



January 18, 2023 Regular Council Meeting

January 18, 2022

Addition to the Agenda Questions received from Council seeking additional information and the corresponding responses provided by staff regarding the January 18, 2023 Council agenda items.

Responses Appreciated Prior to Meeting

9.2.1 Report FIN-2023-001 – 2023 Capital and Operating Budget Update

-p. 204 (OCIF) – Formula Based Component Funding for the 2023 year; what has been the OCIF funding for the past 5 years?; can portions of fund be banked for future road works?

2019 - \$169,421

2020 - \$168,923

2021 - \$168,923

2022 - \$331,262

2023 - \$380,951

Based on a letter received from the Ministry of Infrastructure on December 9, 2022, the following is noted “starting with the 2023 allocations, the formula is being calculated using forward-looking Current Replacement Values (CRVs) and CRV estimates to approximate requirements to maintain municipal core infrastructure assets, instead of closing cost balance values from the Financial Information Return. To fill in any gaps in cases where CRVs for OCIF eligible core infrastructure are not included in a municipality’s asset management plan, or not complete, the Ministry is using its own CRV estimates for those assets. A smoothing mechanism has been implemented to generally limit year-over-year changes in funding within ±15 percent of the 2022 allocations.”

The Township’s increase in 2023 is the maximum 15% increase from 2022 allocations as noted in the Ministry’s letter above.

Yes, based on the funding agreement in place with the Province, saved funds from one funding year must be spent within five funding years of the year the funds were



allocated. For example, if funds are received in 2023, they must be spent by December 31, 2027. The Township does not have any unspent funds as of December 31, 2022 and typically allocates the full funding amount in a given budget year.

-p. 208 the table for a family home shows a county tax rate increase of 4.68% whereas the next two tables and the County's information identifies a tax rate increase of 3.8%; please explain the disparity

The difference relates to the 0% median assessment change for the median/typical farmland property and the median/typical small retail commercial property. The median assessment increase for the median/typical single family home is 0.83% and the median assessment increase for the median/typical standard industrial property is 12.79%. If there is an increase in the median assessment for a property type, that will impact the yearly calculated Township taxes, County taxes, and Education taxes.

Fin 2023-1 page 5, replacement of the electronic sign. My understanding of the direction from Council was that the sign was to be replaced in this term and that third party funding should be explored as a partnership not solely fund the project.

The electronic sign at the PCC has been included for replacement in 2025 to be funded by third party funding sources (ie. provincial/federal grants, donations, fundraising). If this was not Council's direction at the December 7, 2022 Council Meeting, staff will need this clarified at this Council Meeting.

Fin 2023-1 page 5 OCIF funding increase. All of our AMP funding graphs (that indicate we are within the balance directed for the future) did not include the 50k extra we received from the OCIF grant, can we direct that 50k annually to the gravel roads improvement reserve?

This could be a direction of Council – ie. to reduce the Asset Management Discretionary Reserve tax levy contribution by \$50K and redirect those tax levy contributions to the Gravel Roads Improvement Discretionary Reserve for 2023. Staff are not 100% certain that the 2024 OCIF allocation will not decrease. 3 of our local municipalities including the County of Wellington have seen a decrease in their OCIF formula funding from 2022 to 2023. Based on correspondence received from the Ministry on December 7, 2021, it was noted "Please keep in mind that recipient eligibility and future formula component



allocations (i.e. for 2023 and beyond) will be confirmed on an annual basis and should not be assumed.”

Fin 2023-1 page 8. Aggregate levy, is it possible to move the entire amount out of the operating budget and into the Capital budget to reduce the risk to the Municipality if those funds change drastically, that won't have a levy impact ? If that is possible would it be more advised to transfer the funds incrementally vs one large movement ? Could you explain the risk associated with leaving the levy in the operating budget vs having it in the Capital.

Yes, this is possible. This would simply change the proportion of the capital tax levy in comparison to the operating tax levy. The proportion of the tax levy from 2021/2022 approved to 2023 proposed under both options is outlined below:

	<i>2021 approved</i>	<i>2022 approved</i>	<i>2023 proposed based on Report FIN-2023-001</i>	<i>2023 proposed based on 100% of aggregate levy being allocated to capital</i>
<i>Capital Tax Levy</i>	<i>33% - \$1,442,416</i>	<i>31% - \$1,460,100</i>	<i>30% - \$1,503,000</i>	<i>26% - \$1,311,000</i>
<i>Operating Tax Levy</i>	<i>67% - \$2,963,355</i>	<i>69% - \$3,203,288</i>	<i>70% - \$3,466,329</i>	<i>74% - \$3,658,330</i>
<i>Total</i>	<i>100% - \$4,405,771</i>	<i>100% - \$4,663,388</i>	<i>100% - \$4,969,330</i>	<i>100% - \$4,969,330</i>

If the full amount of the 2023 proposed aggregate levy of \$492K was contributed to the aggregate levy discretionary reserve to fund the capital budget, fewer funds from the Asset Management Discretionary Reserve would be required to fund the Capital Budget resulting in a lower amount of tax levy funding being contributed to the Asset Management Discretionary Reserve. This would be a good approach in order to mitigate the risk associated with keeping the aggregate levy in the operating budget if aggregate production decreases significantly in any given year. Staff would prefer the transfer of the funds at one time as opposed to incremental as there is little risk associated with this change.



Council direction would be required to implement this change for the budget that will be presented to the Public at the January 25th Public Information Meeting. This is a good approach and it could be incorporated prior to the final approval of the 2023 budget.

Capital and Operating Budget

- The report discusses the possibility of projecting the aggregate levy shipment contribution in the budget model based on a 5 year average rather than a 10 year average. Can staff comment on whether this is a risk? The year average would equate to 4.4 million however the lowest shipments over the last 5 years have been 4.2 million. Perhaps using the lowest shipments over the past 5 years is more realistic and also less risky? What are staff's thoughts?

The Township has no control over aggregate levy production. The Township's aggregate levy over the last five years is outlined below:

2018 – \$281K
2019 - \$507K
2020 - \$524K
2021 - \$584K
2022 - \$599K

In 2018 and previous years, the aggregate levy was calculated at \$0.06 per tonne. This increased to \$0.12 per tonne in 2019.

Staff believe that the response above regarding allocating the full amount of the 2023 proposed aggregate levy to the aggregate levy discretionary reserve to fund the capital budget would address the risks associated with aggregate shipments being lower in any given year.

- The report indicates the OCIF funding has increased to \$380,951 - almost \$50,000 more than the previous version. This has no tax levy implication as it results in less funds required from the AM discretionary reserve.
At the same time, The proposed budget at this point does not include any additional phasing in of the Cambridge Fire Contract.
If council wanted to phase in a further \$11,410 into the tax levy for Cambridge Fire (which is operating) is there any option to reduce the contribution to the AM reserve



(which is capital) to end up at the same combined tax levy increase while at the same time still maintaining the recommended balance between \$2M and \$4M in the AM Discretionary reserve given that \$50,000 less funds are required from AM Reserve for capital projects based on the increased OCIF funding? In other words, instead of contributing \$1,197,792 to the AM reserve, reduce the contribution to \$1,186,382 which would result in below?

Description	2022 approved budget	2023 proposed budget	Difference
Total Capital Tax Levy	\$1,460,100.00	\$1,491,590.00	\$31,490.00
Total Operating Tax Levy	\$3,203,288.00	\$3,477,739.00	\$274,451.00
Total Municipal Tax Levy	\$4,663,388.00	\$4,969,329.00	\$305,941.00

Yes this could be a direction of Council – ie. to reduce the Asset Management Discretionary Reserve tax levy contribution by \$11,410 and redirect those tax levy contributions to the operating budget to phase in further costs associated with the Cambridge Fire Contract in 2023.

9.3.3 Report ADM-2023-003 – Library Lease – Puslinch Historical Society
-p.328 you may wish to change Union gas to Enbridge

Staff can have this updated in the new contract.

7.2.1 Written Delegation by Helmuth Slisarenko, Kate Dewasha and Bruce Taylor of Concerned Citizens of Puslinch regarding Safety and Maximum Speed Limits in and around Arkell
-question of staff ; what is the timing of the Roads Master Plan to come back to Council?
-can this request be put in the review process cited in the study?

We are finalizing the review/revision of the 2nd draft of the Plan based on council's comments. We hope to have this 2nd draft presented to council Feb-March. If Council is pleased with the second draft, the intent is to then seek public comment. Comments



received along with our consultant's responses where appropriate will then be provided for council's consideration for finalization and endorsement, hopefully in 2nd quarter. Given that the plan has not been finalized and the review process for requests has not been finalized or confirmed, it might be best for residents to wait until that process is determined and finalized.

Safety and Maximum Speed Limits in Arkell

- For the village of Arkell to be designated as a community safety zone – with whom would that decision lie? Would that be a township or a county initiated decision?

This would be a County decision based on criteria that they set across the County

- Currently, the township is working on a Roads Management Plan. This plan, in part, will set out a framework for how speed limit reduction requests are evaluated. The first draft of the plan speaks to considerations for a 40km/h speed limit and the criteria are fairly limited. Is it possible for the next draft of the Roads Master Plan to include a discussion as to the implications of reducing the speed limit to 40km/hr in residential hamlets and plans of subdivision in addition to the criteria proposed in the first draft?

Yes, there will be an aspect of the Plan that deals with speed limit reductions. We can ask that this specific aspect be considered by the consultant. As indicated previously to Council and I believe in the draft Plan, reductions in speed limits are really only effective if regular and consistent enforcement goes hand in hand.

- The south section of Watson Rd and Boreham drive are township roads however, all of Arkell Road and the northern section of Watson Road S are county roads? Are there any opportunities for the county and township to work collaboratively on a speed limit review in the village or does this have to be done separately by each?

The County and the Township would need to do this independently. In terms of Boreham Drive, staff could implement a temporary speed bump trial as was done in other areas of the township to see if it has the desired outcome.



- Reducing the speed of vehicles is understandably not solved by simply changing the speed limit – but it’s a start and it’s something within the townships control – whereas enforcement is not. Could Puslinch consider a pilot project of reducing the speed limit on one road or a small selection of roads to evaluate the effectiveness so that we can use that information when considering future requests?

Staff would defer to the advice of the Township’s traffic consultant on this. Given that the 2nd draft of the Plan will be presented to Council in the next month or two and then go to the public, it may be best to wait until the plan is approved before embarking on speed reduction trials.

7.2.2 10:05 AM Delegation Conservation Halton regarding the 2023 Budget

-p. 193 Municipal Apportionment slide; please comment on the reason behind the change to the apportionment ie. Puslinch has gone up

Conservation Halton will be prepared to further answer this question at the meeting if necessary.

In comparing the annual increase in CVA from 2021 to 2022 for Puslinch and the other municipalities, the CVA for Puslinch has increased at a higher rate than the other municipalities resulting in 2022 in a higher apportionment percentage increase of 5.4% or \$1,271 than the overall percentage increase of 4.7%.

Municipality:	2023 Apportionment (%)	2023 Municipal Funding (\$)	2022 Apportionment (%)	2022 Municipal Funding (\$)	% Increase
Region of Halton	87.9192%	\$9,933,846	87.8985%	\$9,489,203	4.7%
City of Hamilton	7.1961%	\$813,075	7.1904%	776,249	4.7%
Region of Peel	4.6664%	\$527,249	4.6944%	506,790	4.0%
Township of Puslinch	0.2183%	\$24,665	0.2167%	23,394	5.4%
	100%	\$11,298,835	100%	\$10,795,636	

The municipal apportionment calculation has not changed and has used MPAC CVA data for at least over 20 years. MPAC CVA data is updated annually by the province and is used to calculate the apportionment percentage. The portion of Puslinch in the Conservation Halton watershed has not changed in the calculation. The fluctuations in the municipal apportionment percentage would be based on the changes in the CVA data provided.