Present were: Chair T. Galloway, L. Armstrong, J. Brewer, T. Cowan, D. Craig, J. Haalboom, B. Halloran, R. Kelterborn, G. Lorentz, C. Millar, J. Mitchell, K. Seiling, S. Strickland, J. Wideman and C. Zehr

Members absent: R. Deutschmann

DECLARATIONS OF PECUNIARY INTEREST UNDER THE MUNICIPAL CONFLICT OF INTEREST ACT

None declared.

D. Craig inquired as to how voting will be completed for elements of the budget which encompass Rapid Transit matters, and K. Seiling noted that all members would be able to vote on global budget items such as the Regional Transportation Master Plan; if more specific items arise which require a declaration of conflict of interest on the matter then members will be able to make their declarations and items will be voted on separately.

OPENING REMARKS (T. Galloway)

Chair T. Galloway provided opening remarks to the Committee with regard to the items of business to be dealt with, noting the exception of receiving a delegation on the final budget day and the reasons for allowing such an exception. He complimented staff on doing an extraordinary job in its base budget review, and noted the reduced number of budget issues brought forward for this budget cycle.

DELEGATIONS

a) Alan Grose, Memorial Society of Kitchener/Waterloo and Area re: funeral rates for 2012

A. Grose, Chair of the Memorial Society of Kitchener-Waterloo and Area addressed the Committee with regard to funeral rates. He spoke to the purpose of the Society, related anecdotes pertaining to funeral affordability, and noted local funeral homes and other options where the consumer could obtain comparatively low-cost funeral services. He asserted that increasing the public funding of funerals to $5,500 should not be necessary.

A. Grose provided a handout to the Committee in support of his appearance at the Committee, which is attached to the original minutes.

The Committee ascertained that the Memorial Society does not provide funeral services but rather focuses it's work on public advocacy.

Regional staff provided an update to Appendix F, ‘Information: 2012 Funeral Rates’ of report F-12-002, which is attached to the original minutes.
The Committee obtained clarification from Lee Parent, Manager, Budgets & Financial Services and Mike Schuster, Commissioner, Social Services, of the funeral rate changes proposed with their respective timelines. M. Schuster observed that the Region is ultimately responsible for the funerals of any indigent persons, and emphasized the importance of Council making a policy decision with respect to the funding of low-income funerals.

The Committee questioned Rob Wintonyk, Waterloo Region Funeral Directors, as to how any funerals not funded by the Region would be handled under their proposal and he responded that the funeral home would work with the family on the matter. R. Wintonyk clarified the Funeral Directors' suggestion for the division of responsibilities between the Region and the Funeral Directors. The Committee clarified the manner in which funeral costs are absorbed by funeral homes, and the means by which their clients pay for services. The Committee suggested that the Memorial Society and the Funeral Directors would benefit in meeting and discussing issues of common concern, and representatives of each body indicated their general agreement. The Committee observed the cost-shared nature of funding low-income funerals.

A member of the Committee expressed that a fair solution for all parties involved is needed, recognizing the sensitivity of the issue and the contribution that the Funeral Directors have made toward such funerals in the past. Another member of the Committee related their disagreement with the notion of not providing funding support for low income funerals, expressing that the Region has an obligation to support those who require assistance. Another member of the Committee expressed reluctance at increasing funeral rates, noting that the Region’s present funeral rates are comparable to other municipalities; they also suggested that any Memorandum of Understanding between the Region and Funeral Directors should be seen up front.

The Committee ascertained from M. Schuster that families who received funding assistance for funerals have their choice as to the funeral provider, and that the Region could pursue the option of putting out a request for proposals from funeral providers; staff would require Council direction to pursue an alternate option. The Committee pointed out that the Region’s funeral rates are an upset limit and that not all funerals make use of the full rate. The Committee observed that families are negotiating their rates with the funeral homes, and that the Region’s recoveries differ between situations.

L. Parent explained to the Committee that some funerals are cost-shared with the province, while others are not cost-shared and will always be entirely funded by the Region.

The Committee noted any memorandum of understanding developed between Regional staff and the Funeral Directors would require Council approval.

8. Funeral Rates

MOVED by S. Strickland
SECONDED by T. Cowan

THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve a phased-in approach to increasing funeral rates, subject to Council approval of a Memorandum of Understanding with the Region of Waterloo Funeral Directors to establish the service standards for funerals undertaken under the agreement;

AND THAT the Memorandum of Understanding reflect a phase-in of funeral rates over a three-year period as follows:
AND FURTHER THAT the phased-in funeral rates shall become effective upon completion of the Memorandum of Understanding.

CARRIED

The Committee directed staff to meet with the Kitchener-Waterloo Memorial Society in the process of developing the Memorandum of Understanding to obtain its perspective and consider options that it would be able to suggest.

OPENING REMARKS (M. Murray)

Mike Murray, Chief Administrative Officer, provided remarks to the Committee with regard to the Budget, thanking staff for their efforts in the budget process. He observed that staff had undertaken a capital budget review as well as an employee suggestion program which had yielded significant base budget savings. He emphasized the importance of considering value in meeting the community’s needs, as well as balancing the needs of Regional activities against the constraint of maintaining property taxes at a reasonable level.

BUDGET UPDATE (A. Hinchberger)

a) F-12-002, Executive Summary – Budget 2012

Angela Hinchberger, Acting Chief Financial Officer, provided a presentation to the Committee on the 2012 Budget, including:

- Budget updates;
  - Assessment growth;
  - Fuel costs;
  - Inflation;
  - Ontario Works;
  - Police Services Budget;
- Budget issues;
- Outstanding issues from previous meetings;
  - Gapping;
  - Children’s Services budget;
  - Opportunities Waterloo Region;
  - Economic Development and Promotion budget; and
- Regional tax rate position and impacts to average household.

The presentation is attached to the original minutes.

The Committee obtained clarification on the total amount of the child care fee subsidy budget from M. Schuster.

The Committee discussed the joint galleries’ proposal which was referred to the Economic Development and Promotion Committee, specifically the manner in which a funding increase to
that Committee’s grant budget can be made and how the galleries’ request would be brought forward.

The following items were received for information:

- Responses to Councillors’ Requests information paper;
  - Includes Waterloo Regional Police Services – Base Budget Savings information paper, circulated to the Committee at the meeting;
- Fees & Charges Bylaw information paper;
- Transportation Base Capital Program Long Term Funding Strategy information paper; and
- Municipal Budget Regulations information paper.

Anne Schlorff, Director, Central Resources, responded to a question from the Committee that the fees for oral contraceptives have doubled as a result of increased costs to obtain them from the supplier, as the Region distributes oral contraceptives on a cost-recovery basis.

The Committee obtained detail from A. Hinchberger as to the mechanism by which the Tax Stabilization Reserve Fund is replenished, noting the policy in place for transferring the Region’s surplus.

The Committee learned from Rob Horne, Commissioner, Planning, Housing and Community Services, that a new marketing strategy for Grand River Transit (GRT) will be included in the new GRT five year business plan, a report for which is to be brought forward to Committees on January 31.

Thomas Schmidt, Commissioner, Transportation and Environmental Services, affirmed that sidewalks, trails and cycling infrastructure is included in the asset management plans for the Region’s infrastructure.

MOVED by T. Cowan
SECONDED by S. Strickland

THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve the 2012 Regional Budget as described in report F-12-002.

The Committee proceeded to debate various elements of the budget.

BUDGET RESOLUTIONS

Children’s Services Resolutions

1. Children’s Services

MOVED by S. Strickland
SECONDED by J. Mitchell

THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve an increase of $559,517 in 100% provincial funding with a net levy impact of $0 for the 2012 Children’s Services budget as outlined in Appendix G of Report F-12-002, dated January 18, 2012.

CARRIED

The Committee discussed the request for funding from Opportunities Waterloo Region.
MOVED by K. Seiling
SECONDED by S. Strickland

THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve an adjustment to the 2012 budget to provide funding of $110,000 to Opportunities Waterloo Region, for one year, to be funded from the Capital Levy Reserve Fund.

CARRIED

The Committee discussed the procedure of approving increased funding for Economic Development and Promotion so as to facilitate the joint grant request received from the Region’s galleries on December 14, 2011 and referred to the Economic Development and Promotion Committee. The Committee spoke to the appropriateness of referring the matter to that committee, given its focus on economic development.

MOVED by J. Wideman
SECONDED by D. Craig

THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve an adjustment to the 2012 budget in the amount of $30,000 to increase funding for Economic Development and Promotion, to be funded from the Capital Levy Reserve Fund.

CARRIED

The Committee noted that Joe Steiner, Director, Administration and Finance, Waterloo Regional Police Service, had provided a summary of savings accrued from the Police’s base budget reviews in recent years. The summary is attached to the original minutes.

The Committee spoke to the budgeted vs. actual realized savings from gapping in recent years.

MOVED by J. Wideman
SECONDED by C. Zehr

THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve an adjustment to the 2012 budget to increase the gapping provision in the budget by $150,000.

CARRIED

The Committee discussed the Region’s assessment growth and the efforts of the Municipal Property Assessment Corporation to catch up on obtaining supplementary tax revenues. The Committee discussed the budget vs. actual revenues for supplemental taxes in recent years. A member of the Committee emphasized the importance of maintaining a prudent amount for budgeted supplementary taxes.

MOVED by J. Wideman
SECONDED by C. Zehr

THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve an adjustment to the 2012 budget to increase revenues from supplementary taxes by $300,000, for a total of $2 million.

CARRIED
The Committee considered the Transit for Reduced Income Program, noting that certain non-profit groups in the Region fundraise annually to assist in buying transit passes. The Committee noted the multitude of programs totaling $1.6 million which assist individuals in accessing Grand River Transit.

MOVED by B. Halloran
SECONDED by J. Mitchell

THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve an adjustment to the 2012 budget to increase funding for the Transit for Reduced Income Program by $155,000, for a total further increased expenditure of $305,000.

CARRIED

The Committee noted the environment of historically-low interest rates and the resultant reduction in borrowing costs.

MOVED by S. Strickland
SECONDED by J. Wideman

THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve an adjustment to the 2012 budget of $150,000 to reflect lower borrowing costs.

CARRIED

The Committee discussed the possibility of adjusting the proposed Grand River Transit fare increase from 5% to another value. The discussion included:

- Rationale for increasing the proportion of transit costs recovered through direct revenues;
- Comparisons with other municipalities with respect to transit cost recovery, and factors which confound such comparisons;
- Marketing of transit to “choice riders”;
- Subsidy of transit operations from Regional general revenues;
- Mandate to improve frequency and reliability of transit service to improve ridership;
- Magnitude of impact of a 9% fare increase upon transit riders;
- Staff anticipation of nominal loss of ridership due to increased fare, based on elasticity model to calculate ridership; and
- Impact of fare increase upon U-Pass riders, with Regional staff being in discussions to include Conestoga College in the program and renewing agreements with the universities.

S. Strickland provided the Committee with a chart comparing various municipalities’ transit expenditures, revenues, ridership, and analysis of those figures. The chart is attached to the original minutes.

R. Horne related that staff anticipates transit-related challenges in providing greater frequency of services, as well as new routes.

The Committee requested that staff examine how to emphasize the benefit of transfers within the GRT marketing plan. The Committee requested information from staff as to the possibility to provide reduced cash fares for those who are eligible for other reduced transit services. Both requests will be addressed with the report on the GRT business plan on January 31.
Some members expressed that insufficient information on the transit fare increase would preclude their support for it. A member of the Committee warned that the province’s fiscal situation may bring austerity measures which could become a significant issue in the future. The Committee confirmed that a 9% fare increase adds $416,000 to the Region’s revenues.

Members of the Committee debated a 9% transit fare increase, with members taking various views of the necessity to improve the system prior to increasing fares and discussing the relative merits and drawbacks of the potential increase.

9. Grand River Transit fare increase

A recorded vote was requested.

MOVED by S. Strickland  
SECONDED by J. Wideman

THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve a GRT fare increase of 9% effective July 1, 2012 as currently reflected in the 2012 base budget with specific fare increases to individual elements to be brought forward to Council for approval in Spring 2012.

CARRIED


Nays: J. Brewer, T. Cowan, D. Craig, J. Haalboom, B. Halloran, C. Millar

Members of the Committee asked that the question of the main motion be put, as amended.

MAIN MOTION CARRIED, as amended

Social Services Budget Resolutions

2. Counselling Services

MOVED by S. Strickland  
SECONDED by J. Mitchell

THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve the following Counselling Service Grants for 2012:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lutherwood</td>
<td>$ 47,287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shalom Counselling Services Inc.</td>
<td>13,213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Counselling Centre of Cambridge and North Dumfries</td>
<td>57,874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interfaith Community Counselling Centre</td>
<td>15,168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchener-Waterloo Counselling Services Inc.</td>
<td>191,817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mosaic Counseling and Family Services</td>
<td>130,948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woolwich Counselling Centre</td>
<td>13,625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td><strong>$469,932</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CARRIED
3. Peer Counselling Services

MOVED by S. Strickland
SECONDED by J. Mitchell

THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve the following Peer Counselling Service grants for 2012:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge Self Help Food Bank Inc.</td>
<td>$ 4,756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-W Working Centre for the Unemployed</td>
<td>14,932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$19,688</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CARRIED

4. Community Outreach Programs

MOVED by S. Strickland
SECONDED by J. Mitchell

THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve the following Community Outreach grants for 2012:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge Family Early Years Centre</td>
<td>$ 40,179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge Self Help Food Bank Inc.</td>
<td>78,080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mosaic Counselling and Family Services</td>
<td>109,720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Counselling Centre of Cambridge &amp; North Dumfries</td>
<td>53,678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenway Chaplin Community Centre</td>
<td>43,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House of Friendship of Kitchener</td>
<td>131,262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchener-Waterloo Counselling Services Inc.</td>
<td>176,206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchener-Waterloo Multi-Cultural Centre Inc.</td>
<td>35,663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinbridge Community Association</td>
<td>85,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langs Farm Village Association</td>
<td>43,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our Place Family Resource and Early Years Centre</td>
<td>38,396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preston Heights Community Group</td>
<td>43,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilmot Family Resource Centre Inc.</td>
<td>37,578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivational Learning Groups</td>
<td>8,473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$924,234</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CARRIED

5. Emergency Food Hamper Program

MOVED by S. Strickland
SECONDED by J. Mitchell

THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve the following rates for the Emergency Food Hamper Program effective January 1, 2012:
Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hamper Rate</td>
<td>$39.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diaper Rate</td>
<td>$ 5.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formula Rate</td>
<td>$14.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AND THAT the 2012 expenditures for the Emergency Food Hamper program not exceed $785,400.

CARRIED

6. Dental Program

MOVED by S. Strickland
SECONDED by J. Mitchell

THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve a 2% increase in rates for basic, emergency and discretionary dental services and denture rates effective April 1, 2012, subject to approval by the Province of Ontario.

CARRIED

7. Homelessness to Housing Strategy

MOVED by S. Strickland
SECONDED by J. Mitchell

THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve the following Homelessness to Housing Stability Strategy Grants for 2012:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>House of Friendship of Kitchener</td>
<td>$ 54,346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YWCA of Kitchener-Waterloo</td>
<td>54,346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge Shelter Corporation</td>
<td>90,203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lutherwood</td>
<td>94,399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-W Working Centre for the Unemployed</td>
<td>60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchener Downtown Community Health Centre</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reaching Our Outdoor Friends (ROOF)</td>
<td>38,613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mennonite Central Committee of Ontario</td>
<td>60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEP Home</td>
<td>8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive Housing of Waterloo (SHOW)</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argus Residence for Young People</td>
<td>54,346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$634,253</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AND THAT the 2012 expenditures for the Emergency Shelter Overflow not exceed $78,243.

CARRIED

General Budget Resolutions

MOVED by J. Wideman
SECONDED by G. Lorentz
10. THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve the 2012 Property Tax Operating Budget with a net levy of $271,958,573 (1.23%), excluding Police Services, and the 2012 Property Tax Capital Budget and 2013-2021 Capital Forecast, excluding Police Services, reflecting budget issues presented to Budget Committee as amended.

CARRIED

MOVED by J. Wideman
SECONDED by G. Lorentz

12. THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo repeal By-law Number 11-015, being a By-law to Establish Fees and Charges for the Regional Municipality of Waterloo and that a new Fees and Charges By-law be passed including those fees and charges listed on the January 18, 2012 Budget Committee Agenda.

CARRIED

MOVED by J. Wideman
SECONDED by G. Lorentz

13. THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo receive the Information Paper titled “Municipal Budget Regulations” included in the January 18, 2012 Budget Committee Agenda for information, as required by Ontario Regulation 284/09.

CARRIED

The Committee clarified with Chair T. Galloway as to details of the Police Services Budget approved by the Police Services Board, including the increase to the levy and prospective new hires. He indicated that Matt Torigian, Chief, Waterloo Regional Police Service is to bring forward more specific details as to the operational implications of the approved budget to the Police Services Board at their February meeting.

A member of the Committee noted the contentious nature of the Police Services Budget, and asked why the Chief was not present to answer Councillor’s questions on the changes made to the budget since the Chief’s appearance at the previous Committee meeting. Chair T. Galloway observed that the Chief has not historically attended the Region’s final budget meeting. The Committee engaged in discussion with regard to the Police Services Budget, including:

- Question of impact of operational changes in specific geographic areas of the Region;
- Region’s role in approval of the overall Police Services Budget;
- Tax implications of Police Services Budget;
- Lack of sustainability of certain costs within Police Services Budget;
  - Inability of the Region to control arbitration results and provincial decisions with respect to police services;
  - Wage settlements for police and fire services significantly outstrip those for other municipal employees;
- Desirability of being able to ask questions about changes to the Police Services Budget in between their presentation at the Committee and its final approval;
- Region is 17th of 17 largest Ontario municipalities for per capita police expenditures;
- Requirement of greater resources to allow more proactive police work, and the possibility of obtaining the vision of the Chief and/or Police Services Board as to how to allow for more proactive time for police;
• Police Services is the item with single largest budget increase in the Regional budget; and
• Consideration of and rejection by Police Services Board of a request to change the deployment model in rural areas

Chair T. Galloway observed that the commanders of each division are available and willing to meet with Councillors with regard to their respective deployments and to answer any questions that Councillors may have. He noted that the Chief is slated to appear at Council on April 25 to present the results of the Patrol Staffing Analysis using the first full year of data. He also pointed out that a new trial staffing schedule will be undertaken in 2013, following approval by the Waterloo Regional Police Association.

MOVED by K. Seiling
SECONDED by J. Brewer

11. THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve the Waterloo Region Police Services 2012 Property Tax Operating Budget with a net levy of $125,944,325 (1.30%) and the Waterloo Regional Police Services 2012 Property Tax Capital Budget and 2013-2021 Capital Forecast as amended.

CARRIED

Library Budget Resolutions

MOVED by T. Cowan
SECONDED by R. Kelterborn

14. THAT the Region of Waterloo Budget Committee approve the following with regard to the Region of Waterloo Library Budget as contained in Report P-LIB-11-007, dated December 6, 2011:

a) the 2012 Library Operating Budget with a net levy of $2,190,207;
b) the 2012 Library Capital Budget;
c) the 2013-2021 Library Capital Forecast;
d) the distribution of the 2010 Library Operating Surplus.

CARRIED

Chair T Galloway thanked the Committee and staff for their efforts throughout the budget process.

ADJOURN

MOVED by J. Brewer
SECONDED by C. Zehr

THAT the meeting adjourn at 6:23 p.m.

CARRIED

COMMITTEE CHAIR, T. Galloway
COMMITTEE CLERK, M. Grivicic
Good afternoon.

I am Allan Grose, chair of the Memorial Society of Kitchener-Waterloo and Area. Thank you for the opportunity to speak.

Memorial societies have nothing to sell. We are a non-profit advocacy group, part of a continent-wide movement that began after the publication of Jessica Mitford’s *The High Cost of Dying* about 60 years ago. We advocate for simplicity, dignity, and choice in death care. It is within this broader context that I want to address the question of whether the Region should increase funding for funerals. About a century ago, families took care of their own dead. They laid out the corpse, carefully washed and dressed, in the parlour where family members could say farewell. During the American Civil War, families of northerners who died in the south wanted their sons’ bodies returned, so the practice of embalming began. When Lincoln died in the South, he was embalmed, and the train stopped along the way north so people could view their dead president. Since then, the practice has spread all across North America. Today, a traditional funeral has become an elaborate affair often costing from eight to twenty thousand dollars.

I’ve been a Memorial Society member most of my life. Recently, an incident spurred me to become more active. A technician was installing a water heater in a rental house for me. His daughter had died in a snowmobile accident ten years earlier. He said, “Before that, my wife and I had been setting aside money each year for our retirement. But the funeral cost us $19,000, and we’ve never resumed saving since.” He was bitter about the emotional loss, but also about the financial impact.

A Kitchener woman called me recently. Her infant daughter has leukemia, and may not live long. She said a friend recently lost her baby due to a miscarriage. The friend felt the baby should have a proper funeral, but was overwhelmed, later, to learn that she had spent $6,000 on that funeral. The lady who called wondered how to avoid such a calamitous expense.

Our Memorial Society has contractual arrangements with funeral homes in Wellesley and Tavistock. Futher-Franklin in Wellesly provides a basic transfer service for $1,328. It includes coroner’s fee, death registration fee, the funeral director’s services, transportation, cremation container, cremation fee, and urn. For the same package, Francis Funeral Home in Tavistock charges $1,491. These prices are available to non-Memorial Society members. Funeral establishments within the twin cities will provide similar basic services, but in some instances, the price will be significantly higher.

Last Friday, I called Affordable Burial and Cremation, in Hamilton. Their cloth-covered utility casket sells for $475. I, personally, purchased from them a cremation container, with rigid chipboard bottom and collapsible cardboard sides, for $70. Affordable Burial and Cremation provides a basic package for social assistance funerals for $1,868. However, that municipality will pay up to $3,500 for a more full-service funeral.
An online funeral service called Basic Funerals also offers no frills funeral services, but their prices are also higher than the Futher-Franklin and Francis Funeral Home prices.

Some people will say that just because someone is poor, he should not be denied the right to a "proper" or "decent" funeral. By the same token, it could be said that just because someone is poor, he should not be denied the right to live in a decent three-bedroom home, or to give his children a proper university education. Funeral service is a multi-billion dollar industry in Ontario. We feel that some of the tens of thousands of dollars spent daily in Ontario on funerals could be better spent on the living, whether the money is from private estates, or from the public purse. This is a time of tight budgeting in almost every jurisdiction. This region, with help from provincial subsidies, spent close to half a million last year subsidizing funerals. Could some of that money not have been used, for example, for more day-care services for needy, working families?

Public attitudes regarding death care have changed. Not long ago, many believed that our bodies should be preserved intact, ready to rise at the last trumpet call. Even organ donation was frowned upon for that reason. Cremation was thought to be the ultimate sacrilege. In the late 1970's, only 4% of Ontarians were cremated. Today, it is nearly 60%. It takes time for this kind of change in social attitudes, but it is happening. Perhaps it is time for the Region to reconsider the kind of death care they are willing to finance at taxpayers' expense. The only reason for embalming is to preserve bodies a few extra hours for public viewing. It is not required by law. But public viewing of bodies is no longer considered necessary, or even desirable, by many. Immediate disposition within 48 hours of death, without embalming, allows for more relaxed planning for a later service of celebration of the loved one's life.

I know some will disagree, but I believe that increasing the public funding of funerals to over $5,500 should not be necessary. Thanks for your attention.

Delivered to the Budget Committee of Waterloo Region Jan. 18, 2012.

Notes:

The attached Funeral Pre-arrangement Form is one of the documents we supply to our members. Note, however, that the distinction between Plan "A" and "B" on the back page is no longer widely used. Refer to our brochure for current contact information. We are ready to provide information to anyone who requests it.

The new legislation regulating funeral services, which was passed in 2002, will finally take force on July first of this year. It is known as The Funeral, Burial, and Cremation Services Act (FBCSA). It provides for much enhanced consumer protection than is available in the current Funeral Directors and Establishments Act (FDEA). Details of the FBCSA can be viewed online at funeralboard.com.
FUNERAL PRE-ARRANGEMENT FORM

for

[Blank space for name]

Fill in here the name of the person whose funeral arrangements are covered by this form

[Blank space for funeral home]

Fill in here the name of the Funeral Home selected from the list provided by the Society

This form provided by
The Memorial Society of Kitchener-Waterloo
A Member of the Federation of Ontario Memorial Societies
# VITAL STATISTICS

(Required under the Province of Ontario Vital Statistics Act)

1. Print name in full
   Surname  
   All given names  

2. Date of birth
   Month  Day  Year  
   Gender

3. Birthplace
   City or place  
   Province or Country

4. Single, Married, Widowed or Divorced (Specify) 
   If Married, Widowed or Divorced state full name of husband or full Maiden name of wife
   Surname  
   All given names

5. Usual Residence (If rural, give exact location, not P.O. Box or R.R. #)
   Borough, city, town, village or township  
   Province  
   Postal Code

6. Trade, profession or type of work done during most of your working life
   Citizenship  
   Occupation  
   How Long  
   Type of business or industry

7. If retired, date last worked at this occupation: Month  Day  Year

8. Father
   Surname  
   All given names

9. Birthplace of Father
   City or Place  
   Province or Country

10. Mother
    Maiden Name  
    All given names

11. Birthplace of Mother
    City or Place  
    Province or Country

12. If Veteran, War & Rank

13. Membership in Clubs, Societies

14. Family Doctor
    Name  
    Address

15. Survivors (Parents, Spouse, Children, Siblings, Grandchildren)
    Survivors Name  Relationship  Address
    ______________________________________  ______________________________________  
    ______________________________________  ______________________________________  
    ______________________________________  ______________________________________  
    ______________________________________  ______________________________________  
    ______________________________________  ______________________________________  
    ______________________________________  ______________________________________  
    ______________________________________  ______________________________________  
    ______________________________________  ______________________________________  
    ______________________________________  ______________________________________  

FUNERAL PLAN AND GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS

for the funeral of ____________________________

(Name of the Member)

1. List your closest living family members, or other individuals, related or not, who would be most likely to contact the funeral director when death occurs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Phone #, City</th>
<th>Relationship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executor/Executrix</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>(Phone #, City)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Funeral Plan and arrangements

I wish Plan "A" (see reverse) with burial ☐ OR cremation ☐

I wish Plan "B" (see reverse) with burial ☐ OR cremation ☐

I wish an alternative (see "Additional Special Instructions") with burial ☐ OR cremation ☐

3. If Burial selected

Use Plot # __________________ Name of Cemetery _______________________

Registered owner's name ______________________ Located at ________________ (may be extra charges)

I do not own a cemetery plot and leave the purchase of one to the discretion of my survivors. ☐

4. If Cremation selected

Name of Crematorium ______________________ Located at __________________

I wish my remains to be handled by the crematorium ☐ my family ☐ or as follows ☐

5. Religious Service

I wish: (a) Service in a Church ☐ Name of Church __________________ (b) Service in the Funeral Director's Chapel ☐

(c) Service at the Crematorium Chapel ☐ (d) at the Cemetery ☐ (e) A Memorial or Private Service to be arranged by my family ☐

I do not wish any Service at all ☐

6. Donations

I prefer that in lieu of flowers donations be sent to ________________________________

7. Additional Special Instructions

____________________________________

____________________________________

8. I wish the same arrangements as designated above for the following children under 18 years of age:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full Name</th>
<th>Date of Birth</th>
<th>Place of Birth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This Plan supersedes any previous instructions and can be revoked or changed by the undersigned, in writing, on this form or a copy of it. Upon death of the member, the survivors are authorized to remit to the Kitchener-Waterloo Memorial Society a nominal sum to help defray expenses incurred in maintaining permanent membership records.

Signature of person completing this form __________________________ Date ____________

Address ______________________________

(This form may be signed on behalf of the member named above if necessary.)
FUNERAL PLANS AVAILABLE TO MEMBERS OF THE KITCHENER-WATERLOO MEMORIAL SOCIETY

Plan “A”
- Removal of the body to the funeral home.
- Obtaining and completing the necessary legal papers.
- Placing the body in plain unlined container.
- Transportation to cemetery or crematorium.

**NOTE:** This service **does not include** embalming, viewing, use of funeral home parlor or chapel, or cars for a procession. Also note that **cemetery and/or cremation charges are extra.**

Plan “B”
- Removal of the body to the funeral home.
- Obtaining and completing the necessary legal papers.
- Placing the body in plain unlined container.
- Use of funeral home chapel, with organist for a memorial service (the body not present).
- Cars for clergy and family to reach cemetery or crematorium.

**NOTE:** Crematorium and/or cemetery charges are **not included.** Options for which extra charges are made include embalming, cosmetology, newspaper notice, use of pall, a different casket, extra mileage, etc...

*Cremains (ashes) can be handled in different ways. Charges for additional crematorium services are made.*

**VARIATIONS** Some society members may ask for variations on the above. This will require an agreement by the contracting parties (the member and the funeral home) as to additional costs where extras are requested or price decreases where simpler arrangements are desired.

**CHARGES**

*To be Completed by Funeral Director*

It is agreed that all the BASIC SERVICES in the plan _____ funeral as described above would, at this time, be provided for the sum of $_______.

It is understood that a reasonable additional charge will be made for any requested EXTRA SERVICE. Because of possible future changes in costs and the long-term nature of these agreements, the above price may be revised upwards at the prevailing price for the type of service agreed herein, which price shall be deemed to be the price most recently communicated in writing to Kitchener-Waterloo Memorial Society for that type of service.

A Funeral trust **has □, or has not □** been established at this time.

Name of Funeral Home _____________________________________________________________

Address ____________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________ Date

Signature of Funeral Director

Two (2) signed copies (coloured) of the completed pre-arrangement form are to be returned to the member by the funeral director.

Mar/99
Please Join Today!

...tion, or religious beliefs, age, nationality, political persuasion is open to all, regardless of race. Membership in the Israeli Memorial Society is dependent on a growing membership. Your influence will be more effective if you give as a member than an idol.

Your influence will be more effective if you give as a member than an idol.

The strength of the Memorial Society has no rights under Ontario law. The Pre-planned arrangements are not necessary. If you want to know your wishes, your executor/executrix will assist you in your efforts to raise public awareness, and help cover our operating expenses. We do not encourage the emotional time when death has occurred. We do not encourage

Talk it over.

...neal Industry.

Talia, executive director of the Consumers Alliance (FOMS-FCA) has been working and persevering for the past 20 years. We are still needed as a last resort. The Consumers Alliance (FOMS-FCA) has been working and persevering for the past 20 years. We are still needed as a last resort. The Consumers Alliance (FOMS-FCA) has been working and persevering for the past 20 years. We are still needed as a last resort. The Consumers Alliance (FOMS-FCA) has been working and persevering for the past 20 years. We are still needed as a last resort.

Their purpose?

Have Memorial Societies served...
end-of-life planning. Funerals, and ecologically-responsible for simple, dignified, and economical funerary arrangements.

Planning
Consumer Rights and Choices & Alternatives,

that encourages:
non-profit organization
A non-sectarian,

info@kommensco.ca
519-662-6576
Kitchener, ON N2B 3V1
37 Frederick St. Box 23032
Kitchener-Waterloo
Memorial Society of

Membership

May be for you.

MEMBERSHIP

Then

Funerals
Pre-dignified, and inexpensive
Profit group working for Sim-
Voluntary, non-sectarian, non-
You would like to support a

While under stress, or
Make fewer difficult decisions
Your wishes and will need to
Your next-of-kin will know
Of-life wishes now so that
You want to record your end-

Casket manufacture
And the use of rare woods for
Final impact on your
You wish to minimize the end-

On display
You don't want your body put
Be spent more wisely
On an elaborate funeral could
You believe that money spent

IF...
INFORMATION: 2012 FUNERAL RATES

At its meeting of January 10, 2012, Community Services Committee requested additional information on approved full service rates and if assistance for low income individuals was provided for comparator and neighbouring municipalities. A copy of the report presented to CSC is appended to this paper.

The following chart summarizes the information available when the Committee Agenda was prepared. An updated paper will be presented on final budget day.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Approved Full Service Rate (2011)</th>
<th>Provide Assistance for Low Income Individuals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comparator Municipalities:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durham</td>
<td>$3,937</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windsor (2010 Rate)</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ottawa</td>
<td>$2,991</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niagara</td>
<td>$2,835</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterloo</td>
<td>$2,775</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peel</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>$2,455</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York</td>
<td>$2,390</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halton</td>
<td>$2,364</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton</td>
<td>$2,334</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median of Comparator Rates</td>
<td>$2,638</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average of Comparator rates</td>
<td>$2,758</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Neighboring Municipalities: |                                |                                             |
| Brantford                | $5,215                          | Yes                                         |
| Oxford (2009 Rate)       | $4,995                          | N/A                                         |
| Wellington (2010 Rate)   | $3,321                          | Yes                                         |
| Stratford (2009 Rate)    | $3,035                          | Yes, if individual is transient and has no next of kin |

* Plus applicable taxes

Financial Implications

The Preliminary 2012 Operating Budget includes a rate increase of 2% for funeral costs. This provision would bring the maximum rate to $2,830 plus applicable taxes. A resolution to approve the 2012 rate is required.
2012 Regional Budget

Today's Agenda

• 2012 Base Budget
• Budget Updates
• Service Enhancements
• Outstanding Issues
• 2012 Property Tax Budget Approval
### 2012 Regional Base Budget Including RTMP
(based on 1.85% Assessment Growth)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Tax Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Opening Base Budget</td>
<td>1.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Less:</strong> Base Budget Strategies</td>
<td>-1.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised Base Budget Before RTMP</td>
<td>0.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Approved Commitments RTMP</strong></td>
<td>1.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Less:</strong> Upload Savings</td>
<td>-0.32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Less:</strong> Debt Retirement</td>
<td>-0.16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Impact for RTMP</strong></td>
<td>1.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Base Budget Including RTMP (Before New Issues or Police)</strong></td>
<td>1.24%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2012 Regional Budget
Budget Updates

• Assessment Growth
• Fuel Costs
• General Inflation
• Ontario Works
• Police Services Budget
2012 Regional Budget
History Of Assessment Growth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Growth Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>5.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>3.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>1.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>0.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>1.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>1.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>0.16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>2.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>1.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>3.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>1.92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>2.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>3.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>3.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>3.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>2.99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>3.53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>2.62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>2.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>1.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>1.34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>2.15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>1.85%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• Fuel prices very volatile – hard to establish budget

• Budget Committee established fuel price at 95 cents /litre in 2011 Budget

• 2012 budget for fuel is based on $1.00 /litre

• November price $1.098 /litre; December price $1.072 /litre

• Average price for all of 2011 was $1.047 /litre
Region Of Waterloo
GRT Fuel Cost

Fuel Cost - Ultra Low Sulphur Diesel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Average Region Price</th>
<th>Budgeted Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jan-08</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar-08</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May-08</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul-08</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep-08</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov-08</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan-09</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar-09</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May-09</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul-09</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep-09</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov-09</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan-10</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar-10</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May-10</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul-10</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep-10</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov-10</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan-11</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar-11</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May-11</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul-11</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep-11</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov-11</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$ per litre
## 2012 Regional Budget
### Consumer Price Index (CPI)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>2.90%</td>
<td>2.97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ontario</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
<td>3.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROW</td>
<td>2.58%</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Jan to Nov. 2011

Source: Stats Can and Bank of Canada
Note: ODSP is no longer the Region’s responsibility
2012 Regional Budget
Ontario Works (OW)

- 2012 budget includes average caseload of 8,759
- Average caseload for 2011 was 8,700
- Tax Stabilization Reserve Fund (TSRF) is being used to fund over expenditures then replenished with surplus
- Expected that TSRF will be sufficient to fund OW over expenditures in 2012 (budget includes $4.6 million)
- Projected use of TSRF for 2011 is $4.6 million
- Use of TSRF for OW beyond 2012 depends on availability of surplus
Police Services Board approved 2012 Police Services Budget on January 11th

Police Services' initial request equalled a tax rate increase of 1.63% (base 1.17% and expansion 0.46%)

Police Services Board approved a final budget with tax rate impact of 1.30%

Original new staffing request was 30 officers and 22 civilians and 10 Special Constables

New staff for 2012 to be determined within 1.30%
• Budget Issues are service expansion requests
• New budget issues required for critical / essential expansion including:
  • EMS Master Plan
  • Child Care Fee Subsidy
  • Affordable Transportation / Low Income persons
• Staff recommend allowance of 0.21% for new issues
• Budget Issue Papers distributed with Nov. 16th Agenda
• Summarized on Pages 7 & 8 of today's agenda
Issues are summarized into two groups:

1. Operating Budget Issues (Property Tax Impact 0.21%)

2. One Time / Capital Budget Issues (no 2012 Property Tax Impact)
2012 Regional Budget
New Budget Issues – Operating

- Requested Operating Budget Issues total $1.426 million
- Staff recommended funding $806,000 or 0.21%
- Some recommended issues have no direct tax levy impact as funded from other sources
- Key issues include:
  - Affordable Transportation for Persons with Low Income
  - EMS Master Plan / staffing
  - Child Care Fee Subsidy
  - Capital Financing
## 2012 Regional Budget
### New Budget Issues – Levy Impact

($000's)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Issue</th>
<th>2012 Request</th>
<th>2012 Recommended</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Funding For Community Sustainability Initiatives</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable Transportation for Persons with Low Income</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMS Master Plan Optimized Staffing</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Care Fee Subsidy Funding</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HNSA Co-ordinator Senior Services</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Financing</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,426</strong></td>
<td><strong>$806</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

= 0.21% tax rate impact
2012 Regional Budget
New Budget Issues – Capital

• One Time / Capital Budget Issues to be added to 2012 capital program and forecast

• Funded by debentures, capital levy, RTMP Reserve Fund or other

• No impact on 2012 tax levy

• Issue papers are mechanism to add specific new projects to first four years of capital forecast or amend existing forecast
## 2012 Regional Budget
### Regional Tax Rate Position

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tax Rate Impact</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Base Position Including RTMP</td>
<td>1.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential New Budget Issues</td>
<td>0.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential Tax Rate Regional Programs</td>
<td>1.45%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2012 Regional Budget
Total Tax Rate Position

Current all-in tax rate position:

Region 1.45%
Police 1.30%
Potential Final Tax Rate Increase 2.75%
2012 Regional Budget
Outstanding Issues

• Gapping
• Children's Services Budget Increase
  ($0 net levy impact)
• Opportunities Waterloo Region
• Funeral Rates for 2012
• Economic Development and Promotion Funding
• Gapping analysis done each year

• Gapping budget has been based on 3 year rolling average

• Gapping Savings:  
  2011 = $2.070 million  
  2010 = $1.930 million  
  2009 = $1.440 million

• 3 year rolling average is $1.813 million

• Base budget includes $1.713 million

• Adjustment of $100,000 recommended for 2012
• 2012 allocation for Early Learning and Child Care Program includes increase in 100% funding of $559,517 ($0 net)

• Funding will assist in three areas of pressure for Children's Services

• Information Paper and Recommendation to increase by $559,577 gross; $0 net on page 21
• Staff was requested to provide a report assessing Opportunities Waterloo Region's 2011 request for $110,000 funding per year for five years

• Report tabled at December 6th CSC provided background information and four options for funding

• CSC referred this report to Budget Committee

• Page 10 of Agenda
• At January 10th meeting, CSC was presented with four options for funding funerals for OW recipients and low income persons

• Funeral Directors were in attendance to answer questions

• CSC referred the matter to Budget Committee and requested additional info

• Copy of report on page 16; additional info on page 20

• Further updates available today
• In December, Council discussed funding for Arts and Culture Organization for 2012

• Proposal to provides $30,000 for coalition of art galleries for marketing referred to EDP Committee

• 2012 Budget for EDP is $154,000 (2011 + inflation); 2011 budget over spent by $17,100

• Budget Committee could consider increased budget for EDP or $30,000 be accommodated in existing 2012 provision
Information Paper On Page 23 of Agenda:

- Assessment Growth and Population Growth
  Page 23

- General Fee and Rate Increases
  Page 25

- Updated Gapping Estimate
  Page 26

- Infrastructure Deficit
  Page 31

- Waterloo Regional Police Base Budget Savings
  Available at Meeting
• Resolutions in this Budget Agenda package:

• Social Service Budget Resolutions are included on page 37

• General Budget Resolutions are included on page 40

• Library Budget Resolutions are included on page 41
2012 Regional Budget
Impact of 1%

- 1% tax rate increase equals $3.81 million in additional revenue
- 1% tax rate increase results in $16.08 increase in average residential property tax bill
Budget Questions
2012 Regional Budget Decisions

- Gapping
- Children's Services Budget Increase ($0 levy impact)
- Opportunities Waterloo Region
- Funeral Rates for 2012
- EDP Funding
- Budget Resolutions
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Tax Rate Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Potential Tax Rate</td>
<td>1.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Programs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Impact</td>
<td>1.49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Impact*</td>
<td>0.47%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* including Regional Library
## 2012 Regional Budget
### Potential Increase Per Average Household

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Urban</th>
<th>Rural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct Regional Program</td>
<td>$3.13</td>
<td>$3.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>21.24</td>
<td>2.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td>20.97</td>
<td>20.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$45.34</strong></td>
<td><strong>$28.01</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Based on average residential property valued at $254,000 in 2011*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Urban</th>
<th>Rural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct Regional Program</td>
<td>0.19%</td>
<td>0.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>1.30%</td>
<td>0.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td>1.28%</td>
<td>1.41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2.77%</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.88%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2012 Budget Information Request - Budget Committee December 14, 2011

Information: Waterloo Regional Police Services – Base Budget Savings

In response to Budget Committee’s request for a dollar value of base budget savings from the WRPS in the past years, we have summarized several of the individual expense codes that have been reduced since 2008 as sustainable subject to exigent circumstances arising in the provision of public safety.

It is important to note that on average 85.2% of the Waterloo Regional Police Services budget is in support of staffing costs. The remaining 14.8% includes but is not limited to major support costs associated with fleet, facilities, maintenance and insurance.

The following categories have been reduced by the corresponding amounts since 2008:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Savings</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Office Supplies</td>
<td>$11,920</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Training</td>
<td>$68,435</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material Supplies</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>$58,252</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffing Adjustment</td>
<td>$109,117</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$257,724</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Staffing – In 2010 the operations of the Central Cell-block were re-engineered with the hiring of five civilian Special Constables in exchange for five Patrol Constables. As a result, the sustainable savings totals $109,117 in 2010 dollars.

In addition to cost reductions, revenue has increased by $1,994,926 since 2008. This increase is the combination of general recoverable revenue, Ministry supported staffing grants and the recently confirmed uploading of court security and prisoner transportation costs.

Lastly, capital budget projects have been reviewed annually and then prioritized based on need. These annual reviews have resulted in deferring debt charges by $2.3 million dollars since 2010. It should be noted that as part of the 2009/10 budget process it was projected that the peak financing year from 2010 to 2019 would be 2013 at $6.4 million. The peak year is now projected to be $6.3 million in 2015.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>GRT</th>
<th>Mississauga</th>
<th>Mississauga</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Direct Operating Expenses</td>
<td>$61,011,962</td>
<td>$134,638,294</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Revenue</td>
<td>$23,160,348</td>
<td>$62,907,957</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Passenger Revenue</td>
<td>$22,075,241</td>
<td>$59,202,051</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ridership</td>
<td>18,054,938</td>
<td>30,589,359</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R/C Ratio</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Fare</td>
<td>$1.22</td>
<td>$1.94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brampton</td>
<td>York (YRT)</td>
<td>Durham (DRT)</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ 69,145,641</td>
<td>$ 133,021,440</td>
<td>$ 47,090,948</td>
<td>$ 67,776,313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ 30,311,310</td>
<td>$ 51,467,683</td>
<td>$ 18,877,785</td>
<td>$ 34,914,726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ 29,260,831</td>
<td>$ 50,314,956</td>
<td>$ 17,235,298</td>
<td>$ 33,817,954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13,843,278</td>
<td>19,395,721</td>
<td>9,120,880</td>
<td>21,226,393</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

43%  39%  38%  51%  58%  52%

$ 2.11 $ 2.59 $ 1.89 $ 1.59 $ 1.32 $ 1.54