



Adam A. Donaldson @adamadonaldson

Jan 25 · 146 tweets · [adamadonaldson/status/1618303098526773249](https://twitter.com/adamadonaldson/status/1618303098526773249)

Starting a new thread for the debate now that Mayor Guthrie has called the meeting order again. It's time to make decisions!



Guthrie opens with some "foundational" comments. He thanks everyone who got us this far and acknowledges the new councillors who are proverbially drinking from a firehouse. He also gives high marks of professionalism and respect, and wants to keep that up.

Guthrie says that council may win some motions and lose some motions, but take the vote and move on. He's looking for unanimous vote on the budget to send a message to the community though he respects any councillor that can't support. Also, more "We" less "Me".

Cllr Gibson asks of council can offer some Qs for staff separate from any additional motions. Guthrie says, "Of course."

Gibson asks how the City benefit from high interest rates on short-term investment? DCAO Lee says it's benefiting on the operating side where inflation is hitting the City the hardest.

Gibson asks how the budget policy guided the presentation of the budget this year, he felt like there was some missing reporting requirements. Baker says they tried to reflect every change in the budget docs and presentation...

Lots of complexities in capital, too much for the budget docs so with the delegated authority that staff had gotten last year they outline the complete breakdown on budget dashboard.

Gibson notes that as complicated as it was for staff to present, it was harder for council to put the pieces together since they're not living the budget any day.

Busuttil asks about where the funding came from for the mayor's downtown group, and the the process for its approval. Guthrie says it was a supportive motion because anyone on council can set up a task force on anything.

The \$50k for Welcoming Streets, Guthrie says, was separate from the creation of the task force. There were no terms of reference because it was not a City-mandated committee.

Busuttill says that she has some concerns about the procedure and transparency around the creation of the task force. Guthrie says he takes some offences to that because that there are minutes and materials are shared with the community. Also, not sure how this is a budget thing.

Guthrie looks to the Clerk, and at the July meeting there was a motion to spend up to \$100,000 but it was ultimately defeated. A separate motion to spend an extra \$50k on Welcoming Streets was then passed.

On the arrangement between the City and the County, Clack-Bush outlines that the County is the City's social services provider for prescribed provincially-mandated services. Also, the City provides ambulance services to the City.

Something like the funding recently approved for Royal City Mission is discretionary, the City doesn't have to provide that, but they decided to in community interest.

Goller/Allt move main motion:

Recommendation:

That the following recommendations be approved:

1. That the 2023 operating budget be readopted as amended at a gross expenditure budget of \$508,599,380 with a 2023 property tax and payment-in-lieu of taxes levy requirement of \$297,280,030 or 4.96 per cent over 2022 inclusive of the following:
 - a. City service budget requirement, net of the proportionate share of assessment growth, totalling an increased net levy requirement in 2023 of \$9,083,317 or 3.25 per cent inclusive of the following:
 - i. Increase of \$2,413,429 for in-year Council decisions related to Mayor and Council compensation, Property and Assessed Clean Energy Program, Municipal Accommodations Tax, Farmer's Market transition to 10C and costs to implement Bill 109.
 - ii. Increase of \$1,980,000 for new legislation requirements including increased capital transfers of \$1,000,000 to fund preliminary impacts of Bill 23 and an increased benefit of \$980,000 related to changing eligibility for the Ontario Municipal Employees Retirement System.
 - iii. Elimination of the \$500,000 transfer to the Affordable Housing reserve in response to exemptions outlined in Bill 23.
 - iv. Reduction of \$469,000 for phase-in of South End Community Centre and Baker District Redevelopment.
 - v. Increased funding of \$1,255,830 through other revenues and grants associated with the Property and Assessed Clean Energy Program and Municipal Accommodations Tax.
 - vi. Additional assessment growth revenue of \$594,831.
 - vii. Transfers from the Tourism Municipal Accommodation Tax reserve of \$171,910 to support the Municipal Accommodations Tax program.
 - viii. Increased transfers from contingency reserves of \$1,692,109.
 - b. Rates, fees and charges totalling an increased requirement of \$2,517,346 or 2.73 per cent over 2022 inclusive of the following:
 - i. Increased investment of \$600,000 to fund preliminary impacts of Bill 23 including a \$300,000 transfer to the Water Capital reserve and a \$300,000 transfer to the Wastewater Capital reserve.
 - ii. Increased transfers from rate-specific contingency reserves of \$600,000.

- c. Local Boards and Shared Services budget requirement, net of the proportionate share of assessment growth, totalling an increased net levy requirement and in 2023 of \$4,792,488 or 1.71 per cent inclusive of the following:
 - i. Additional assessment growth revenue of \$292,977.
- d. Total transfers to/from Reserve and Reserve Funds in 2023 in accordance with the Reserve and Reserve Fund summary.
2. That the temporary pressures of inflation and increasing expenses resulting from supply chain challenges be offset by temporary operating surpluses experienced from tight labour markets and increased investment income, and that any shortfall be funded through the City's Tax Rate Operating Contingency reserve in 2023.
3. That the 2024-2025 operating budget forecast and the 2026 inflationary budget forecast be received for information, with a full four-year multi-year budget planned for 2024-2027.
4. That the 2023 approved capital budget be amended with a net reduction of \$38,751,650 resulting in the gross 2023 capital expenditure budget of \$123,155,500 and the associated operating budget required upon completion of these projects totalling \$1,182,700, be readopted inclusive of the following:
 - a. Funding transfers from capital reserve funds and other sources including partnerships and grants.
5. That the 2024-2031 capital forecast in the gross amount of \$1,736,763,840, be received unchanged as presented in December 2021, with a full 10-year budget and forecast update to be prepared for the 2024-2027 multi-year budget.
6. That the Guelph General Hospital levy in the amount of \$750,000 be budgeted for the third of six years as approved on December 3, 2019 and be funded from the Tax Rate Operating Contingency reserve.
7. That the Downtown Guelph Business Association 2023 budget with gross expenditures of \$719,512, and a total levy of \$679,800 be confirmed as presented on Dec 2, 2021.

First additional motion, and this comes out of the closed meeting earlier and has already been factored into the budget. Passed unanimously.

**Non-Union Municipal Employee Group
Compensation Increase 2023 - 2023-09**



1. That non-union compensation adjustment in the amount of \$1,097,000 be approved for 2023; representing a 1.95 percent adjustment and the associated employee benefits.

Guthrie is starting with motions that might increase the budget and then motions that might decrease it. First, a motion from Goller about the Affordable Housing Reserve. He says we should keep it in till we know the full impact from Bill 23. Downer seconds.

5. 2023 City Budget Confirmation



Motion Councillor Goller

1. To remove staff recommendation 1.a.iii. to remove the elimination of the Affordable Housing reserve transfer adding a levy impact of 0.18 per cent in 2023

Billings suggests that this should be an amendment to iii because otherwise it's contrary to the motion.

- ii. Increase of \$1,980,000 for new legislation requirements including increased capital transfers of \$1,000,000 to fund preliminary impacts of Bill 23 and an increased benefit of \$980,000 related to changing eligibility for the Ontario Municipal Employees Retirement System.
- iii. Elimination of the \$500,000 transfer to the Affordable Housing reserve in response to exemptions outlined in Bill 23.
- iv. Reduction of \$469,000 for phase-in of South End Community Centre and Baker District Redevelopment.
- v. Increased funding of \$1,255,830 through other revenues and grants associated with the Property and Assessed Clean Energy Program and Municipal Accommodations Tax.
- vi. Additional assessment growth revenue of \$594,831.

Guthrie says he's going to let the motion stand, and wants to do a bit more digging on this issue.

Allt asks for the rationale for removing it to being with. Clack-Bush the reserve was meant to incentivise the construction, which is incentivised now by the elimination of fees, the Province is providing the incentive.

Allt asks Goller about what the idea of the terms might be access these funds. Goller says the funds are disposed of by the County, and they know how to best allocate those funds (though he wishes the City had their own expertise).

Clack-Bush that there are terms of reference though previous motions, it was a council directive to have the County advise the City on how to allocate that money and then council votes.

Allt's still struggling with making sure that there's transparency in terms of what we fund and what we don't fund from this account. Maybe he's off base. Clack-Bush says this money goes to Guelph projects with their own RFP, we just refer to the County for housing guidance.

O'Rourke asks if the account is still there. Clack-Bush says yes, but the fund is more or less depleted right now, so unless there's this \$500k injection, they just won't pursue and RFP this year.

O'Rourke says she hears what Goller is saying, but the fact is that Guelph doesn't build housing. Is it not better to work with the County to look at needs & then put a price tag on that? Stewart says his view was that was to deal with DCs up front & now Province has changed that

Stewart suggest that the City needs to look at seeing what the new needs are, and it's also important to note that the City's Public Services is not a social services department and they're struggling to catch up. Need clarity on what the City's role should be.

Downer notes that the reserve came out the Affordable Housing Strategy, and while there does need to be some more, clear direction on what the goals should be, it might send the wrong message to cancel this transfer right now.

Billings notes that the \$500k in savings to the levy from the impacts of Bill 23 is the elimination of this fund because otherwise there is nearly \$2 million in impacts including the part funded from other reserves. Stewart says Billings interpretation is correct

Klassen asks if the City is keeping up with the commitments in the affordable housing strategy. DCAO Holmes says that it's probably outdated, and the City will be looking for an update in advance of 24-27 budget.

Gibson asks if a supportive housing project comes forward in the next year, will the fees there be waved? Staff says not all regulations from Bill 23 have been released, but anything less than 80% of market value built is exempt.

Guthrie asks if there's a way that this can be funded without an impact on the tax rate? Baker suggests that using the 2022 surplus or the tax contingency reserve. Guthrie notes that with all the talk about this being a transition year, this could be a sign for one-time funding.

Guthrie asks if there could be a way to allocate these funds to other fees, like permitting fees. Clack-Bush says that's a possibility.

Billings asks if the expected surplus for 2022 is still around \$9 million? O'Dwyer says that's the expectation, won't know until May when the final report comes in. Clack-Bush says location of dispersed funds depends on when the RFP is issued.

Downer has a suggestion for an amendment that the funding from the contingency reserve. That means we dispatch this issue and then wait for the year-end variance report.

The Downer amendment to the motion (3rd try). Guthrie says they're going to take a breath because it needs some more wordsmithing.

5. 2023 City Budget Confirmation



Amendment Councillor Downer

1. To remove staff recommendation 1.a.iii. to remove the elimination of the Affordable Housing reserve transfer **with funding coming from Tax Rate Operating Contingency Reserve in 2023.**

Guthrie proposes that Goller remove the whole motion and have a clean motion. So all the motions are removed. Goller suggests either a small break or move forward to a new motion. Staff say they have a path: To remove clause iii and then put a motion to add the \$500k.

Billings suggests calling a motion on iii and once it gets defeated have the separate motion. Guthrie says "I will do that."

Goller moves to remove clause 1.a.iii. It passes unanimously.

Guthrie confirms: Since that clause wasn't supported, it's in the based. So Goller moves the \$500k from Tax Operating Reserve for Affordable Housing reserve. That passes.

Next from Goller:

5. 2023 City Budget Confirmation

Motion Councillor Goller



1. To temporarily extend the Kids Ride Free Pilot Program, in 2023, until the upcoming Transit Fare Strategy is approved by Council, at a maximum cost of \$138,911, funded from the Tax Rate Operating Contingency Reserve. If the Kids Ride Free Program is not approved by Council as part of the Transit Fare Strategy, a wind down period of up to 4 months is recommended and would be funded through this allocation.

Allt says that he believes that the second part of the motion should be removed because it's conditional on the first part of the motion failing. Clack-Bush says we want to make sure that if there fare strategy doesn't include the program there's time to wind it down.

Allt says he understands all that, but he thinks it's conjecture, a "what if" scenario. Guthrie agrees with Allt, the second part should be considered in April.

Goller says that he crafted his motions with the assistance of staff, so perhaps Allt can pass a motion to strike that sentence. Clack-Bush says it's no big deal, they wanted to make clear that they couldn't just stop in April if the fare strategy doesn't incl. Kids Ride Free.

Goller withdraws motion and resubmits it with one sentence.

Gibson comments that using the word "free" is not necessarily free because the cost is covered in other places in the budget. Guthrie says that the success of this program is evident, people he met at Shelldale yesterday raved about it.

Goller motion on Kids Ride Free passes unanimously. Next, the sliding scale affordable pass pilot:

5. 2023 City Budget Confirmation

Motion Councillor Goller



1. To approve the Affordable Bus Pass – Sliding Scale Pilot Program to be continued on an ongoing basis at an annual cost of \$458,000 to be added to the base budget in 2024, and to fund 2023 costs totaling \$558,000, including one-time capital costs of \$100,000 and operating costs of \$458,000 from the Tax Rate Operating Contingency Reserve.

Clack-Bush that this is not a fare strategy, this is a subsidy program, which is why they're being handled differently. This is going to be a permanent program, and that permanent spending piece will be figured out in '24-'27 budget.

Gibson asks about how many use the affordable pass given the price tag. Clack-Bush says it's about 1,800 people.

Learn more about the success of these programs as reported by City staff here:



Staff Says New Transit Initiatives Are a Success

Last year during the 2022-23 budget process, council approved two new projects to increase transit use. One of the new programs was a multi-tiered affordable bus pass, and the other was a pilot tha...

<https://guelphpolitico.ca/2022/12/13/staff-says-new-transit-initiatives-are-a-success/>

Billings asks if staff's okay with this being made permanent. Clack-Bush says that they do, and that the clause it written the way it is to be clear that the City is moving to make the program part of the base budget in 2024.

Billings wants the motion to be split into two clauses and Guthrie remarks that this might be complicated the way it's worded. Billings says never mind.

In response to Gibson's talk about subsidising transit more, Downer notes that there are a lot of subsidies that that the City does in various programs.

Motion approved unanimously.

Next motion, which is on Welcoming Streets from Goller/Richardson.

5. 2023 City Budget Confirmation

Motion Councillor Goller



1. To provide an ongoing annual contribution to the Welcoming Streets initiative at a cost of \$202,500 in 2023, with increases considered annually as part of the Community Benefits Agreement process, adding a tax levy impact of 0.07 per cent in 2023.

O'Rourke asks to strike the language in the middle about increases considered annually because it's redundant and part of the CBA process. Billings seconds. Clack-Bush says that's fine, they were just trying to be transparent that this moving away from one-time funding.

The motion is amended unanimously.

Caton asks if this is downtown specific, because there are some business in Victoria area that could benefit. Clack-Bush says they are downtown centric because they most travel on foot, but it's a great program that could be expanded.

Motion approved unanimously on Welcoming Streets.

Now a motion from O'Rourke, to add the \$300k for business development. Klassen seconds.

5. 2023 City Budget Confirmation

Motion Councillor O'Rourke



1. To add \$300,000 for City Building investment: Business Service Agencies Agreements to address the current under-funding of Guelph's business service agencies and help fund services that include consulting, market research, referrals, mentorship for female, BIPOC, student, circular economy, small businesses, and more, with a tax levy impact of 0.11% in 2023.

Caron says she doesn't disagree with the motion, but doesn't like the comment about underfunding. O'Rourke says it's her understanding that we're one of the only municipalities that doesn't fund these groups. Caron says she feels like it doesn't belong there.

Allt asks about the perception of underfunding in these areas. DCAO Holmes notes that this was brought to council last year and it didn't pass, Innovation Guelph is not funded at all and there's limited funding for the Business Centre.

John Regan from Economic Development notes that Guelph's \$35k to the BCGW pales in comparison to the other 57, and for cities our size. So there is a discrepancy.

Caton suggests adding LGBTQ+ and disable communities, or simply adding marginalised groups. O'Rourke suggests that they can streamline the language further, she wanted to give people some idea of what the funding was going to do.

Revised motion:

5. 2023 City Budget Confirmation

Motion Councillor O'Rourke



1. To add \$300,000 for City Building investment to fund Business Service Agencies Agreements that include consulting, market research, referrals, mentorship with a tax levy impact of 0.11% in 2023.

Gibson says he's hearing a lot about the cost of doing business, he came in tonight not wanting to add any thing to the budget, so he answer isn't no, it's not this year.

Guthrie asks if this more the original five-years or is this a one year thing. Holmes says the wording here adds it to the base. Guthrie says this is necessary and it needs to be in the base for maybe beyond the five years.

Passes 11-2 (Gibson and Billings against).

A motion crafted by Guthrie (it's a long one).

5. 2023 City Budget Confirmation

Motion Mayor Guthrie



1. That given the financial impacts expected as a result of changing provincial housing legislation, and the increasingly urgent homelessness, addictions and mental health crisis being felt in our community, staff be directed to assess any identified gaps, while considering the multi-agency and multi-governmental responsibility for these services, and to monitor and report on such impacts before the implementation of the multi-year budget in a stand-alone report outlining any emerging provincial funding opportunities or recommend any potential local governance and service delivery mechanisms for council consideration. And, to help facilitate this work, that staff be authorized to use one time funding in the amount of up to \$150,000 from the tax rate contingency reserve for expertise in this field to help inform next steps. And that staff respectfully request outside agencies, boards and stakeholders involved in this work to collaborate throughout this process.

Downer asks if this is funding for the work of the task force. Guthrie says it will tie in with that group's work, but this is explicitly a City project.

Allt says that this is a good motion because its asking the City to seek out expertise and he didn't want to take part in tacit downloading with the introduction of a levy. Guthrie credits Downer and staff for massaging this out.

Caton asks how this affects the research on Bill 23 impacts. Guthrie says it's about looking at the gaps left by the bill because we don't have the full impact of Bill 23 yet. There's no mention of 23 because MMAH Clark told Guthrie directly that more changes are coming.

/s

Busuttill that research is lacking in any conversation around these issues, and wants to know how this will connect to the Strategic Plan and if these are recommendations for the sector or council.

Stewart says these will be recommendations for council, and staff will engage agencies to get information, it may have to come forward with recommendations after the SP is complete, b/c they don't want to impose a deadline. The goal is to be done by Sept at the latest.

O'Rourke asks if there will be an inventory of different services, b/c there's stuff through CBA, subsidies, wellbeing, etc. Stewart says that's an important part of this and part of this to develop an advocacy plan to the Province backed by data.

Gibson says the first half of the motion seems like something that AMO and intergovernmental should do, so how is this something that different that Guelph has to do?

Guthrie says that AMO or FCM don't understand the Guelph-specific things about CHC or Royal City Mission. There's great collaboration in the community, and we need the local context. Also governance relationship with County is very unique, only a couple like them in Canada,

Stewart says "Ditto" and there's no reason these things can't be shared with AMO, but he doesn't think they're taking a strong enough stance against the Province. This is data, and the City's been asking for an emergency meeting with the Province and it hasn't happened.

Goller asks about leveraging the U of G and the skills there. Stewart says he's not sure, but they can have those conversations.

Vote on the motion passes unanimously.

Guthrie calls for an eight minute break.

So Guthrie calls the meeting back to order.

First amendment to reduce the levy from Billings, an amendment to 1.a.ii. Billings says its with the expectation that a) there's going to be a positive variance for 2022 and/or b) there's going to be funding from the Province to soften blow from Bill 23.

5. 2023 City Budget Confirmation

Motion Councillor Billings



1. That the financial impacts of Bill 23 for 2023 be funded by the Tax Rate Operating Contingency Reserve.

Guthrie says be careful because provincial funding may come with strings and those were only vague promises.

Allt asks Lee for notes, who says that the decision was originally made because they expect the impacts from 2023 to be greater than the \$1 million presented here, and if they are greater the shortfall could be covered by any 2023 variance.

Goller says he's concerned about drawing down the reserves too much with so much unknown. Caron and Downer say "ditto."

Klassen asks if there's a way of using the surplus for 2022 as opposed to the reserve. O'Dwyer says we won't know the final numbers about 2022 till May, so the choice is to pay it though the levy, or the reserve, or defer decision to May.

Billings says this is really about finding \$500,000 because looking to cover the portion that was cancelled when council kept the affordable housing reserve. Gibson asks to amend it with a dollar amount of \$500k.

Lee says their original recommendation is still the staff recommendation because they're worried about all the known unknowns. We need to make provision for the exposure, to put it in financial terms.

"In the amount of \$500,000" is Gibson's amendment to the motion. O'Dwyer, in response to Gibson's query, the current balance for the tax contingency reserve is \$15.7 million after the decisions made today.

5. 2023 City Budget Confirmation

Motion Councillor Billings



1. That the financial impacts of Bill 23 for 2023 be funded by the Tax Rate Operating Contingency Reserve.

Gibson says that given were the reserves once were, he's comfortable with this direction. Amendment (the \$500k addition) passes unanimously.

Klassen asks about the vulnerabilities. Lee says things have changed dramatically with new regs for DCs, parkland, et al. Moving that to the reserves comes with risks, which council can needs to understands even if they decide to walk the riskier course.

Downer says something (meaning 🤡) is going to hit the fan next year if they push off the impacts of Bill 23 because they're not going to away and will likely be worse.

O'Rourke asks about current levy increase. It's 5.14 per cent.

O'Rourke says collecting too much creates positive variance, but it never brings the base down. Suggests that we look to provide rate relief no where the number ends up.

Guthrie says that answering that might put staff in an uncomfortable position because this is more of a political question. O'Rourke rephrases, is there a better place to make a transfer? Baker says there will be the same impact no matter what and the hit still comes in '24.

Allt asks in a normal year what do DCs and parkland bring in. O'Dwyer says DCs was \$21 million. Allt says that could be an offset they're look at at some point, and this is a new normal so there's no certainty. He's worried about depleting reserves.

O'Dwyer notes that Bill 23 won't eliminate DC income, it could shave off \$4 million per year, but there's still no certainty.

Gibson says there's a pattern with this provincial government where they announce something that breaks City business and then walks it back. We might be looking at something similar, and if there's a need to mitigate midyear, staff won't keep that to themselves.

Klassen says "ditto" to some of Gibson's point, but notes Shayani's delegation about how the City is asking a lot but there's a question about what we're giving.

Goller asks about impact on credit rating with impact on reserves. Baker says that's complicated because the rating is based on a number of factors.

Guthrie says he'll support the motion, and reinforces that there are still a lot of unknowns. He's talked to a few mayors and they're not taking Bill 23 into account in this year's budget at all. Perhaps this is more of a strategic plan.

Motion as amended passes 9-4 (Caton, Allt, Downer, Caron vote against).

Motion from Gibson/Billings, and notes that this isn't a pause on the projects, but since the buildings are delayed, we can delay the phase in on costs.

5. 2023 City Budget Confirmation

Motion Councillor Gibson



1. That Council remove \$938,000 phase-in costs for the south end recreation center and new central library from the 2023 operating budget increase. Reducing the 2023 budget increase by 0.34%.

Downer asks if there's a pause on the Baker Street project. Stewart says nothing's been paused yet, and they're still planning for a ground breaking this spring. Downer says that staff have already accounted for these delays by spearing the phase-in over extra year.

Goller asks for an update on levy increase. It's back to 4.96 per cent.

Goller asks if this is another 0.34 per cent shave. O'Dwyer says that's right.

Guthrie asks what happens with the phase in money. Baker says the phased in money will go to the City building reserve fund, so this motion will leave his fund short for 2023 and will report on that later.

Guthrie says he will support the motion, but this is an "eyes wide open moment" for the community because that money's got to come back in at some point. In this year, ratepayers want \$938k to go to something not a fund.

O'Rourke says she's not sure that there's going to be an appetite for .34 when there's already a lot on the plate coming up in 2024. She wants to cut the tax burden, but maybe not at the expense of increasing it later.

Billings asks if the City has received an operating plan for the future budget of the library. Baker says the total Baker operating budget hasn't be received yet. She adds that the number for GPL in the budget is from the KPMG business case.

Gibson says the 2024-27 budget is their own animal, and this is not the first time he's suggesting that things are unsustainable. We don't have a construction timeline for either Baker or SECC, let alone opening date, so shaving a million here seems like a minimum.

Holmes notes that Baker will have a groundbreaking in Q2 (we've never been closer) and that will open in 2026. Report on SECC is coming in March, and that ground breaking could be in Q3 this year with opening in mid-2026.

Caron says the purpose of a phase in is mitigating the impact, and we just spent a lot of time as council talking about Bill 23 and other uncertainties. Planning for impact is also fiscally irresponsible.

Chew said if had it his way, council would just approved what staff recommended. He hasn't been comfortable with a lot of these last minute changes, and there's a lot of expectations on council to finish these projects.

Motion fails 5-8 (Richardson, Allt, Caton, Busuttill, Downer, Caron, O'Rourke, Chew)

Gibson tries to cut the amount by 50 per cent instead.

5. 2023 City Budget Confirmation

Motion Councillor Gibson



1. That Council remove \$938,000 phase-in costs for the south end recreation center and new central library from the 2023 operating budget increase. Reducing the 2023 budget increase by 0.34%.

This also fails 5-8.

Next, a classic Gibson motion. He'd like to send a positive message to the City that while we're pausing the work, we're also pausing the levy.

5. 2023 City Budget Confirmation

Motion Councillor Gibson



1. That council reduce the infrastructure renewal transfer by \$2.8 million in 2023 representing a 1.00% reduction to the overall budget increase.

Allt says one of the major complaints he hears is that our infrastructure is "tired" and he's not sure we can wait, especially when inflation is leaning heavy on construction.

Downer asks staff about the impact. Holmes says there's lots of things that can effect the timing on when something gets fixed or repaired, but the worst condition is when something has to be fixed right away. That's a risk w/o the funds.

Baker adds that capital was benched to the asset management plan, and there's still a big gap between the funding we need and where funding is. We were at 60 per cent, and with inflation the gap will be even more significant and might be down to 40-50% depending on final numbers.

Caton says she appreciates what Gibson is trying to do, but infrastructure keeps getting pushed off and that's something the people expect council to deliver on.

O'Rourke says she understands the pressures, but if this was her RRSP should would be re-thinking paying the whole contribution for this year. Baker say what's in the base is a half-per cent, so it's not even the full amount they should put away.

Gibson says the infrastructure fund is taking shape, and that we can't collect 50 years of city building over 50 years. Also notes that there's a capacity issue in getting all these projects done so there's room to pace.

Holmes points out that while Gibson is correct that water infrastructure is separately funded, the City does try to do all work at one time in one place, and so a project can involve funding from multiple sources.

After Guthrie suggests that he'd be comfortable with half, Billings moves to cut it in half to \$1.4 million. That passes 10-3 with Allt, Caron and Downer against.

Amended motion passes 9-4 with Caton, Allt, Downer and Caron against.

5. 2023 City Budget Confirmation

Motion Councillor Gibson As Amended



1. That council reduce the infrastructure renewal transfer by \$1.4 million in 2023 representing a 0.50% reduction to the overall budget increase.



Anything else before the final vote? Gibson suggests getting finally number and they taking a minute.

4.46 per cent is the new levy.

Okay, so no break, but comments.

O'Rourke says it's important to point out that council has advanced the paramedic master plan. Praises staff for the good job and says she will support this budget through she didn't support it in 2021.

Caron says there's a lot of change in this budget, though it's supposed to be a confirmation budget and a lot of this has been cause be events in the last 12 months. She also compliments staff.

Caron also notes that it's fitting that we're passing a budget on [#RobbieBurnsDay](#) since being a tax collector was his day job.

Allt says he's concerned because this budget should have been more straightforward than it was because of the unknown effects of Bill 23.

We're now on the thank yous.

Gibson says again that bringing three big projects online at the same time - Baker, SECC and Operations Centre - is unsustainable, and he hopes to be proven wrong in the future. He's a no vote.

Guthrie says he feels good about supporting the confirmation, council needs to show that leadership now in the face of challenges. Thanks the community, and says he's looking forward to Strategic Plan discussions and he envisions some crossover with Gibson.

Guthrie adds that he's changed over the years and he sees the value in things and not just the tax increase number and he's happy to vote for the value in this budget.

Budget approved as amended 11-2 (Gibson and Billings against).

This additional motion passed unanimously. It's just a matter of budget reporting.

6. Budget Impacts per Ontario Regulation 284-09 and Budget - Public Sector Accounting Standards Reconciliation 2023, 2023-27

Recommendation:

1. That the Budget Impacts per Ontario Regulation 284/09 and Budget - Public Sector Accounting Standards Reconciliation for the 2023 budget be approved.

Starting with additional motions, including this one from Cllr Caton. It's another urgent SOS for mental health and addictions support

5. 2023 City Budget Confirmation

Motion Councillor Caton



1. That the Council of the City of Guelph repeat the request for help with the urgent crisis on mental health, addiction, and housing in the City of Guelph.
2. That Council call on the Provincial and Federal governments to assist by providing the City with an immediate increase in emergency funding or long-term financial supports to meet the needs of the community.
3. That this resolution be shared with the provincial Minister of Children, Community and Social Services; the provincial Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing; the provincial Minister of Health; the federal Minister of Housing and Diversity and Inclusion; the federal Minister of Employment, Workforce Development and Disability Inclusion; MP Lloyd Longfield; MPP Mike Schreiner; the Association of Municipalities of Ontario (AMO); the Federation of Canadian Municipalities (FCM); the Ontario Big City Mayor's Caucus (OBCM); and, the County of Wellington.

Caton motion passes unanimously.

Motion from Cllr Downer about [#pickleball](#). Clack-Bush says staff is good with this wording and confirms that there is a big community of pickleball fans in the Guelph.

5. 2023 City Budget Confirmation

Motion Councillor Downer



1. That the matter of indoor and outdoor pickleball facilities be referred to staff for consideration in the 2024 budget process.

Busuttill asks to think about the neighbourhood benefit along with the economic one. Also hopes there's conversations with the school boards and other potential partners.

Pickleball motion passes unanimously.

Second motion from Downer. People in the neighbourhood are looking for some assistance developing Dovercliffe since it's a "blank slate" and it's the biggest park in the area. Motion passes unanimously.

5. 2023 City Budget Confirmation

Motion Councillor Downer



1. That the matter of Park Master Plan for Dovercliffe Park be referred to staff for consideration in the 2024 Budget process.

O'Rourke asks if staff might consider zero-based budgeting in a rotating schedule now that we're doing multiyear budgeting. Guthrie says he brought that issue up in his first term as mayor and it's publicly available. Times might have changed though.

Lee says once the 24-27 budget is complete, they can focus off-years to do more continuous improvement. Baker adds that looking forward using tech and better data is a priority, including some more automation.

Bylaws of the week pass unanimously.

that by-laws numbered (2023) - 20758 and (2023) - 20770 are hereby passed.

***7.1**

By-law Number (2023) - 20758

A By-law to adopt the budget for all sums required for 2023 for the purposes of The Corporation of the City of Guelph.

***7.2**

By-law Number (2023) - 20770

A by-law to confirm the proceedings of a meeting of Guelph City Council held January 25, 2023.

With that...



...