east London? Finally, (censored) is getting stuff fixed. Don't cut this now, east end has been short changed long enough.
- Sidewalk improvements and new sidewalk connections in neighborhoods are important for improving active transportation in the city. This fund should NOT be used for car-related infrastructure.
- Leaving repairs too long will cost more in the long run, so please don't try to save today to up costs tomorrow.
- Repair & upgrade sidewalks, new connections, bike lanes and build traffic calming (chicanes, speed bumps, neck downs).
- But reduce by half and prioritize needs.
- Pay now or pay more later. Civil suits for car damage, trips and falls...
- People pay taxes and deserve proper roads to get to and from work to earn said taxes.
- We pay taxes to ensure our infrastrutucure meets a certain operational standard.
- The condition of the neighbour hood reflects behavior and vice versa. So we must keep our neighborhoods structurally sound to help civic and social civility.
- Streets are used not only by cars but by pedestrians, cyclists, dog-walkers, people with strollers, wheelchairs etc. Maintaining and upgrading sidewalks is important for accessibility. Spend the money.

**Business Case 34 - Transfer portion of Conservation Authority costs to Wastewater & Treatment Budget**

Responses	Total Responses	% Yes	% No
Online Survey	121	36%	64%
Public Engagement Events	8	38%	63%

**Comments/ Feedback Received**

- Just move to hydro bill.
- I would need more info about the implications of this.
- This just changes the focus of payment from all citizens to those who have water bills. Something that benefits all should not be subsidized by one group.
- This is a sound proposal with major savings. As said before, the City and it's Services should already be working together to find savings without cuts to services. Working together always benefits all parties involved and saves doing double duty!
- We don't want a Flint, Michigan situation...
- This is simply hiding the fee somewhere else, taxpayer will still pay the same amount regardless. All this will do will be to encourage further water conservation leading to a starved system and future increases in rates.
- From one pocket to the other - this isn't a savings. Still the same impact to the homeowner.
- Because I don't understand the benefit.
- Not sure how this really matters. Mind you this transfers added costs to institutions like the University and Hospital.
- Yes please transfer UTRCA costs to wastewater rates this is very smart!
- This is simply a reallocation from the tax budget to the Wastewater budget. This will NOT save taxpayers any money!
- This is 'smoke and mirrors'.

- I don't completely understand what this transfer portion relates to - and the paragraph that describes what it does isn't written very clearly or in jargon-free language (what's a net levy?) so I said no - but I don't really know what I'm saying no to.
- You are just hiding things. You did this year ago with sewers. I think this is a fraudulent move. Time to pay the piper and get the City's spending under control .
- Yes, but...what's the benefit of this budget shuffle? How is moving from one bucket to the other going to help? Is Wastewater funded by other mechanisms and is therefore enabling a cost-reduction?
- Of course, the province should be continuing to fund the work of the Conservation Authorities adequately, but since they're not, someone has to pay for this essential service.
- Would the conservation authority then reduce their budget by this amount? Or do they want the same budget without the responsibility?
- This is unclear.
- What's the difference? It all comes from taxpayer.
- I don't understand the accounting here but I support whatever will lead to the speediest improvement of stormwater diversion from the sewage treatment plants. If \$14 a year helps, go ahead. The Conservation Authorities need the money and will use it well.

## **APPENDIX B – PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT EVENT FEEDBACK RECEIVED**

- What is the R.O.I. of widening Wonderland Road? How does this reduce traffic in the City? How does the City propose to increase LTC service levels in order to decrease traffic and also decrease CO2 emissions?
- Why are tax increases always much higher than inflation rate? Salaries!
- Why do we not refurbish City buses instead of buying new ones?
- City Hall is not old, my house was built in 1964 and still serves me well.
- Police budget too high.
- 2.9% - 2.8% - 2.7% - 2.5% - maximum plan.
- Smooth the huge “bump” in business case impact on the front end 2020-2021- no one can afford this!
- Increase the service improvements contribution from City of London from \$1M/year to \$2.5M/year, now – it’s needed.
- More “P3’s” please.
- Hire a City manager with expertise in finding efficiencies and savings, without job loss.
- Excellent info session; it was very encouraging. Don’t stop seeking out ways to be better/help make London better. There is a very real possibility that things may get significantly worse before they get better (hopefully not). The more prepared and resilient we are now, the less we may struggle later. Thank you! Keep up the good work!
- I would like to see the Climate Emergency Action Plan implemented → it is our top priority for our City’s future well-being. All projects should be viewed with a sustainability lens, or else we are not demonstrating compassion and equality to future Londoners.
- Business case 15 Subsidized Transit – good program to get more people on the buses. Many seniors, however, do not need subsidies, and thus money would be better improving subsidies for those in need.
- Strongly endorse all actions to support Climate Action Plan declaration, including reduced road widenings.
- Thank you for the opportunity to attend the public forum. It is important that the Council acts boldly and keep Back to the River in the budget. This is a unique opportunity that utilizes both public and private capital to create a crown jewel. I noticed in the marketing material that pictures of London include the Forks on the Thames. Let’s have some vision – the cost is 0. Let’s Do It!!!
- Please continue to work on improving the core area, and dealing with affordable housing. A great city takes care of its people. Approve – Core Area Action Plan. Approve- Affordable Housing.
- Focus on fixing the homeless issues.
- NO new city hall.
- Find efficiencies in each department.
- 4.3% is too much of an increase per year.
- You may create a further homeless problem if people cannot afford to pay their taxes.
- Seniors are on a fixed income!
- Proposed Bylaw: each budget manager/department must keep a standing file on how to reduce their budget by: a) 5% b) 10% c) 15%. Failure to provide this to the Financial Planning Team will result in a 15% budget reduction over the 4 year planning horizon.
- Fund all affordable & public housing business cases. Please.
- Budget Process: structured change is not a business case. Item #34 does not belong. Please don’t do this again (apples & oranges).
- We cannot afford cuts to transit. At minimum, existing service levels have to be funded. We already lag so many jurisdictions – we can’t fall behind again.
- Police services: 1) should be encouraged/mandated to use more non-police trained personnel, i.e. social workers to assist in dealing with citizens suffering from mental health challenges. Social workers are trained and interested in dealing with this population and are, in general, paid considerable less than police officers. Match training to the requirements of the job. 2) I am a citizen of London – not a civilian and the police are not/ or should not be seen as paramilitary force.
- Why are the taxpayers paying for the costs surrounding the behaviours of UWO students during homecoming – e.g. damage, policing on Broughdale, etc. Is this a problem in other cities and universities? If so how are they dealing with this issue.

- Increase of 5-6% for 2020 in both water and wastewater treatment. No specific item causing this, just increases on several budget lines e.g. “admin” up by 25% does this mean an increase of 5-6% for years 2021 etc.
- Business Case #34, transfer of \$12M(?) for Conservation Authority from main budget to Water Treatment budget. No savings to consumer (taxpayer) less control of item by city council.
- London has declared a climate crisis. Among other responses to the crisis what is status of: Green bins, more user friendly transit especially for older persons, Greening buildings, Encouraging green businesses, why are we buying diesel fueled buses.
- I would suggest preferred procurement practices be adopted in order to encourage and support green enterprise. Also some grant incentives for small business looking to innovate and disrupt in the name of the environment.
- Keep at or below 3 percent still have water and hydro increases – Council do what you were elected to do.
- Use reserve to reduce debt – reserve fund is still taxpayer money – use debt savings to build fund for new City Hall down road.
- Police & Fire Services too high – reduce, don’t have to do “it all”. Do it as you can afford it just like the rest of us!
- Do not use reserve funds!
- Vendor developer costs too high - \$600,000 for “temporary” bike lane on King street – ridiculous!
- Only the most poor should be subsidized for transit - not students of wealthy families, not working people.
- Put Christmas tree in backyard for birds, cut up in spring for leaf yard pick up.
- No proclamations, no sanctuary city – NO PR ON VANITY PROJECTS.
- If the executives and staff of the non-profits made salaries/money they should pay it back.
- Tax Increase should be 2% or less – elected to do this:
  - Expected more from (censored).
  - If you cannot afford it don’t do it.
  - City Budget should be fiscally responsible, balanced, sustainable and eco-friendly.
- Focus on Core City Functions:
  - Infrastructure, roads, sewer, water/waste management etc.
  - Safety fire and crime (base salaries way too high).
  - Is the taxpayer paying for hundreds of salaried workers to attend mass funerals but amount of crime increasing home and car break ins, vandalism, graffiti (justice systems needs to step up here too)
- Savings:
  - Stop vanity and PR projects.
  - Reduce debt deficits (use reduction to save for new City Hall) much later – 20 + years from now.
  - Forks “facelift” a vanity project – forget it.
  - Proclamations, sanctuary city, don’t get mixed in these potential subjective legal messes also waster of city staff time.
  - Audit special interest groups who get city funds – what portion is used for executive and admin salaries and expense accounts when volunteers do all the work – those that do have them fundraise 75% of the costs and have referendum or which get city funding for 25%.
  - Audit and reduce drugs and care (consumption) clinics – costs too high e.g. naloxone kits overpriced.
  - Base/permanent site/mobile more than enough for 3,000 for city size of London with 30 a day.
  - Stop fluoridation of water (ingested) – today toothpaste has fluoride in it.
  - Stop low balling and infusing budget items e.g. BRT costs way more than told.
  - Stop overpaying- vendors and suppliers taking you to cleaners on taxpayers dime e.g. \$600,000 for King Street TEMPORARY bike lane – outrageous.
  - Reduce staff (attrition) and consultants (if needed use Canadian and local, regional where possible).

- Stop using American – 30% increase automatic due to difference in dollar with Canadian.
- Reduce numbers of wards and councillors – far too many for a population of less than 400,000.
- If getting full time salary should be full time position (grandfather existing councillors).
- Developers in London need to step up and do their bit for climate change, city should not give them permits unless they have walkable streetscapes – tree canopy, benches, public courtyards (green spaces)(age and disability friendly).
- Maintain heritage look on existing streetscapes “village” concept, retail bottom, offices, then residential above
- No flood plane development keep as green space.
- Along waterways restore riparian buffer.
- Do not pick up the downloads of the lack of funding from the P.C. Ford Gov.
- Parking fine – increase.
- Greater authority – parking enforcement.
- Garbage pickup every two weeks.
- By-law enforcement – increased.
- Increase transportation fees annually.
- Statistics Canada:
  - Cancer rate Ontario, London only city to increase cancer rate.
  - Landfill site – incinerator, low ceiling, south wind blows, particulates over city.
  - Lungca.org: relates particulates to cancer.
- License plates (and fees) for bikes for reinvestment: Consider licensing bicycle users, the licensing fee revenue could then be invested in bike lanes.
- Would like to know more about the Climate Emergency Declaration Plan.
- City gives away too much money every year. UWO, Fanshawe, London Theatre, RBC, Centre, Children’s Museum, etc.
- London needs to step into the future – and the future is Green. Buses need to be electric and the city needs better public transportation, bike lanes. New projects need to include green roofs, affordable housing as a proportion of it. Trees – trees – trees – too many new projects are removing too many trees – green spaces – build it and they will come. Green Bins Please!!
- Housing – the amount of dilapidated unused buildings in this city is horrible and eyesore. These buildings can be put to good use – refurbished for affordable housing. Empty buildings are blight and these landlords that keep them like that for years on end NEED to be FINED Heavily!
- I know policing is expensive, BUT we need more visible traffic cops. The speeders in school zones is horrendous – tickets equal revenue.
- Speculation of property values, when are we up for assessment? (Justify growth).
- Snowplow.
- Bike lanes.
- The topics were interesting as you know it’s the same issues that were talked about years ago. But new falters are coming in, all the time new standards, rules & what not, it will be nice to see the new rec finished as a child. I used to swim in East Lions pools. That was a good place in ITS TIME, WE NEED MORE ROAD improvements. As for snow removal, I don’t think we need two or three trucks on Trafalgar St. It keeps us awake, also one night the street was clear and a truck was trying to clear it. That was a waste. Keep the good work up.
- Just remember that you have also raised our surcharge on water & sewage. And hydro rates have also gone up.
- Housing is in a state of emergency, basic needs must be met before our most vulnerable can move up in their self-efficacy.

## **APPENDIX C – ONLINE/SOCIAL MEDIA FEEDBACK**

### *Emailed Feedback Received*

- I have a few things to say about the upcoming budget. Firstly, the huge hike in ambulance fees. Where is this coming from? London's population hasn't suddenly grown that much. It would appear that Middlesex county is trying to piggyback their ambulance costs onto ours. Hopefully, city hall isn't (censored) enough to meekly go along with this demand. Then there is that infernal BRT. Tens of millions of taxpayers' dollars to be spent without much to show for it. BRT proponents tell us that along with BRT there will be a smart traffic light system. That system alone will greatly improve traffic flow for a fraction of the cost. The BRT cheerleaders are completely the Richmond St. rail crossing. It really will be "rapid transit" when we're all sitting there waiting for another interminable freight to go crawling by at the speed of a one-legged tortoise - just like a 100 years ago. Ain't tradition grand! CP should be forced to elevate its track enough from east of Adelaide so that dips in the will provide enough headroom for vehicles to pass underneath. These days streets like Waterloo and Colburne, besides Richmond, are rush hour routes, and the idea that all kinds of people should have to sit there widdling their thumbs while another freight goes by is pathetic! BRT does nothing to extend bus service into industrial areas, which would be money far better spent. Considering that the Ford government is downloading costs onto the city and the fact that London's subsidized housing needs over 200 million in repairs, is another good reason to scrap BRT. Any new buses purchased by the LTC should be electric. Such buses might cost somewhat more to buy, but cost a fraction of the money to maintain. Then we've got the poor cops and firemen and their perennial huge demands for more money. Life is such a bite struggling to get by on their \$90,000 a year plus salaries; not to mention benefits that the majority of taxpayers paying for those salaries can only dream of. They need to be told in no uncertain terms if they want a whole lot more people hired, they are going to have to take a salary cut (oh the horror). There's a reason why GM no longer uses two men with a jig to weld the rear door posts in place. Lastly, one has to wonder why there should be any property tax increase at all since every year London's assessment is growing by millions of dollars. Considering what the average new detached home is selling for in London, the property tax per home must be at least \$6,000 or more, considering that new million dollar homes are common these days. Also, there are, what, around 18-20 homes on each new block and then there are all the new condos. None of which are cheap. Keep in mind that yearly out of control tax increases will drive more people to locate in towns around London like Mt. Bridges, Lucan, Thorndale etc. where increases are smaller. Something to keep in mind.
- My husband and I have been residents of Byron for the past 4 years. Before that, we lived near Admiral Drive in the east end. My in-laws live with us, having been moved out of their apartment at Huron & Adelaide when we learned it was unsafe. We have built our family here, and hearing news that city council is preparing a 4% increase in taxes is quite the gut punch in a year that has our daughter entering day care and myself standing against our provincial government as an elementary teacher supporting public education. We are not living beyond our means by ANY means. I would like more information on these increases and what you propose to do with the money. I'm aware of the difficulties this city faces with regards to combatting increased homelessness, addiction, and mental health concerns. I would hope to see dramatic funding in proactive supports and first responder departments, as well as continued subsidies for child care. I will adjust my response accordingly.

### *Feedback Directly Received to City of London Facebook Page via Posts*

- Don't you dare build yourselves a cushy new building while there is a single person living on the street.
- GREEN BOX PROGRAM #LONDON IS CHEAP
- Staying informed is the best plan 🐦
- Perfect reading for when you are trying to fall asleep Christmas Eve lol
- The staffers down at city hall do all the budgeting for the council members anyway, stop the BRT and save a (censored) load of money

- Cut the fluff, stick to city business, stop all social engineering! Nut as and bolts of the city!
- I pay more property taxes in London than I would if I had the same home in Toronto.
- ... and while the politicians repeatedly and publicly state that housing, active transportation and the environment are their top priorities the City of London, Ontario - Municipal Government 2020-23 budget continues to slate \$200 million for road widening.

**Culture** (amounts rounded to the nearest 1,000)

4.1a) That the net 2020-2023 Multi-Year Operating Budget for the following services within Culture BE ADOPTED:

- i. Page 60 - Centennial Hall - \$764,000
- ii. Page 60 - Arts, Culture and Heritage Advisory and Funding - \$9,869,000
- iii. Page 60 - Museum London excluding provincial impacts - \$7,499,000
- iv. Page 60 - Museum London provincial impacts for consideration - \$54,000
- v. Page 60 - Eldon House - \$1,206,000
- vi. Page 60 - Heritage - \$844,000
- vii. Page 60 - London Public Library - \$87,341,000

4.1b) That the 2020-2023 Multi-Year Capital Budget for Culture BE ADOPTED:

- i. Page 62 – Lifecycle Renewal Capital Budget - \$7,984,000
- ii. Page 62 – Growth Capital Budget - \$6,186,000
- iii. Page 62 – Service Improvement Capital Budget - \$0

4.1c) That the 2024-2029 Multi-Year Capital Forecast for Culture BE ADOPTED in principle:

- i. Page 62 – Lifecycle Renewal Capital Forecast - \$15,331,000
- ii. Page 62 – Growth Capital Forecast - \$0
- iii. Page 62 – Service Improvement Capital Forecast - \$0

**Economic Prosperity** (amounts rounded to the nearest \$1,000)

4.2a) That the net 2020-2023 Multi-Year Operating Budget for the following services within Economic Prosperity BE ADOPTED:

- i. Page 71 - Economic Development - \$29,792,000
- ii. Page 71 - Community Improvement/Business Improvement Areas - \$981,000
- iii. Page 71 - RBC Place London - \$2,651,000
- iv. Page 71 - Tourism & Sports Attraction - \$8,254,000
- v. Page 71 - Covent Garden Market - \$0

4.2b) That the 2020-2023 Multi-Year Capital Budget for Economic Prosperity BE ADOPTED:

- i. Page 72 – Lifecycle Renewal Capital Budget - \$3,565,000
- ii. Page 72 – Growth Capital Budget - \$5,150,000
- iii. Page 72 – Service Improvement Capital Budget - \$23,467,000

4.2c) That the 2024-2029 Multi-Year Capital Forecast for Economic Prosperity BE ADOPTED in principle:

- i. Page 72 – Lifecycle Renewal Capital Forecast - \$5,092,000
- ii. Page 72 – Growth Capital Forecast - \$0
- iii. Page 72 – Service Improvement Capital Forecast - \$32,995,000

**Environmental Services** (amounts rounded to the nearest \$1,000)

4.3a) That the net 2020-2023 Multi-Year Operating Budget for the following services within Environmental Services BE ADOPTED:

- i. Page 81 – Kettle Creek Conservation Authority excluding provincial impacts - \$2,199,000
- ii. Page 81 – Kettle Creek Conservation Authority provincial impacts for consideration - \$133,000
- iii. Page 81 – Lower Thames Valley Conservation Authority excluding provincial impacts- \$680,000
- iv. Page 81 – Lower Thames Valley Conservation Authority provincial impacts for consideration - \$19,000
- v. Page 81 – Upper Thames River Conservation Authority excluding provincial impacts - \$16,171,000
- vi. Page 81 – Upper Thames River Conservation Authority provincial impacts for consideration - \$451,000
- vii. Page 80 – Environmental Action Programs and Reporting - \$3,330,000
- viii. Page 80 – Garbage Recycling and Composting - \$82,011,000

4.3b) That the 2020-2023 Multi-Year Capital Budget for Environmental Services BE ADOPTED:

- i. Page 82 – Lifecycle Renewal Capital Budget - \$8,790,000
- ii. Page 82 – Growth Capital Budget - \$0
- iii. Page 82 – Service Improvement Capital Budget - \$51,500,000

4.3c) That the 2024-2029 Multi-Year Capital Forecast for Environmental Services BE ADOPTED in principle:

- i. Page 82 – Lifecycle Renewal Capital Forecast - \$9,315,000
- ii. Page 82 – Growth Capital Forecast - \$20,000,000
- iii. Page 82 – Service Improvement Capital Forecast - \$8,000,000

**Parks, Recreation and Neighbourhood Services** (amounts rounded to the nearest \$1,000)

4.4a) That the net 2020-2023 Multi-Year Operating Budget for the following services within Parks, Recreation and Neighbourhood Services BE ADOPTED:

- i. Page 90 – Neighbourhood and Recreation Services excluding provincial impacts - \$95,041,000
- ii. Page 90 – Neighbourhood and Recreation Services recommended provincial impacts - \$1,206,000
- iii. Page 90 – Neighbourhood and Recreation Services provincial impacts for consideration - \$5,190,000
- iv. Page 90 – Parks and Urban Forestry - \$54,488,000

4.4b) That the 2020-2023 Multi-Year Capital Budget for Parks, Recreation and Neighbourhood Services BE ADOPTED:

- i. Page 91 – Lifecycle Renewal Capital Budget - \$39,673,000
- ii. Page 91 – Growth Capital Budget - \$77,738,000
- iii. Page 91 – Service Improvement Capital Budget - \$11,026,000

4.4c) That the 2024-2029 Multi-Year Capital Forecast for Parks, Recreation and Neighbourhood Services BE ADOPTED in principle:

- i. Page 91 – Lifecycle Renewal Capital Forecast - \$63,504,000
- ii. Page 91 – Growth Capital Forecast - \$36,766,000
- iii. Page 91 – Service Improvement Capital Forecast - \$13,200,000

**Planning and Development Services** (amounts rounded to the nearest \$1,000)

4.5a) That the net 2020-2023 Multi-Year Operating Budget for the following services within Planning and Development Services BE ADOPTED:

- i. Page 99 – Building Approvals - \$(1,821,000)
- ii. Page 99 – Planning Services - \$18,311,000
- iii. Page 99 – Development Services - \$20,277,000

4.5b) That the 2020-2023 Multi-Year Capital Budget for Planning and Development Services BE ADOPTED:

- i. Page 100 – Lifecycle Renewal Capital Budget - \$880,000
- ii. Page 100 – Growth Capital Budget - \$8,344,000
- iii. Page 100 – Service Improvement Capital Budget - \$552,000

4.5c) That the 2024-2029 Multi-Year Capital Forecast for Planning and Development Services BE ADOPTED in principle:

- i. Page 100 – Lifecycle Renewal Capital Forecast - \$1,320,000
- ii. Page 100 – Growth Capital Forecast - \$1,918,000
- iii. Page 100 – Service Improvement Capital Forecast - \$600,000

**Protective Services** (amounts rounded to the nearest \$1,000)

4.6a) That the net 2020-2023 Multi-Year Operating Budget for the following services within Protective Services BE ADOPTED:

- i. Page 108 – Animal Services - \$7,819,000
- ii. Page 108 – By-Law Enforcement and Property Standards - \$6,974,000
- iii. Page 108 – Corporate Security and Emergency Management - \$10,997,000
- iv. Page 108 – Fire Services - \$269,934,000
- v. Page 108 – London Police Services excluding provincial impacts - \$474,150,000
- vi. Page 108 – London Police Services provincial impacts for consideration - \$2,554,000

4.6b) That the 2020-2023 Multi-Year Capital Budget for Protective Services BE ADOPTED:

- i. Page 110 – Lifecycle Renewal Capital Budget - \$37,173,000
- ii. Page 110 – Growth Capital Budget - \$46,389,000
- iii. Page 110 – Service Improvement Capital Budget - \$8,411,000

4.6c) That the 2024-2029 Multi-Year Capital Forecast for Protective Services BE ADOPTED in principle:

- i. Page 110 – Lifecycle Renewal Capital Forecast - \$63,848,000
- ii. Page 110 – Growth Capital Forecast - \$40,258,000
- iii. Page 110 – Service Improvement Capital Forecast - \$6,696,000

**Social and Health Services** (amounts rounded to the nearest \$1,000)

4.7a) That the net 2020-2023 Multi-Year Operating Budget for the following services within Social and Health Services BE ADOPTED:

- i. Page 121 – Housing Services - \$47,721,000
- ii. Page 121 – Housing Development Corporation - \$9,689,000
- iii. Page 121 – London and Middlesex Community Housing - \$47,923,000
- iv. Page 121 – Long Term Care - \$21,494,000
- v. Page 121 – Land Ambulance - \$101,860,000
- vi. Page 122 – Middlesex-London Health Unit excluding provincial impacts - \$24,380,000
- vii. Page 122 – Middlesex- London Health Unit recommended provincial impacts - \$2,438,000
- viii. Page 122 – Social and Community Support Services excluding provincial impacts - \$65,672,000
- ix. Page 122 – Social and Community Support Services provincial impacts for consideration - \$6,249,000

4.7b) That the 2020-2023 Multi-Year Capital Budget for Social and Health Services BE ADOPTED:

- i. Page 123 – Lifecycle Renewal Capital Budget - \$11,217,000
- ii. Page 123 – Growth Capital Budget - \$0
- iii. Page 123 – Service Improvement Capital Budget - \$3,750,000

4.7c) That the 2024-2029 Multi-Year Capital Forecast for Social and Health Services BE ADOPTED in principle:

- i. Page 123 – Lifecycle Renewal Capital Forecast - \$17,636,000
- ii. Page 123 – Growth Capital Forecast - \$0
- iii. Page 123 – Service Improvement Capital Forecast - \$5,000,000

**Transportation Services** (amounts rounded to the nearest \$1,000)

4.8a) That the net 2020-2023 Multi-Year Operating Budget for the following services within Transportation Services BE ADOPTED:

- i. Page 131 – Parking - \$(15,051,000)
- ii. Page 131 – London Transit Commission excluding provincial impacts - \$136,505,000
- iii. Page 131 – London Transit Commission provincial impacts for consideration - \$21,926,000
- iv. Page 131 – Roadways - \$183,961,000
- v. Page 131 – Rapid Transit - \$0

4.8b) That the 2020-2023 Multi-Year Capital Budget for Transportation Services BE ADOPTED:

- i. Page 133 – Lifecycle Renewal Capital Budget - \$219,206,000
- ii. Page 133 – Growth Capital Budget - \$506,826,000
- iii. Page 133 – Service Improvement Capital Budget - \$18,295,000

4.8c) That the 2024-2029 Multi-Year Capital Forecast for Transportation Services BE ADOPTED in principle:

- i. Page 133 – Lifecycle Renewal Capital Forecast - \$342,678,000
- ii. Page 133 – Growth Capital Forecast - \$543,499,000
- iii. Page 133 – Service Improvement Capital Forecast - \$7,800,000

**Corporate, Operational and Council Services** (amounts rounded to the nearest \$1,000)

4.9a) That the net 2020-2023 Multi-Year Operating Budget for the following services within Corporate, Operational and Council Services BE ADOPTED:

- i. Page 142 – Corporate Services - \$238,396,000
- ii. Page 142 – Corporate Planning and Administration - \$8,623,000
- iii. Page 142 – Council Services - \$15,812,000
- iv. Page 142 – Public Support Services - \$9,860,000

4.9b) That the 2020-2023 Multi-Year Capital Budget for Corporate, Operational and Council Services BE ADOPTED:

- i. Page 143 – Lifecycle Renewal Capital Budget - \$51,726,000
- ii. Page 143 – Growth Capital Budget - \$0
- iii. Page 143 – Service Improvement Capital Budget - \$5,135,000

4.9c) That the 2024-2029 Multi-Year Capital Forecast for Corporate, Operational and Council Services BE ADOPTED in principle:

- i. Page 143 – Lifecycle Renewal Capital Forecast - \$79,180,000
- ii. Page 143 – Growth Capital Forecast - \$0
- iii. Page 143 – Service Improvement Capital Forecast - \$3,000,000

**Financial Management** (amounts rounded to the nearest \$1,000)

4.10a) That the net 2020-2023 Multi-Year Operating Budget for the following within Financial Management BE ADOPTED:

- i. Page 149 – Capital Levy - \$199,716,000
- ii. Page 149 – Debt Servicing - \$139,244,000
- iii. Page 149 – Contributions to Capital Reserve Funds - \$110,033,000
- iv. Page 149 – Contingencies - \$72,534,000
- v. Page 149 – Other Corporate Revenue and Expenditures - \$(59,806,000)
- vi. Page 149 – Finance - \$26,041,000

**Business Cases for Reductions** (amounts rounded to the nearest \$1,000)

4.11) That the following 2020-2023 Multi-Year Budget business cases for potential net levy reductions BE CONSIDERED:

- i. Business Case 26 – Eliminate Curbside Christmas Tree Collection - 2020-2023 Total Investment (\$120,000); Net Levy (\$120,000)
- ii. Business Case 27 - London Public Library - Eliminate Planned Security Enhancements – 2020-2023 Total Investment (\$107,000); Net Levy (\$107,000)
- iii. Business Case 28 - London Public Library - Eliminate Planned Staffing Increase – 2020-2023 Total Investment (\$42,000); Net Levy (\$42,000)
- iv. Business Case 29 - London Public Library – Promissory Note Forgiveness - 2020- 2023 Total Investment (\$912,000); Net Levy (\$717,000)
- v. Business Case 30 - London Public Library - Wi-Fi Hotspot Lending Program – 2020-2023 Total Investment (\$188,000); Net Levy (\$188,000)
- vi. Business Case 31 - Multi-Residential Sector Fee Increase for Waste Collection – 2020-2023 Total Investment \$0; Net Levy (\$900,000)
- vii. Business Case 32 - Museum London - Exhibitions and Programs Reductions - 2020-2023 Total Investment (\$236,000); Net Levy (\$236,000)
- viii. Business Case 33 - Reduce Road Network Improvements for Minor Streets – 2020-2023 Total Investment (\$3,200,000); Net Levy (\$3,200,000)
- ix. Business Case 34 - Transfer portion of Conservation Authority costs to Wastewater & Treatment Budget – 2020-2023 Total Investment (\$11,544,000); Net Levy (\$11,554,000)

**Business Cases for Additional Investments** (amounts rounded to the nearest \$1,000)

4.12) That the following 2020-2023 Multi-Year Budget business cases for additional investment that Civic Administration has prioritized BE APPROVED:

- i. Business Case 1 – 60% Waste Diversion Action Plan – 2020-2023 Total: Investment \$17,600,000; Net Levy \$17,600,000
- ii. Business Case 2 – Affordable Housing Community Improvement Plan – 2020-2023 Total: Investment \$4,772,000; Net Levy \$772,000
- iii. Business Case 3A – Back to the River – Forks with Outlook – 2020-2023 Total: Investment \$12,403,000; Net Levy \$0
- iv. Business Case 3B – Back to the River – One River Environmental Assessment Management Implementation – 2020-2023 Total: Investment \$1,250,000; Net Levy \$0
- v. Business Case 3C – Back to the River – SoHo Environmental Assessment – 2020-2023 Total: Investment \$500,000; Net Levy \$0
- vi. Business Case 4A – City of London Infrastructure Gap – 2020-2023 Total: Investment \$3,000,000; Net Levy \$3,000,000
- vii. Business Case 5A – Climate Emergency Declaration – Develop Action Plan – 2020-2023 Total: Investment \$50,000; Net Levy \$0
- viii. Business Case 6 – Coordinated Informed Response – 2020-2023 Total: Investment \$6,703,000; Net Levy \$6,703,000
- ix. Business Case 7A – Core Area Action Plan – 2020-2023 Total: Investment \$16,385,000; Net Levy \$9,320,000
- x. Business Case 8 – Dearness Home Auditorium Expansion - 2020-2023 Total: Investment \$2,456,000; Net Levy \$518,000
- xi. Business Case 9 – Fanshawe College Innovation Village – 2020-2023 Total: Investment \$3,000,000; Net Levy \$0
- xii. Business Case 10A – HDC Funding for Affordable Housing - 2020-2023 Total: Investment \$850,000; Net Levy \$850,000
- xiii. Business Case 11A – Information Systems – Development Application Tracking Software – 2020-2023 Total: Investment \$3,900,000; Net Levy \$0
- xiv. Business Case 11B – Information Systems – Human Capital Management System – 2020-2023 Total: Investment \$1,230,000; Net Levy \$732,000
- xv. Business Case 12 – LMCH Infrastructure Gap – 2020-2023 Total: Investment \$15,518,000; Net Levy \$5,000,000
- xvi. Business Case 13 – Master Accommodation Plan – 2020-2023 Total: Investment \$13,000,000; Net Levy \$0
- xvii. Business Case 14 – Operations Master Plan 2020 – 2020-2023 Total: Investment \$5,118,000; Net Levy \$0
- xviii. Business Case 15 – Subsidized Transit Program – 2020-2023 Total: Investment \$3,608,000; Net Levy \$964,000
- xix. Business Case 16 – T-Block Replacement/New Storage Building – 2020-2023 Total: Investment \$901,000; Net Levy \$0

**Business Cases for Additional Investment** (amounts rounded to the nearest \$1,000)

4.13) That the following 2020-2023 Multi-Year Budget business cases for additional investment for Council's consideration BE CONSIDERED:

- i. Business Case 4B – City of London Infrastructure Gap – 2020-2023 Total: Investment \$17,563,000; Net Levy \$17,563,000
- ii. Business Case 5B – Climate Emergency Declaration – Implementation – 2020-2023 Total: Investment \$1,295,000; Net Levy \$1,044,000
- iii. Business Case 7B – Core Area Action Plan – 2020-2023 Total: Investment \$9,775,000; Net Levy \$9,625,000
- iv. Business Case 10B – HDC Funding for Affordable Housing – 2020-2023 Total: Investment \$2,800,000; Net Levy \$2,800,000
- v. Business Case 17A – Community Improvement Plan – Community Building Projects – 2020-2023 Total: Investment \$160,000; Net Levy \$160,000
- vi. Business Case 17B – Community Improvement Plan – Land Acquisition – 2020-2023 Total: Investment \$400,000; Net Levy \$400,000
- vii. Business Case 18 – LMCH Co-Investment with CMHC – 2020-2023 Total: Investment \$20,229,000; Net Levy \$7,777,000
- viii. Business Case 19 – LMCH Operating Staffing & Security – 2020-2023 Total: Investment \$6,941,000; Net Levy \$5,675,000
- ix. Business Case 20 – London Public Library - Collections – 2020-2023 Total: Investment \$600,000; Net Levy \$600,000
- x. Business Case 21 – Regeneration of Public Housing – 2020-2023 Total: Investment \$5,250,000; Net Levy \$5,250,000
- xi. Business Case 22 – Smart City Strategy – 2020-2023 Total: Investment \$466,000; Net Levy \$466,000
- xii. Business Case 23 – Street Light Local Improvement – 2020-2023 Total: Investment \$832,000; Net Levy \$512,000
- xiii. Business Case 24 – WIFI in Recreation Centres for the Public – 2020-2023 Total: Investment \$155,000; Net Levy \$0
- xiv. Business Case 25 – Winter Maintenance Program Support – 2020-2023 Total: Investment \$4,220,000; Net Levy \$4,220,000

4.14) That the following 2020-2023 Multi-Year Budget overviews BE RECEIVED for information:

- i. Reserve and Reserve Funds Overview (Page 150)
- ii. Debt Overview (Page 158)

4.15) That the reconciliation of the tabled budget to the Public Sector Accounting Board financial statement budget BE RECEIVED for information (Page 215)

4.16) That the following actions be taken with respect to the 2020-2023 Multi-Year Budget:

- i. The 2020-2023 corporate tax levy BE ADOPTED in the amount of **\$TBD**, which represents an approximate average annual increase of **TBD%** from rates; and 2020-2023 gross expenditures equal to **\$TBD**
- ii. The 2020 corporate tax levy BE ADOPTED in the amount of **\$TBD** after recognizing **\$TBD** of increased taxation from assessment growth; and 2020 gross expenditures equal to **\$TBD**
- iii. That Civic Administration BE DIRECTED to bring forward any necessary by-laws regarding the operating and capital budgets for introduction at Municipal Council
- iv. That the Managing Director, Corporate Services and City Treasurer, Chief Financial Officer and the City Clerk BE INSTRUCTED to prepare the 2020-2023 Tax Levy By-law for introduction and enactment by the Municipal Council at the appropriate time.

## **Water and Wastewater & Treatment**

4.17a-f) That the following actions be taken with respect to the 2020-2023 Operating Budgets and 2020-2023 Capital Budgets and associated forecasts for Water and Wastewater & Treatment Services:

- i. The 2020-2023 Operating Budget for Water Services BE ADOPTED as submitted (page 34 - \$356,452,000);
- ii. The 2020-2023 Capital Budget for Water Services BE ADOPTED as submitted (page 38 - \$200,773,000);
- iii. The 2024-2029 Capital Forecast for Water Services BE ADOPTED in principle (page 38 - \$278,507,000);

it being noted that all rates and charges related to the provision of Water Services were increased by 2.5% effective January 1, 2020 as approved by Council on November 26, 2019.

- iv. The 2020-2023 Operating Budget for Wastewater & Treatment Services BE ADOPTED as submitted (page 44 - \$436,096,000);
- v. The 2020-2023 Capital Budget for Wastewater & Treatment Services BE ADOPTED as submitted (page 45 - \$364,721,000);
- vi. The 2024-2029 Capital Forecast for Wastewater & Treatment Services BE ADOPTED in principle (page 49 - \$571,640,000);

it being noted that all rates and charges related to the provision of Wastewater & Treatment Services were increased by 2.5% effective January 1, 2020 as approved by Council on November 26, 2019.

4.17g) That the following 2020-2023 Multi-Year Budget overviews BE RECEIVED for information:

- i. Reserves/Reserve Funds Overview (Page 57)
- ii. Debt Overview (Page 63)

4.17h) That the reconciliations of the tabled budgets to the Public Sector Accounting Board financial statement budget BE RECEIVED for information (Water - Page 84 and Wastewater & Treatment - Page 88)