2016 | MULTI-YEAR 2019 | BUDGET



AMENDMENT FORM - CASE #9

STRATEGIC AREA OF FOCUS: BUILDING A SUSTAINABLE CITY

INVASIVE SPECIES MANAGEMENT STRATEGY

SERVICE: PARKS & NATURAL AREAS PLANNING & DESIGN

SERVICE LEADS: JOHN M. FLEMING, MANAGING DIRECTOR, PLANNING AND CITY PLANNER

TYPE OF AMENDMENT: NEW COUNCIL DIRECTION

Budget Amendment Tax Levy Impact (\$000's)	2016	2017	2018	2019	2016-2019 TOTAL
Expenditure	\$0	\$0	\$350	\$350	\$700
Revenue	\$0	\$0	(\$350)	(\$350)	(\$700)
Net Requested Tax Levy (Cumulative)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Net Incremental Tax Levy	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Annual Tax Levy Impact % 1	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	

Note 1: The tax levy impact is calculated using the approved budget.

AMENDMENT 1: INVASIVE SPECIES MANAGEMENT STRATEGY

Capital Budget Table (\$000's)

Inve	ssive Species Management Strategy	Expenditure						
Invasive Species Management Strategy		2016	2017	2018	2019	2020-2025		
Approved Budget		150	150	150	150	900		
	Cumulative Amendment			350	350			
Rev	ised Budget			500	500	900		
Sou	rce of Financing							
App	roved Budget	(150)	(150)	(150)	(150)	(900)		
လွ	Capital Levy (CL)							
Amendments	Debenture (D)							
upu	Reserve Fund (RF) ¹			(350)	(350)			
me	Other (O)							
٧	Non-tax Supported (NTS)							
Rev	ised Budget			(500)	(500)	(900)		

2026 Capital Gross Expenditure: \$150 2027 Capital Gross Expenditure: \$150

Note 1 – Funded from the Woodland Acquisition & Management Reserve Fund.

Tax Levy Per Cent Impact Table

Tax Levy Impact (Incremental Changes)	2016	2017	2018	2019	2016-2019 Average
Capital Impact	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%

Key Performance Indicator(s) Table

Metrics (Cumulative Changes)	2016	2017	2018	2019
Hectares of Phragmites removed Hectares of Buckthorn removed Number of sites of other invasive species removed		1.1 Ha 47.9 Ha 21	20.0 Ha 40.0 Ha 25	21.0 Ha 42.0 Ha 25

What is the reason for the budget amendment?

Control and eradication of terrestrial invasive species is a key activity in the long-term management of the City's Natural Heritage System. Invasive species are the biggest threat to the sustainability of London's natural areas. Currently, the City carries out invasive species control activities yearly in our Environmentally Significant Areas, woodlands and parks, but the efforts need to be significantly increased.

As part of the City's new Terrestrial Invasive Species Strategy, a budget request is being submitted to increase the funding for invasive species removal from \$150,000 to \$500,000 for 2018 and 2019. Delays in addressing invasive species increases the annual and total costs associated with invasive species management. Council approved the Strategy and referred the budget request to the 2018 budget process on October 3, 2017. A permanent increase in funding for the Strategy will be subject to budget availability in the 2020-2023 Multi Year Budget.

The Invasive Species Management Strategy can be found at:

http://sire.london.ca/mtgviewer.aspx?meetid=1611&doctype=AGENDA (agenda item #8)

2016 | MULTI-YEAR 2019 | BUDGET



AMENDMENT FORM - CASE #12

STRATEGIC AREA OF FOCUS: STRENGTHENING OUR COMMUNITY

INITIATIVE: REALIGNMENT OF GROWTH PARKS PROJECTS

SERVICE(S): PARKS & NATURAL AREAS PLANNING & DESIGN

SERVICE LEAD(S): JOHN M. FLEMING, MANAGING DIRECTOR, PLANNING AND CITY PLANNER

TYPE OF AMENDMENT: COST DRIVER

Budget Amendment Tax Levy Impact (\$000's)	2016	2017	2018	2019	2016-2019 TOTAL
Expenditure	\$0	\$0	(\$1,617)	\$807	(\$810)
Revenue	\$0	\$0	\$1,617	(\$807)	\$810
Net Requested Tax Levy (Cumulative)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Net Incremental Tax Levy	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Annual Tax Levy Impact % 1	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	

Note 1: The tax levy impact is calculated using the approved budget.

Overview

This budget amendment has no impact on the annual tax levy. However, for the purpose of clarity and transparency, changes to the timing of various parks projects are being articulated. These parks projects are tied to development – and thus development charges funding – and are subject to review each year and to change, based on changes in the timing of subdivision development.

AMENDMENT 4: NEW ENVIRONMENTALLY SIGNIFICANT AREAS (ESA'S)

Capital Budget Table (\$000's)

PD'	225318 New ESAs			Expenditure		
PD.	223310 New ESAS	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020-2025
App	proved Budget	0	80	60	260	450
	Cumulative Amendment				(60)	60
Rev	rised Budget			60	200	510
Sou	urce of Financing					
App	proved Budget	0	(80)	(60)	(260)	(450)
S	Capital Levy (CL) ¹				29	(29)
nents	Debenture (D)					
endm	Reserve Fund (RF)					
Ame	Other (O)					
4	Non-tax Supported (NTS) ²				31	(31)
Rev	vised Budget			(60)	(200)	(510)

2026 Capital Gross Expenditure: \$0 2027 Capital Gross Expenditure: \$0

Note 1 – A financing adjustment was required to fund the capital project with capital levy, noting that other financing adjustments result in the overall capital levy allocation remaining unchanged.

Note 2 – Non-tax supported: development charges supported (rate varies depending on location).

Tax Levy Per Cent Impact Table

Tax Levy Impact (Incremental Changes)	2016	2017	2018	2019	2016-2019 Average
Capital Impact	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%

What is the reason(s) for the budget amendment(s)?

Changes in timing of projects to suit the timing of subdivision development. The change means that funding commitments are better aligned with the revised schedule for parkland assumption and subsequent construction. The gross budget amount for the 2016-2025 period has not changed.

AMENDMENT 5: NEW WOODLAND PARKS

Capital Budget Table (\$000's)

PD276518 New Woodland Parks			Expenditure		
FD270316 New Woodland Falks	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020-2025
Approved Budget	100	125	100	400	425
Cumulative Amendment			(100)		100
Revised Budget			0	400	525
Source of Financing					
Approved Budget	(100)	(125)	(100)	(400)	(425)
Capital Levy (CL) 1			23		(23)
Debenture (D)					
Reserve Fund (RF)					
Other (O)					
Non-tax Supported (NTS) ²			77		(77)
Revised Budget			0	(400)	(525)

2026 Capital Gross Expenditure: \$100 2027 Capital Gross Expenditure: \$100

Note 1 – A financing adjustment was required to fund the capital project with capital levy, noting that other financing adjustments result in the overall capital levy allocation remaining unchanged.

Note 2 – Non-tax supported: development charges supported (rate varies depending on location).

Tax Levy Per Cent Impact Table

Tax Levy Impact (Incremental Changes)	2016	2017	2018	2019	2016-2019 Average
Capital Impact	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%

What is the reason(s) for the budget amendment(s)?

Changes in timing of projects to suit the timing of subdivision development. The change means that funding commitments are better aligned with the revised schedule for parkland assumption and subsequent construction. The gross budget amount for the 2016-2025 period has not changed.