Regional Municipality of Waterloo
Budget Committee
Minutes

Wednesday, February 11, 2015
12:33 p.m.
Regional Council Chambers
150 Frederick Street, 2nd Floor, Kitchener


Declarations of Pecuniary Interest under “The Municipal Conflict Of Interest Act”
None declared.

Opening Remarks
Chair Sean Strickland provided opening comments, outlining the purpose of the meeting.

Grand River Conservation Authority (GRCA) Budget
Jane Mitchell, Chair of GRCA, provided opening comments.

Joe Farwell, Chief Administrative Officer and Sonja Radoja, Manager, Corporate Services, provided a presentation to the Committee; a copy is appended to the original minutes.

J. Farwell outlined the scope of the watershed and provided an overview of the management plan. He summarized the programs provided in the Region.

S. Radoja provided the budget overview, details about funding sources and the challenges, including increased demand for services, the forestry program and GRCA
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Conservation Areas revenue. She gave an overview of GRCA’s responses to these budget issues. She summarized the 2015 revenue and expenditures estimates, operating and capital budgets and special projects. She provided details about the general municipal levy for 2015, the per capita across all the Grand River watershed municipalities that the GRCA serves, base operating programs, base capital programs and special projects. The GRCA is seeking $6M from Regional Council, a 2.3% increase from 2014.

In response to a Committee question about Regional funding for the water quality program, S. Radoja stated that the Region funds $300,000 under Special Projects, in addition to the Regional levy. Thomas Schmidt, Commissioner, Transportation and Environmental Services, confirmed that Regional funds for the water quality program come from the Water Services capital budget.

The presenters responded to Committee questions regarding revenue impact of the growing eco tours industry, funds available for dam repairs, the ownership status of the dam in the Preston area of Cambridge, and the balances of various reserves.

2015 User Rate Budgets

Craig Dyer, Chief Financial Officer, provided a presentation; a copy is appended to the original minutes.

He provided a summary of the Information Paper - User Rates History, Model and Options and he clarified that the Rural Water Quality project is funded from Regional development charges (RDC) and wastewater rates.

C. Dyer summarized the proposed 2015 Council Resolutions for Water and Wastewater Budgets, as well as the impact of rate reduction options requested by the Committee. He noted that any reductions will have an impact on future reserve balances and won't serve to save money for most customers in 2015 since most area municipalities have already set their 2015 rates.

B. Vrbanovic stated that he would like to move a motion to adjust the proposed wholesale water supply rate to 3.9% and the wastewater treatment rate to 6.9%. S. Strickland suggested that the staff recommendation come forward first and then any amendments can be dealt with. B. Vrbanovic called a Point of Order, stating that since there is no motion on the floor, his motion should be allowed. S. Strickland advised that he had allowed for latitude during the discussion but that his ruling stands. K. Seiling advised that he was prepared to move the motion as proposed in the staff report. D. Craig also called a Point of Order, reiterating the points raised by B. Vrbanovic. The Chair stated that his ruling stands.
B. Vrbanovic spoke to his rationale for the amendment to reduce the wholesale water supply and wastewater treatment rates.

K. Seiling stated that Regional Council is responsible for setting its own budget and not the budgets of the Area Municipalities. He noted that the plans for infrastructure will also benefit Area Municipality growth and that a reduction in the rates is not fiscally responsible.

The Committee discussed the merits of the rate model, the impact on compliance with the current legislation and regulations and the impact on homeowners.

Moved by K Seiling
Seconded by T. Galloway

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve the 2015 Water Supply Operating Budget, the 2015 Water Supply Capital Budget and the 2016-2024 Water Supply Capital Forecast.

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve a Regional Wholesale Water Rate of $0.9776 per cubic metre effective March 1, 2015 and that the necessary by-law be introduced.

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve the 2015 Wastewater Treatment Operating Budget, the 2015 Wastewater Treatment Capital Budget and the 2016-2024 Wastewater Treatment Capital Forecast.

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve a Regional Wholesale Wastewater Rate of $0.9441 per cubic metre effective March 1, 2015 and that the necessary by-law be introduced.

A recorded vote for the amended motion was requested.

Moved by B. Vrbanovic
Seconded by D. Craig

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve the 2015 Water Supply Operating Budget, the 2015 Water Supply Capital Budget and the 2016-2024 Water Supply Capital Forecast.

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve a Regional Wholesale Water Rate of $0.9682 per cubic metre effective March 1, 2015 and that the necessary by-law be introduced.
That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve the 2015 Wastewater Treatment Operating Budget, the 2015 Wastewater Treatment Capital Budget and the 2016-2024 Wastewater Treatment Capital Forecast.

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve a Regional Wholesale Wastewater Rate of $0.9353 per cubic metre effective March 1, 2015 and that the necessary by-law be introduced.

   Motion Lost

Yeas: D. Craig, S. Foxton, D. Jaworsky, K. Kiefer and B. Vrbanovic


Original Motion Carried

Moved by K. Seiling

Seconded by W. Wettlaufer

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve the 2015 Water Distribution Operating Budget, the 2015 Water Distribution Capital Budget and the 2016-2024 Water Distribution Capital Forecast.

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve a Retail Water Rate of $2.18 per cubic metre effective March 1, 2015 and that the necessary by-law be introduced.

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve a monthly maintenance fee of $8.00 per account for the customers connected to the Retail Water Distribution System effective March 1, 2015 and that the necessary by-law be introduced.

   Carried

Moved by K. Seiling

Seconded by W. Wettlaufer

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve the 2015 Wastewater Collection Operating Budget, the 2015 Wastewater Collection Capital Budget and the 2016-2024 Wastewater Collection Capital Forecast.

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve a Retail Wastewater Rate of $1.79 per cubic metre effective March 1, 2015 and that the necessary by-law be introduced.
That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve a monthly maintenance fee of $6.00 per account for the customers connected to the Retail Wastewater Collection System effective March 1, 2015 and that the necessary by-law be introduced.

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve an increase of 9.9% effective March 1, 2015 to the flat annual rate upon every owner of a property in the Township of Wellesley or the Township of North Dumfries that is connected to the Regional Municipality of Waterloo’s wastewater collection system but is not connected to the Regional Municipality of Waterloo’s water distribution system, and that the necessary by-law be introduced.

Carried

S. Strickland suggested that staff consider realigning the timing of the approval of the Regional water and wastewater user rates so that these are set prior to that of the Area Municipalities.

**Ten-year Capital Program**

C. Dyer provided a presentation regarding the Ten-year Capital Program, outlining the objectives, capital expenditures and financing; a copy is appended to the original minutes. He provided ten-year capital investment and financing details for major program areas.

C. Dyer responded to Committee questions regarding the Housing Reserve Fund.

D. Craig advised that he will be seeking an accelerated project plan related to the 2016 budget cycle and the capital budget for roads, specifically for the south and east boundary roads in Cambridge. He requested that staff make a presentation after the 2015 budget cycle, with details about the progress of this project. S. Strickland requested that information about the top ten projects for the next five years also be included in the staff presentation.

T. Schmidt stated that construction for the south boundary road will begin for phase one in 2017 and in 2022 for phase 2. He advised that the environmental assessment is currently underway on the east boundary road and a report is anticipated for Council review in spring 2016 but this project is not currently in the capital program. He indicated that staff can bring forward a report regarding the Roads Rehabilitation Program to a Planning and Works Committee meeting prior to the 2016 budget review.

In response to Committee questions, T. Schmidt stated that the roads rehabilitation capital program is based on available funding and not based on need. He added that the asset management program being developed will identify priorities and how best to reduce the infrastructure deficit. He stated that prioritization on the rehabilitation side is
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based on the highest need and on the expansion side it is based on development charges funding.

Mike Murray, Chief Administrative Officer, stated that roads projects are largely informed by the Regional Transportation Master Plan (RTMP) including project priorities and that staff will report back on roads rehabilitation priorities within the context of the RTMP. T. Schmidt added that the RTMP will be revisited beginning in 2015.

C. Dyer continued with his Ten-year Capital Program presentation outlining the following:

- Completion rates for multi-year construction
- Completion rates for User Rate capital
- Internal Capital Plan reviews
- Debt profile and outstanding profile
- Capital Financing Challenges

* G. Lorentz and B. Vrbanovic left the meeting at 2:43 p.m.

C. Dyer responded to questions regarding the net debt load and payments against the debt per capita calculations and comparisons, options to develop a policy to pay for facilities capital renewal from the operating budget and the variance between projections and actuals for capital projects. In response to a Committee question about the flexibility in replacing Regional vehicles, T. Schmidt advised that staff annually review all vehicles and that in many instances, replacement is deferred.

* T. Galloway left the meeting at 2:55 p.m.

In response to a Committee question about project completion rates and the framework for funding projects in the most appropriate timeframe and the impact on the debt servicing costs, C. Dyer stated that staff will be reviewing the capital program over the course of this year.

M. Murray added that staff have attempted to make the capital program more accurate by eliminating $30-40M worth of projects; this adjustment is in recognition of the fact that the completion rate is not at a desired level. He reminded the Committee that debt is only incurred if and when a project proceeds.

Moved by D. Jaworsky

Seconded by L. Armstrong

That the Committee recess for ten minutes.

Carried 1806036
The Committee reconvened at 3:12 p.m.

* T. Galloway and G. Lorentz returned to the meeting at 3:12 p.m.

**Waterloo Regional Police Services (WRPS) Budget**

T. Galloway, Chair, Police Services Board (PSB), provided introductory comments and acknowledged the attendance and contributions of Deputy Chief Steve Beckett, who is retiring after 35 years of service.

Police Chief Bryan Larkin and Joe Steiner, Director, Administration and Finance, gave a presentation to the Committee; a copy is appended to the original minutes. B. Larkin acknowledged other police services members in the audience. He outlined the strategic planning process being undertaken and advised that a master plan is also being developed, for release in late 2015.

J. Steiner presented the Police Services budget, which was approved, in principle, by the PSB on February 4, 2015, noting that tax impact of the 2015 the budget was decreased from .7% to .6%, as requested by the PSB.

J. Steiner responded to Committee questions regarding fuel expenditures and civilianization. B. Larkin added that the WRPS are setting the trend in civilianization, has re-structured and is seeing more growth in civilian staff than in uniform staff.

**COR-FSD-15-03, 2015 Budget Update**

C. Dyer provided a summary of the 2015 Tax Supported Budget, as noted in the staff report, and stated that the motion to approve the Community Alzheimer Program in Waterloo will be considered for approval by Council during the February 11th Council meeting.

C. Dyer provided an overview of the Budget Information Papers, as follows:

a) Waste Management, including rural transfer stations, tipping fees and roadside dumping

C. Dyer summarized the status of the rural transfer stations and advised that an adjustment would be required to the 2015 budget of approximately $132,000 if the decision was made to keep the stations open for the balance of 2015.

Jon Arsenault, Director, Waste Management, responded to Committee questions about roadside dumping, staffing recommendations related to Saturday service and the rationale for the proposal to increase tipping fees. He stated that staff is working to create a greater awareness about curbside collection since items are being taken to the dump that could be picked up at the curb.
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In response to a Committee inquiry about how to move forward discussion and review of the issue of the closure of rural transfer stations, S. Strickland advised that if rural Councillors want to keep the stations open beyond March 31, 2015, they could bring a motion back to Budget Committee on March 4 and provide details about the financial impact on extending the life of the rural transfer stations. T. Schmidt provided information about the costs associated with keeping the stations opened for the rest of the year and for a full year, at $132,000 and $207,000 respectively.

Committee members representing the rural municipalities commented on the impact of an extension in terms of having a better opportunity to review the options available.

b) RERU Upgrade – Impact on Rural Response Times

In response to a Committee question about upgrading a Rural Emergency Response Unit (RERU) to an ambulance and crew system in Wellesley Township, Stephen Van Valkenburg, Chief, Paramedic Services, stated that the options are to convert the RERU to an ambulance or to maintain the RERU and add an ambulance. J. Nowak expressed his preference for the second option.

C. Dyer noted that there is a Budget Issue Paper proposing to convert the RERU to a 12-hour ambulance but not to maintain the RERU.

In response to Committee questions about the impact on response times in the rural municipalities, S. Van Valkenburg provided a presentation; a copy is appended to the original minutes. He summarized the response times for RERU and for ambulance, noting that when an ambulance is added, the response times are reduced.

S. Strickland provided direction to J. Nowak on how to proceed if he wishes to bring forward a motion to the next Budget Committee meeting.

A request was made by the Committee for information regarding three (3) options: the status quo, the conversion of the RERU to an ambulance, and the maintenance of the RERU along with the addition of an ambulance.

S. Van Valkenburg responded to a Committee question how response times are measured, noting that the key is when the first responder arrives; he also provided information about the challenges in collecting information from fire response teams.

In response to an additional Committee request for a history on paramedic services provided for each of the three urban municipalities, S. Strickland suggested that this information could come back to a future Community Services Committee meeting.

S. Van Valkenburg responded to a Committee inquiry about the differences between RERUs and ambulance services, confirming that if a RERU is switched to ambulance services...
service, the ambulance won’t stay in rural area once the call has been responded to and resolved. RERUs on the other hand, are always on site in the rural communities.

c) 2015 Social Assistance Costs & Tax Stabilization Reserve Fund Projection Information Paper

C. Dyer gave an overview and advised that the balance of this reserve fund will be sufficient to fund the related social assistance costs.

* W. Wettlaufer left the meeting at 4:35 p.m.

d) Reserves and Reserve Funds Information Paper was received for information.

e) Responses to Councillor Requests Information Paper

Staff responded to Committee questions regarding the summer schedule for the iExpress routes and the historical funding allocation for the Community Homelessness Prevention Initiative (CHPI)

C. Dyer highlighted the RTMP funding strategy options and responded to a Committee inquiry about the benefit of opting for a reduced funding timeframe.

* W. Wettlaufer returned to the meeting at 4:39 p.m.

C. Dyer gave an overview of the proposed Fuel Price Strategy, noting the benefits and he advised that the Fuel Equipment Reserve has a balance of approximately $100,000. He responded to Committee questions regarding the cost of diesel and unleaded gas as well as the timelines for the funds transfer.

f) Waterloo Regional Police Services Board 2015 Budget Information Paper was received for information.

Moved by T. Galloway

Seconded by S. Foxton

That the Region of Waterloo take the following action with respect to the 2015 Preliminary Tax Supported Operating Budget:

1. Approve the recommendations from the Community Services Committee regarding the Provincial Wage Enhancement Program as set out in the Summary of Recommendations to Budget Committee attached as Appendix B to this report COR-FSD-15-03 dated February 11, 2015.

   Carried
2015 Tax Supported Operating Budget

Moved by T. Galloway

Seconded by S. Foxton

That the Region of Waterloo take the following action with respect to the 2015 Preliminary Tax Supported Operating Budget:

2. Approve the recommendations from the Community Services Committee regarding the Investment in Affordable Housing (2014 Extension) – Proposed Program Delivery and Fiscal Plan as set out in the Summary of Recommendation to the Budget Committee attached as Appendix B to this report COR-FSD-15-03 dated February 11, 2015.

Carried

Moved by K. Seiling

Seconded by J. Nowak

That the Region of Waterloo take the following action with respect to the 2015 Preliminary Tax Supported Operating Budget:

3. Approve the new and revised fees and charges as listed in Report COR-FSD-15-01 dated January 21, 2015 (pages 26 and 27) for Community Planning, effective March 5, 2015 and increase the 2015 Community Planning User Fee Revenue budget by $120,000.

Carried

Moved by G. Lorentz

Seconded by L. Armstrong

That the Region of Waterloo take the following action with respect to the 2015 Preliminary Tax Supported Operating Budget:

4. Amend the Fees and Charges by-law to increase the general refuse/garbage tipping fee from $74.00/tonne to $75/tonne, effective July 1, 2015 and increase the 2015 Waste Management Revenue budget by $38,250.

Carried
The Committee discussed the reference to transfer stations in the following motion and a friendly amendment was approved to note that the motion refers to the transfer stations in Cambridge and Waterloo exclusively.

Moved by G. Lorentz

Seconded by L. Armstrong

That the Region of Waterloo take the following action with respect to the 2015 Preliminary Tax Supported Operating Budget:

5. Amend the Fees and Charges by-law to increase the minimum fee per visit to the Regional landfill site and the transfer stations in Cambridge and Waterloo from $2.00 to $5.00, effective July 1, 2015, with rates for the rural transfer stations being determined subject to final disposition, and increase the 2015 Waste Management Revenue budget by $12,500.

Carried, as amended

Moved by D. Craig

Seconded by L. Armstrong

That the Region of Waterloo take the following action with respect to the 2015 Preliminary Tax Supported Operating Budget:

6. Approve 2015 fuel budgets for direct Regional services based on a price of $1.00/litre for diesel and $0.88/litre for unleaded gas resulting in a 2015 operating expenditure reduction of $1,042,000 to be allocated as follows:

a. $261,000 reduction to the 2015 Property Tax levy,

b. $760,000 to be transferred to the Transit Vehicle Reserve to reduce debenture financing of Grand River Transit bus replacements, and

c. $21,000 to be transferred to the Fuel Equipment Reserve to reduce debenture financing of future fuel infrastructure replacement.

Carried

Next Meeting: March 4, 2015, 3:00 p.m.

Moved by S. Shantz

Seconded by K. Redman
That the meeting adjourn at 4:58 p.m.

Carried

Committee Chair, S. Strickland

Committee Clerk, S. Natolochny
About the watershed

- Largest watershed in Southern Ontario
- 300 km long from Dundalk to Lake Erie
- Major tributaries: Conestogo, Speed, Eramosa, Nith
- Population: about 1 million
- Rich agricultural region
GRCA Strategic Plan

Objectives

1. Protect life and minimize property damage
2. Improve watershed health
3. Connect people with the environment
4. Organizational focus on teamwork, development and engagement
5. Deliver value and innovation
Watershed issues

• Watershed population growing rapidly
  —expected to reach 1.5 million by 2051

• Extensive agriculture
  —70% of land is farmed; factor in water quality

• Climate change could have major impact
  —More extreme events, e.g. floods, drought
Water Management Plan

• New water management plan addresses issues:
  – Ensure sustainable water supplies
  – Reduce flood damage potential
  – Improve water quality
  – Build resiliency to address climate change

• Participating partners:
  – Hamilton and other municipalities
  – Canada
  – Ontario
  – First Nations
  – GRCA

• Plan completed endorsed by partners in 2014
  – Water Managers group meeting regularly to implement
The GRCA and the RMOW

- Seven reservoirs managed to reduce flood damages and maintain flows
  - Flood peaks reduced 50% or more
  - Water released during summer & fall maintains minimum flows
  - Ensure drinking water and waste treatment plants can operate properly

- Cambridge & Bridgeport flood control works
The GRCA and the RMOW

• **GRCA owns more than 1,800 acres of recreational and natural land in the Region**
  - Two active Conservation Areas
    - Laurel Creek (Waterloo)
    - Shade’s Mills (Cambridge)
  
  - Two Nature Centres
    - Laurel Creek (Waterloo)
    - Shade’s Mills (Cambridge)
  
  - Natural areas & infrastructure:
    - Dumfries Conservation Area
    - Snyder’s Flats
    - Dickson & Bannister Lake wildlife areas
    - Chicopee
    - Stanley Park
    - Riverfront lands near Pioneer Tower
The GRCA and the RMOW

• 2014 Rural Water Quality Program in Region of Waterloo

  – 89 projects with total value of $1,305,000
  – Grants to landowners totalling $410,500
  – Projects included:
    • 22,600 trees planted
    • 40 acres retired
    • 600 metres of streams fenced
    • 11 wells plugged
    • 9 manure storage projects

• Recently updated guidelines
  – New grants available (cover crops, living snow fence, tile drain control structures, natural area restoration)
The GRCA and the RMOW

• **Mill Creek Rangers**
  – Community partnership to restore Mill Creek in Cambridge

• **Ocean Bound**
  – GRCA/GRCF sponsoring and providing exhibit info for Waterloo Region Museum display

• **Water Festival**
  – Waterloo Wellington Children’s Groundwater Festival (at Doon)
Budget overview

• **2015 expenditures: $29.1 million**
  – *down* from $29.8 million in 2014

• **Municipal dollars highly leveraged**
  – $1 in municipal levy matched by $2 from other sources

• **Per capita municipal levy: $10.39**
2015 budget issues

• Demand for GRCA services remains high
  – Responding to climate change (severe weather events)
  – Population growth

• Forestry Program
  – Emerald Ash Borer infestation
  – Ice Storm Funding

• GRCA Conservation Areas revenue
  – Weather dependent.
  – Revenue held constant at 2014 actual
  – Preparing Business Plans
  – Looking for cost savings and revenue opportunities
Response to budget issues

• **Managing staff costs**
  – restructuring of staffing complement
  – budgeting for savings due to gaps in employee service (e.g. leaves, departures, retirements)

• **Emerald Ash Borer**
  – requesting provincial funding

• **Provincial Funding Opportunities**
  – adhoc (special project) funding has been approved.

• **Hydro Development**
  – Cambridge new site development, potential for $600,000 gross annual revenue (2016)
  – Guelph site upgrade being evaluated
  – Shand/Conestogo have long term contracts in place

• **Conestogo Dam spillway project**
  – working with province to reduce size and cost of project

• **Major fundraising campaign underway**
  – ‘Your River, Your Life’ supports key projects to reduce impact on levy, e.g. trails, restoration projects
Total 2015 Budget Revenue = $29.1 Million (29.8 Million in 2014)
2015 Budget - Revenue

• **Revenue Categories**
  – Have remained consistent in relative size year over year.

• **General Municipal Levy**
  – Increasing by 2.5% to $10,548,000 in 2015
  – Operating Levy increasing 2.8%
  – Capital Levy held constant at $1.0 million (nil increase)

• **Special Projects**
  – Expenses are offset 100% by special funding sources.
  – Do not use general municipal levy to fund these projects.
2015 Budget – Expenditures by Category

2015 Budget Expenditures = \$29.1 Million \ ($29.8 Million in 2014)
2015 Budget - Expenditures

• **Operating Budget** ($23.5 million)
  – Watershed Management (Dams, flood forecasting, planning, lands management, education)
  – Conservation Areas
  – Corporate Services and Communication

• **Capital Budget** ($2.5 million)
  – Water Control Structures
  – Conservation Areas

• **Special Projects** ($3.1 million)
  – Rural Water Quality Program
  – Land Acquisition
  – Emerald Ash Borer
  – Source Projection Program
General Municipal Levy for 2015

Distribution of $10,548,000 Municipal Levy by Program

- Water Control Structures & FFW: 31%
- Water Resources Planning & Environment: 25%
- Resource Planning: 14%
- Forestry: 7%
- Conservation Services: 8%
- Communications & Foundation: 8%
- Environmental Education: 5%
- Conservation Lands: 2%

Total: 100%
GRCA Per Capita Levy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>7.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>7.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>8.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>8.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>9.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>9.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>9.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>10.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>10.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>10.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>10.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Budget 2015

## BUDGET 2014 VS BUDGET 2015 - "EXPENDITURES"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>Incr/(Decr)</th>
<th>%age change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total OPERATING</td>
<td>23,358,557</td>
<td>23,481,773</td>
<td>123,216</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total CAPITAL</td>
<td>2,962,400</td>
<td>2,549,000</td>
<td>(413,400)</td>
<td>-14.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Special Projects</td>
<td>3,474,000</td>
<td>3,045,000</td>
<td>(429,000)</td>
<td>-12.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL EXPENSES</td>
<td>29,794,957</td>
<td>29,075,773</td>
<td>(719,184)</td>
<td>-2.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# GRCA Budget 2015

## Section A: BASE PROGRAMS – OPERATING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BASE PROGRAMS</th>
<th>2014 Budget</th>
<th>2015 Budget</th>
<th>Incr (Decr)</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operating Expenditures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watershed Management and Other</td>
<td>13,116,600</td>
<td>13,322,450</td>
<td>205,850</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation Areas</td>
<td>6,367,000</td>
<td>6,317,000</td>
<td>(50,000)</td>
<td>-0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Services and Communications</td>
<td>3,874,957</td>
<td>3,842,323</td>
<td>(32,634)</td>
<td>-0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Base Operating Expenditures</strong></td>
<td>23,358,557</td>
<td>23,481,773</td>
<td>123,216</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sources of Funding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal General Levy</td>
<td>9,292,000</td>
<td>9,548,000</td>
<td>256,000</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Special Levy</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Grants</td>
<td>978,573</td>
<td>978,573</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Generated</td>
<td>12,561,000</td>
<td>12,481,200</td>
<td>(79,800)</td>
<td>-0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserves</td>
<td>124,000</td>
<td>324,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>161.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surplus Carried Forward</td>
<td>352,984</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>(252,984)</td>
<td>-71.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Base Funding</strong></td>
<td>23,358,557</td>
<td>23,481,773</td>
<td>123,216</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Section B: BASE PROGRAMS – CAPITAL

#### Capital Expenditures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>2014 Budget</th>
<th>2015 Budget</th>
<th>Incr (Decr)</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Water Contr. Structures, Gauges, FF&amp;W</td>
<td>2,150,000</td>
<td>1,800,000</td>
<td>(350,000)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation Areas</td>
<td>655,000</td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td>(55,000)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>157,400</td>
<td>149,000</td>
<td>(8,400)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Base Capital Expenditures</strong></td>
<td>2,962,400</td>
<td>2,549,000</td>
<td>(413,400)</td>
<td>-14.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Sources of Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>2014 Budget</th>
<th>2015 Budget</th>
<th>Incr (Decr)</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Municipal General Levy</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Grants</td>
<td>875,000</td>
<td>775,000</td>
<td>(100,000)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Generated</td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserves</td>
<td>487,400</td>
<td>174,000</td>
<td>(313,400)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Base Capital Funding</strong></td>
<td>2,962,400</td>
<td>2,549,000</td>
<td>(413,400)</td>
<td>-14.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## GRCA Budget 2015

### Section C: SPECIAL PROJECTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Special Projects</th>
<th>2015 Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grand River Water Management Plan</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floodplain Mapping</td>
<td>194,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Water Quality Program Capital Grants</td>
<td>800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecological Restoration</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emerald Ash Borer</td>
<td>400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquisition of Conservation Lands</td>
<td>300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source Protection Program</td>
<td>835,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>496,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Special Projects Expenditures</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,045,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## General Municipal Levy for 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% CVA in Watershed</th>
<th>2014 CVA (Modified)</th>
<th>CVA in Watershed</th>
<th>CVA-Based Apportionment</th>
<th>2015 Budget Operating Levy</th>
<th>2015 Budget Capital Levy</th>
<th>2015 Budget Total Levy</th>
<th>Actual 2014 Levy</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brant County</td>
<td>84.0%</td>
<td>5,191,477,357</td>
<td>4,360,840,980</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>299,997</td>
<td>31,420</td>
<td>331,417</td>
<td>322,593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brantford C</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>11,510,309,897</td>
<td>11,510,309,897</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>791,833</td>
<td>82,932</td>
<td>874,765</td>
<td>855,399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amaranth Twp</td>
<td>82.0%</td>
<td>594,676,910</td>
<td>487,635,066</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>33,546</td>
<td>3,513</td>
<td>37,059</td>
<td>36,159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Garafraxa Twp</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>455,738,235</td>
<td>364,590,588</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>25,081</td>
<td>2,627</td>
<td>27,708</td>
<td>27,222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Grand Valley</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>323,319,521</td>
<td>323,319,521</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>22,242</td>
<td>2,330</td>
<td>24,572</td>
<td>23,283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melancthon Twp</td>
<td>56.0%</td>
<td>434,354,020</td>
<td>243,238,251</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>16,733</td>
<td>1,753</td>
<td>18,486</td>
<td>18,144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southgate Twp</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>748,776,654</td>
<td>44,926,599</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>3,091</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>3,415</td>
<td>3,369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haldimand County</td>
<td>41.0%</td>
<td>5,772,883,876</td>
<td>2,366,882,389</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>162,826</td>
<td>17,053</td>
<td>179,879</td>
<td>177,155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norfolk County</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>7,763,139,368</td>
<td>388,156,968</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>26,703</td>
<td>2,797</td>
<td>29,500</td>
<td>28,947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halton Region</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>32,374,084,654</td>
<td>3,299,802,669</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>227,005</td>
<td>23,775</td>
<td>250,780</td>
<td>241,159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton City (estimated)</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>70,321,727,277</td>
<td>3,305,121,182</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>227,371</td>
<td>23,813</td>
<td>251,184</td>
<td>246,875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford County</td>
<td>38.0%</td>
<td>3,280,399,853</td>
<td>1,247,794,718</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>85,840</td>
<td>8,990</td>
<td>94,830</td>
<td>93,264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Perth T</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>1,574,264,932</td>
<td>31,485,299</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2,166</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>2,393</td>
<td>2,354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perth East Twp</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>1,440,152,628</td>
<td>576,061,051</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>39,629</td>
<td>4,151</td>
<td>43,780</td>
<td>43,121</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Waterloo Region**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% CVA in Watershed</th>
<th>2014 CVA (Modified)</th>
<th>CVA in Watershed</th>
<th>CVA-Based Apportionment</th>
<th>2015 Budget Operating Levy</th>
<th>2015 Budget Capital Levy</th>
<th>2015 Budget Total Levy</th>
<th>Actual 2014 Levy</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Centre Wellington Twp</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>3,901,277,684</td>
<td>3,901,277,684</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>268,451</td>
<td>28,116</td>
<td>296,567</td>
<td>287,256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erin T</td>
<td>49.0%</td>
<td>2,101,147,533</td>
<td>1,029,562,291</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>70,827</td>
<td>7,418</td>
<td>78,245</td>
<td>76,805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guelph C</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>20,630,146,045</td>
<td>20,630,146,045</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>1,419,218</td>
<td>148,640</td>
<td>1,567,858</td>
<td>1,523,954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guelph Eramosa Twp</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>2,226,730,120</td>
<td>2,226,730,120</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>153,184</td>
<td>16,044</td>
<td>169,228</td>
<td>165,640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mapleton Twp</td>
<td>95.0%</td>
<td>1,243,286,242</td>
<td>1,181,121,930</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>81,253</td>
<td>8,510</td>
<td>89,763</td>
<td>87,610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellington North Twp</td>
<td>51.0%</td>
<td>1,316,528,857</td>
<td>671,429,717</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>46,190</td>
<td>4,838</td>
<td>51,028</td>
<td>50,443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puslinch Twp</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>2,122,996,673</td>
<td>1,592,247,505</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>109,536</td>
<td>11,472</td>
<td>121,008</td>
<td>114,318</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% CVA in Watershed</th>
<th>2014 CVA (Modified)</th>
<th>CVA in Watershed</th>
<th>CVA-Based Apportionment</th>
<th>2015 Budget Operating Levy</th>
<th>2015 Budget Capital Levy</th>
<th>2015 Budget Total Levy</th>
<th>Actual 2014 Levy</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>254,337,134,741</td>
<td>138,792,396,875</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>9,548,000</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>10,548,000</td>
<td>10,292,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Budget Review Process

**Jan. 21**
- Detailed budget review
- Public input

**Feb. 11**
- Detailed budget review, approve user rate budgets
- GRCA, WRPS, Public input

**Mar. 4**
- Final budget review and approve tax supported budget
- Approve user fees and charges
2015 Regional Budget
Today's Agenda

• User Rate Budgets
  – GRCA presentation
  – Information paper
  – Resolutions for approval

• 2015-2024 Capital Plan

• Tax Supported Budget
  – 2015 Property Tax Budget Update, Information papers and recommendations
  – Budget issue papers
  – WRPS presentation

• Public Input
User Rate Budgets

Region of Waterloo
2015 User Rate Budgets

- Wholesale Water and Wastewater Rates

- Retail Water Distribution and Wastewater Collection for North Dumfries and Wellesley
Wholesale Water Rate

• Recommended water rate increase of 4.9% in 2015
• No budget issue papers
• No staff complement changes
• Additional information included information paper (p. 1-7 of Agenda), and detailed budget information in Preliminary Budget Book starting on p. 170
Wholesale Wastewater Rate

- Recommended wastewater rate increase of 7.9% in 2015
- No budget issue papers
- No staff complement changes
- Additional information included on in information paper (p. 1-7) of Agenda, and detailed budget information in Preliminary Budget Book starting on p. 182
Water Distribution Rate

- Water Distribution rate is recommended to increase by 8.9% in 2015
- Required for wholesale water increase and to fund operating expenses
- Monthly service charge is recommended to increase by $1.00
Wastewater Collection Rate

• Wastewater Collection rate is recommended to increase by 5.9% in 2015
• Required for wholesale wastewater increase
• Monthly service charge is recommended to increase by $1.00
• Model for each user rate service (water supply, wastewater treatment, water distribution and wastewater collection)
• Models determine the adequacy of rates for funding both operating expenditures and capital requirements
• Minimize user rate funded debentures
• Impacts of reducing projected rate increases
  – Negative impact on future reserve balances
  – Increases likelihood of issuing user rate supported debentures
  – Reduces flexibility to deal with in-year expenditure or revenue variances
  – Will not result in savings for most Regional residents, as most area municipalities have set their 2015 retail water and wastewater rates
• Impacts of reducing projected rate increases
  – Specific concern related to wastewater
  – Reserve balance will drop in the next 2 years due to significant capital investments
  – Region has issued $93m in growth related debentures, resulting in $7.1m annually to be funded from development charges
  – Wastewater reserves needed as a backstop in the event that RDC collections are not sufficient
User Rate Reserves

- Interim reserve balance target of one year's worth of revenue

- Current projections would achieve 80% of target balance for water and 60% for wastewater

- Staff to report back with a proposed reserve fund policy in 2015
Effective March 1, 2015:

- Wholesale water rate of $0.9776/m³
- Wholesale wastewater rate of $0.9441/m³
- Retail water distribution rate of $2.18/m³; monthly fee of $8.00 per account
- Retail wastewater collection rate of $1.79/m³; monthly fee of $6.00 per account; 9.9% increase for accounts billed at an annual flat rate

Note: retail rates apply to residents of North Dumfries and Wellesley only
2015 Tax Supported Budget

Region of Waterloo
## Tax Supported Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status of Preliminary Tax Supported Operating Position (excluding Police &amp; budget issues)</th>
<th>2015 Property Tax Levy ($millions)</th>
<th>2015 Tax Rate % Impact</th>
<th>2015 FTE Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regional Programs, January 21</td>
<td>$304.529</td>
<td>1.77 %</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste Management revenues</td>
<td>(0.051)</td>
<td>(0.01)%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning revenues</td>
<td>(0.120)</td>
<td>(0.03)%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuel Budget Price Strategy</td>
<td>(0.261)</td>
<td>(0.06)%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CSD reports:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>2015 FTE Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Alzheimer's (subject to Council approval February 11)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5.3 Perm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invest in Affordable Housing</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.0 Temp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children's Services Provincial Wage Enhancement</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.0 Temp</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Base Position excluding Police & budget issues**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>2015 FTE Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Base Position excluding Police &amp; budget issues</td>
<td>$304.097</td>
<td>1.67 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**3.0 Temp**
• Rural transfer stations: scheduled to close March 31, 2015; additional budget information provided

• User Fees: increase the minimum fee from $2 to $5 and increase tipping fees from $74 to $75 per tonne

• Roadside dumping: additional information on frequency of incidents and program delivery
Recommendation

- Amend the Fees and Charges by-law to increase the minimum fee per visit to the Regional landfill site and transfer stations from $2.00 to $5.00, effective July 1, 2015 and increase the 2015 Waste Management Revenue budget by $12,500;
2014 Minimum Fee Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Waterloo</td>
<td>$2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niagara</td>
<td>$5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peel</td>
<td>$5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durham</td>
<td>$5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halton</td>
<td>$5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essex Windsor</td>
<td>$6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>$8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton</td>
<td>$9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toronto</td>
<td>$10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York (Markham)</td>
<td>$10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ottawa</td>
<td>$10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guelph</td>
<td>$20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recommendation

• Amend the Fees and Charges by-law to increase the general refuse/garbage tipping fee from $74.00/tonne to $75/tonne, effective July 1, 2015 and increase the 2015 Waste Management Revenue budget by $38,250;
2014 Tipping Fee Comparison

- Essex Windsor: $59
- Guelph: $70
- Waterloo: $74
- London: $75
- Niagara: $90
- Peel: $100
- York (Markham): $100
- Ottawa: $102
- Toronto: $103
- Hamilton: $118
- Durham: $120
- Halton: $154
Recommendation

• Approve the new and revised fees and charges as listed in Report COR-FSD-15-01 dated January 21, 2015 (pages 26 and 27) for Community Planning, effective March 5, 2015 and increase the 2015 Community Planning User Fee Revenue budget by $120,000;
• addition of an ambulance is necessary to respond to growing demand (call volume) and to improve response times

• Budget issue paper: convert one RERU to a 12 hour ambulance

• Response times are generally longer in more rural areas due to longer travel distances (not volume of calls)

• The vast majority of calls for paramedic services come from urban areas
• Region's share of OW caseload is funded by tax levy and TSRF

• Staff has developed caseload projection scenarios

• TSRF sufficient to fund incremental costs until upload is complete
Reserves & Reserve Funds

info paper (pg 47)

- Some programs have adequate reserve contributions to finance capital investments.
- Others do not and rely on debenture financing.
- Budget issue paper requesting additional funding for Capital Levy Reserve Fund (CLRF).
- CLRF finances a small fraction of the capital plan.
• Targeted total reserve balances = one year of property tax and user rate revenue

• Currently at 40% of this target

• Region of Waterloo has very low reserve balances in comparison to other regions with similar services
Reserves & Reserve Funds

Reserve balances per capita*
Municipal Comparators

2013 Financial Information Return data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Reserves per capita</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>York</td>
<td>$1,410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halton</td>
<td>$1,370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durham</td>
<td>$1,260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peel</td>
<td>$1,070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niagara</td>
<td>$610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterloo</td>
<td>$390</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* excluding Development Charges reserves
Councillor Requests
info paper (pg 60)

• Assessment growth by area municipality
• 2010 – 2014 budget impacts
• Grand River Transit (GRT) budget issue paper: 2014 Service Level reductions - reduced or eliminated routes
• GRT fare subsidies for low income residents
• Community Homelessness Prevention Initiative
• Ontario Works Discretionary Benefits
Councillor Requests info paper (pg 60)

- Procurement of electricity
- Regional solar photovoltaic installations
- Impact of interest rate fluctuations on debt, reserves and sinking funds
- Service First Call Centre (SFCC) call volumes
- Capital renewal for Red Light Cameras
- Financing for Roads capital projects
## Councillor Requests

### RTMP funding (pg 68)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Original funding strategy (June 2011)</th>
<th>2014 Budget Revision</th>
<th>Increase 2015 to 1.6%, reduce final year (2019)</th>
<th>Increase 2015-17 to 1.6%, with balance required in 2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>1.25%</td>
<td>1.25%</td>
<td>1.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>1.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0.75%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration of funding strategy</td>
<td>7 yrs</td>
<td>8 yrs</td>
<td>8 yrs</td>
<td>7 yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015 budget impact - $</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.4 m</td>
<td>$0.4 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015 tax rate impact - %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.09 %</td>
<td>0.09 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recommendation

• Approve the recommendations from the Community Services Committee regarding the Provincial Wage Enhancement Program

• Set out in the Summary of Recommendations to Budget Committee (Appendix B – pg. 22)
Recommendations

• Approve the recommendations from the Community Services Committee regarding the Investment in Affordable Housing (2014 Extension) – Proposed Program Delivery and Fiscal Plan

• Set out in the Summary of Recommendation to the Budget Committee (Appendix B – pg. 22)
Crude Oil prices – 1 year

Source: nasdaq.com
Crude Oil prices – 1 month

Source: nasdaq.com
• 2015 base budget developed using 2014 budget cost ($1.07625/L)

• Adjust the budgeted fuel cost to $1.00 for diesel and $0.88 for unleaded

• Savings = $1.042m
  – $261k property tax reduction
  – Repurpose $760k to replace debt financing for GRT bus replacements
  – Repurpose balance of $21k to Fuel Equipment Reserve to replace debt financing
Benefits of strategy:

• Provides relief to tax levy
• Reduces 2015 debt requirement and future debt servicing costs related to bus and fuel equipment replacements
• Mitigates the risk associated with reducing the tax levy significantly
Recommendation

• Approve 2015 fuel budgets for direct Regional services based on a price of $1.00/litre for diesel and $0.88/litre for unleaded gas resulting in a 2015 operating expenditure reduction of $1,042,000 to be allocated as follows:
  – $261,000 reduction to the 2015 Property Tax levy,
  – $760,000 to be transferred to the Transit Vehicle Reserve to reduce debenture financing of Grand River Transit bus replacements, and
  – $21,000 to be transferred to the Fuel Equipment Reserve to reduce debenture financing of future fuel infrastructure replacement.
Budget Issue Papers

• Section 4 of Budget binder
• Service expansion/enhancement requests
• Budget Issue Papers provide details of the request, including costs/revenues, staffing requirements and implications of not approving
Appendix C

Budget impact: $1.6 m or 0.36% tax rate impact

Some recommended issues have no tax levy impact as they are funded from reserves, capital projects, offsetting expenditure reductions, or offsetting revenue increases.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue Papers</th>
<th>$ ’000s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Start-up and Transition Funding for Waterloo Region Economic Development Corporation (WREDC)</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation of Mobility Plus Business Plan</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paramedic Services Upgrade a RERU to an Ambulance and Crew</td>
<td>265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunnyside Home Resident Care</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate IT Solutions Administration and Support</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Financing</td>
<td>750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Tax Levy Impact</td>
<td>1,577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation of RTMP (funded from RTMP reserve)</td>
<td>797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities Project Management</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paramedic Services Master Plan Review</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homemakers and Nurses Coordinator</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Solutions Support</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graphic Design</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provincial Offences Court</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Public Transit

• GRT service enhancements
  (35,000 service hours and 12 buses)
• Mobility Plus business plan
  (additional vehicle and drivers)
Paramedic Services

- Master plan review (funded from reserve)
- Upgrade of Rural Emergency Response Unit (RERU) to a 12 hour ambulance
  - subsidy partially offsets costs (one year lag)
Waterloo Region Economic Development Corporation

- Approved in principle by Region and all 7 local Councils in 2014
- Recommendations considered by EDP Committee on Feb. 11/15
- Funding phased in over 2 years and added to existing funding for CTT
Capital Levy Reserve Fund (CLRF)

- Recommendation to increase the CLRF contribution in 2015
- Additional tax levy funding of the capital program required in future years
## Operating Budget Contributions to Capital Levy Reserve Fund

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Year</th>
<th>Proposed Increase</th>
<th>Council Approval</th>
<th>Total Contribution from Operating Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>$750,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>$750,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>$750,000</td>
<td>$190,000</td>
<td>$440,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>$390,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$540,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>$365,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$640,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>$380,000</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>$890,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>$750,000</td>
<td>$750,000*</td>
<td>$1,640,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Projects to be funded from CLRF in 2015 include (full list on pg. 58-59)

- Regional Service Review
- IT and communication infrastructure upgrades
- HR systems and process automation
- Multi Modal Hub project development
- Brownfield Environmental Assessment grants
- Various Cultural Site projects
- Public Health IT systems
- Also: Paramedic Services issue papers (if approved)
• Presented to Police Service Board Feb. 4
• Gross operating expenditure increase = $6.7m (4.4%)
• Levy increase = $4.7m (3.3%)
• Tax impact = 0.6%

• 2015 capital budget = $11.1m; 2015-2024 capital plan = $82.8m
• Any items carried over from today
• Provincial Funding for Children's Services (report to CS Committee on Feb. 24)
• Grant requests: Innisfree House, Haven House and Fashion History Museum
• Budget Issue Papers
• Final tax supported budget resolutions
• User Fees & Charges by-law
Discussion
10 Year Capital Program

Budget Committee
February 11, 2015
Objectives

• To provide an overview of 10 year capital program (Capital budget and 9 year Capital forecast) at the Region; and

• To outline the Region's financing plans for the capital program.
Capital Expenditure

• Acquisition, installation, construction or significant improvement / rehabilitation of land, buildings, engineering structures, facilities, machinery, equipment or information technology
Capital Expenditure

Total expenditure
2015-2024 capital plan
$3.6b

- Water & Wastewater: $1,203m (33%)
- Public Transit: $857m (24%)
- Roads: $899m (25%)
- Facilities: $174m (5%)
- Everything else: $459m (13%)
Capital Financing

- Grants / Subsidies / Recoveries
- Development Charges
- Property taxes and user rates
  - From previous years' budget and surplus allocations to Reserves and Reserve Funds
  - From the current year's budget
  - From future budgets: long term borrowing
Capital Financing

Total financing
2015-2024 capital plan
$3.6b

- Development Charges
  $1,089m
  30%

- Grants & Subsidy
  $520m
  14%

- Property tax reserves
  $653m
  18%

- User rates reserves
  $593m
  17%

- Debentures
  $737m
  21%
Capital Financing Principles

• Debenture financing focused on significant property acquisition, facilities and fixed infrastructure

• Increased use of current year revenues (property taxes and user rates) and reserves for replacement vehicles and renewal of existing buildings/facilities
Finding the balance

Down Payment

Debt
Regional Asset Valuation

- Water Services – $1.9B
- Transportation – $1.8B
- Housing and Facilities – $1.2B
- Grand River Transit - $135M
- Waste Management - $100M
- Airport - $50M
- Fleet - $42M
Capital Program: Roads

• Ten year investment: $899m
  – Rehabilitation - $428m
  – Expansion - $443m
  – Vehicles, equipment, buildings - $28m

• Projects listed in Appendix pg. 102-156

• Capital program designed to fit into funding envelope
Capital Program: Roads

- **Ten year financing:**
  - RDC - $384m (43%)
  - Rehab reserve fund - $161m (18%)
  - Federal gas tax - $150m (17%)
  - RDC debentures - $99m (11%)
  - Debentures for expansion - $64m (7%)
  - Capital levy reserve & cycle path - $20m (2%)
  - Vehicle reserve - $14m (1%)
  - Other - $7m (1%)
Capital Program: Wastewater

- Ten year investment: $756m
  - Major wastewater treatment plant upgrades at Waterloo and Kitchener WWTP - $293m
  - Galt WWTP and SCADA upgrades
  - Expansion projects
    - East Side lands pumping station
    - Baden-New Hamburg WWTP
    - Hespeler WWTP
    - Waterloo (St. Jacobs) WWTP
  - Projects listed in Appendix pg. 182-184
Capital Program: Wastewater

- Ten year financing:
  - Wastewater reserve fund - $371m (49%)
  - RDC - $261m (35%)
  - RDC debentures - $123m (16%)
  - Vehicle reserve - $1m (<1%)
Wastewater Reserve

- Reserve balance will drop in the next 2 years due to significant capital investments
- Region has issued $93m in growth related debentures, resulting in $7.1m annually to be funded from development charges
- Wastewater reserves needed as a backstop in the event that RDC collections are not sufficient
Capital Program: Rapid Transit

- Ten year investment: $632m
  - LRT construction - $438m
  - Vehicles - $73m
  - Hydro corridor and civil works - $42m
  - aBRT construction - $9m
  - Project development, Phase 2 EA & Cambridge Transit Initiatives - $20m
  - Other costs - $50m
  - Budget book – pg. 150
Capital Program: Rapid Transit

- Ten year financing:
  - Canada and Ontario - $493m (78%)
  - Debentures - $68m (11%) – mostly issued
  - GrandLinq long term debt - $31m (5%)
  - RTMP reserve fund - $30m (5%)
  - Other municipalities - $10m (2%)
Capital Program: Water

- **Ten year investment:** $438m
  - Master plan focuses on optimizing and sustaining the existing water supply and distribution systems
  - Projects include:
    - Combine William St and Strange St systems
    - Optimize water system in Cambridge
    - Implement Waterloo North Water Supply System
    - Replace/upgrade aging existing infrastructure
  - Projects listed in Appendix pg. 175-179
Capital Program: Water

- **Ten year financing:**
  - Water reserve fund - $257m (59%)
  - RDC - $173m (39%)
  - Transfer from Wastewater - $4m (1%)
  - Vehicle reserve - $4m (1%)
Capital Program: Grand River Transit

- **Ten year investment: $224m**
  - Vehicles, expansion & replacement - $106m
  - New maintenance facility (Northfield) - $65m
  - Other – shelters, passenger station, technology - $38m
  - Facilities renewal - $15m
  - Projects listed in Budget Book pg. 162
Capital Program: Transit (GRT)

- Ten year financing:
  - Debentures - $143m (64%)
  - Reserves (transit capital, transmission, bus, Mobility plus) - $61m (27%)
  - RDC - $20m (9%)
Capital Program: Facilities Management

- **Ten year investment: $213m**
  - Acquisition and construction - $105m
  - Refurbish and replace - $80m
  - Vehicles and voice radio - $28m
  - Projects listed in Budget Book pg. 38-44
Capital Program: Facilities Management

- **Ten year financing:**
  - Debentures - $194m (92%)
  - RDC - $8m (4%)
  - Lifecycle reserve - $4m (2%)
  - Capital levy reserve fund - $3m (1%)
  - Vehicle reserve - $2m (1%)
Capital Program: Waste Management

• Ten year investment: $135m
  – Current site - $100 m
  – Vehicles and equipment - $17m
  – Decommissioned sites - $4m
  – Other project - $4m
  – Projects listed in Budget Book pg. 156
Capital Program: Waste Management

• Ten year financing:
  – Debentures - $118m (87%)
  – Vehicle & equipment reserve - $17m (13%)
Capital Program: Community Services

- Ten year investment: $109m
  - Housing - $86m
  - Seniors' Services - $12m
  - Children's Services - $11m
  - Projects listed in Budget Book pg. 210, 214, 233
Capital Program: Community Services

- Ten year financing
  - Housing reserve fund* - $56m (51%)
  - Debentures - $37m (34%)
  - Grants & subsidies - $6m (6%)
  - Lifecycle reserve - $6m (6%)
  - Tax - $3m (3%)
  - Other - $1m (<1%)

* Note: not sustainable as reserve fund is not replenished through property tax
Capital Program: Other

- **Ten year investment: $122m**
  - Airport - $27m
  - Museum & Cultural Sites - $25m
  - Paramedic Services - $21m
  - Tax Increment Grants - $14m
  - Information Technology - $13m
  - All other services - $22m
  - Projects listed in Budget Book
Capital Program: Other

- Ten year financing
  - Debentures - $38m (31%)
  - Various reserve funds - $22 (18%)
  - RDC - $14m (11%)
  - CLRF - $12m (10%)
  - Vehicle/equip. reserves - $19m (16%)
  - Tax - $17m (14%)
## 2015 Capital Program Financing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program area</th>
<th>% of 2015 capital budget financed from debt</th>
<th>2015 property tax/user rate contribution to capital reserves</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Water &amp; Wastewater</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>$58.2 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>22.1 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand River Transit</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>5.0 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Services</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>0.9 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airport</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1.5 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste Management</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>1.0 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities Management</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>0.9 m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tax Supported Capital – Completion rates

- Actual $ spent vs. Budget $
  - 2014 – 43% (estimated)
  - 2013 – 45%
  - 2012 – 59%

- Comment: many projects are multi-year construction or rehabilitation projects for which timelines for expenditures are difficult to predict
Tax Supported Capital – Completion rates

- Over the last three years, divisional completion rates have ranged between 45% and 60%, with some as high as 80%

- Many projects are complex with lengthy timelines for design, approval, tendering and construction
User Rate Capital – Completion Rates

- Actual $ spent vs. Budget $
  - 2014 – 69% (estimated)
  - 2013 – 60%
  - 2012 – 79%

- Comment: smaller number of significant projects (e.g. Waterloo and Kitchener WWTP)
Internal Capital Program Reviews

- Annual CAO/CFO reviews of all capital programs
- Need, scope, cost and timing of all projects in first 5 years of program reviewed in detail
- Many projects adjusted after review
Debt Profile

• Current completion rates range from 40-80%
• Need to improve completion rate - work started for 2015 budget, more work to do
• In the interim, discounting capital plan spending estimates provides a better projection of long term financing needs
• As estimates are improved and achievement rates increase, the need for discounting will diminish
Debt outstanding profile

• 100% profile depicts projected debt outstanding per draft capital program

• Discounted profile depicts projected debt outstanding assuming discounted capital spending levels
Debt outstanding profile

Debt Outstanding Profile per spending scenarios

- 100% Profile
- Discounted Profile
Capital Financing Challenges

- Infrastructure renewal is reasonably well funded in Roads, Water and Wastewater

- but... is not well funded in Housing, Grand River Transit, Waste Management, and Facilities Management
The Region's Approach

• Focus future debt on new assets
• Increase property tax funding for:
  1. Infrastructure renewal (lifecycle provision) and replacement (GRT vehicles)
  2. Smaller, non-debenturable projects (CLRF)
• Development Financing Plan, Asset Management and Reserve/Reserve Fund policy
Budget Continuity
2014 Approved to 2015 Adjusted

Budget Position January 1, 2014 (Approved) $140,905,327
Add: Base Budget Expenditure Adjustments as at December 16th 6,298,929
Deduct: Projected Revenue Adjustments for 2015 (1,558,537)

Total Preliminary Net Levy Base Budget Increase of 3.4% $145,645,719

Add: Expansion Requests (4 Civilians and 85 CEWs) $407,617
Net Levy Budget Increase of 3.65% and a 0.7% Tax Rate Impact $146,053,336

Reduction scenario (Appendix B) to achieve 0.6% Tax Rate Impact $(443,780)
Net Levy Budget Increase of 3.34% and a 0.6% Tax Rate Impact $145,609,556
## 2015 Gross Operating Budget – Cost Drivers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Increase</th>
<th>Percentage of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salary, Wages and Benefits</td>
<td>$4,631,455</td>
<td>73.95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Allowances (Sick Leave &amp; Staff Training)</td>
<td>253,525</td>
<td>4.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance &amp; Repairs (Equipment)</td>
<td>291,208</td>
<td>4.65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Equipment Replacement (inclusive of CEWs)</td>
<td>524,638</td>
<td>8.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service &amp; Fees</td>
<td>219,934</td>
<td>3.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-Departmental Regional Charges</td>
<td>226,588</td>
<td>3.62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Fleet, Rent, Life Cycle Charge)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>115,418</td>
<td>1.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td><strong>$6,262,766</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Budget Reduction Scenario
To Achieve 0.6% Tax Rate Target

Proposed Budget as of December 16, 2014

Reduction Scenario
- Reduce Fuel budget in lieu of world oil prices $149,229
- Reduce IT Equipment Maintenance 132,958
- Reduce Equipment Requests totaling 41,798
- Workflow Document Management System (IT Reserve) 53,850
- IA Pro Blue Team System (IT Reserve) 30,000
- Reduce Meetings and Other Travel 5,250
- Reduce Conferences 30,695

Total Budget Cost Reduction Scenario $443,780 (443,780)
Total Budget, Net of Reduction Scenario as at Feb. 4, 2015 $145,609,556

Tax Rate Impact of 0.6% @ 1.52% Assessment Growth
Paramedic Services
Total call volume and code four call volume, by year
Waterloo Region, 2009-2014

*2009 change in triage tool; previous data not comparable.
Paramedic Services' response time to emergency calls (code 4), 90th percentile, by year
Waterloo Region, 2008-2014

Response Time (H:MM:SS)

- 2008: 0:11:48
- 2009: 0:11:44
- 2010: 0:12:12
- 2011: 0:12:17
- 2012: 0:11:54
- 2013: 0:11:08
- 2014: 0:11:34

90th Percentile
Trends in call volume and response times by year
Waterloo Region, 2008-2014

Resource/staffing enhancements

Calls

30,779
31,281
35,067
37,000

Year
2008 2009 2010 2011 2012 2013 2014

0:11:48 0:12:12 0:11:54 0:11:34

90th percentile response time (HH:MM:SS)
RERU calls are predominantly in rural areas. As per Ministry requirements, closest vehicles are dispatched to code 4 calls.
Call volume is highest in urban core areas
Number of days lost to offload delay
Trailing twelve month (T12M), Waterloo Region, 2011-2014

Offload Delay (days)

Month and Year

Per cent of time in code yellow status, by month
Waterloo Region, 2013-2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2014 code yellow time (H:M:S)
- Jan: 61:48:08
- Feb: 80:32:30
- Mar: 68:07:58
- Apr: 78:49:12
- May: 58:49:44
- Jun: 58:23:02
- Jul: 31:57:45
- Aug: 43:13:38
- Sep: 58:02:20
- Nov: 92:15:06
- Dec: 78:53:33

Historical average 6.9

Percentage (%)
Per cent of time in code red status, by month
Waterloo Region, 2013-2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>% of time in code red (2013)</th>
<th>% of time in code red (2014)</th>
<th>2014 code red time (H:M:S)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>1:52:23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>2:36:46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>2:14:13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>4:23:56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>4:41:50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>4:17:29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0:54:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>2:57:40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>3:16:50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>7:14:59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>4:57:59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>8:39:10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Historical average: 0.36%
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Call</th>
<th>Response Time Target</th>
<th>Approved 2013/14 ROW Target</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sudden Cardiac Arrest</td>
<td>Defibrillator Response in 6 minutes or less (Set by MOHLTC)</td>
<td>50% or better (EMS Only)</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTAS 1</td>
<td>EMS Response in 8 minutes or less (Set by MOHLTC)</td>
<td>70% or better</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTAS 2</td>
<td>EMS Response in 10 minutes, 30 seconds or less</td>
<td>80% or better</td>
<td>3,591</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTAS 3</td>
<td>EMS Response in 10 minutes, 30 seconds or less</td>
<td>80% or better</td>
<td>9,954</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>2,912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTAS 4</td>
<td>EMS Response in 10 minutes, 30 seconds or less</td>
<td>80% or better</td>
<td>5,507</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>1,922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTAS 5</td>
<td>EMS Response in 10 minutes, 30 seconds or less</td>
<td>80% or better</td>
<td>1620</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>653</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Paramedic Services compliance to response time performance plan (RTPP), by CTAS and year**

Waterloo Region, January 1st to December 31st, 2012-2014
Response time performance plan compliance by CTAS
Waterloo Region, 2013-2014

- **SCA (≤6:00)**
  - 2012: 42%
  - 2013: 42%
  - 2014: 39%

- **CTAS 1 (≤8:00)**
  - 2012: 66%
  - 2013: 75%
  - 2014: 66%

- **CTAS 2 (≤10:30)**
  - 2012: 82%
  - 2013: 84%
  - 2014: 83%

- **CTAS 3 (≤10:30)**
  - 2012: 77%
  - 2013: 79%
  - 2014: 78%

- **CTAS 4 (≤10:30)**
  - 2012: 74%
  - 2013: 75%
  - 2014: 74%

- **CTAS 5 (≤10:30)**
  - 2012: 71%
  - 2013: 73%
  - 2014: 71%

- **Approved 2013/14 ROW Target**: 70%
Paramedic Services' response time to emergency calls (code 4), 80th percentile, by population density
Waterloo Region, 2011-2014

Rural
- 2011: 13:52
- 2012: 13:05
- 2013: 12:30
- 2014: 12:47

Suburban
- 2011: 10:51
- 2012: 10:35
- 2013: 09:58
- 2014: 10:12

Urban
- 2011: 08:51
- 2012: 08:46
- 2013: 08:19
- 2014: 08:31

Response Time (H:MM:SS)
Township response time (90th percentile) with and without ERU calls included
Waterloo Region, 2011-2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Time saved code 1-4 calls</th>
<th>Time saved code 4 calls</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>00:33</td>
<td>00:33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>00:53</td>
<td>00:43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>00:29</td>
<td>00:25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>00:43</td>
<td>00:38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- All township calls, without ERU
- All township calls, with ERU
- All township C-4 calls, without ERU
- All township C-4 calls, with ERU
Comparison of hours of service to call volume
Ontario OMBI participating regions, 2011-2013

- △ 2011
- ■ 2012
- ● 2013

2013 OMBI median
(123 per 1,000)

2013 OMBI median
(332 per 1,000)

Lower call volume, higher service hours.
Higher call volume, higher service hours.

Lower call volume, lower service hours.
Higher call volume, lower service hours.

Weighted hours of ambulance service provided in the community per 1,000 people

Calls responded to per 1,000 people
Paramedic Services' response time to emergency calls (code 4), 90th percentile, by municipality

Waterloo Region 2012-2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge</td>
<td>11:43</td>
<td>11:05</td>
<td>11:41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchener</td>
<td>10:43</td>
<td>10:09</td>
<td>10:23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterloo</td>
<td>10:48</td>
<td>10:10</td>
<td>10:29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dumfries</td>
<td>16:49</td>
<td>16:09</td>
<td>16:43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellesley</td>
<td>20:39</td>
<td>20:51</td>
<td>20:53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilmot</td>
<td>18:57</td>
<td>18:48</td>
<td>18:35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woolwich</td>
<td>16:02</td>
<td>15:27</td>
<td>14:56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cities Average</td>
<td>11:01</td>
<td>10:26</td>
<td>10:46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Townships Average</td>
<td>17:49</td>
<td>17:25</td>
<td>17:14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Average</td>
<td>11:51</td>
<td>11:12</td>
<td>11:34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Response Time Working Group - April 25

Hours of ambulance service provided per 1000 population, by EMS Provider, OMBI, 2010-2012

Key Message(s): Insert.
Calls responded to per 1000 population, by EMS Provider, OMBI, 2010-2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>BAR</th>
<th>CAL</th>
<th>DUR</th>
<th>HAL</th>
<th>HAM</th>
<th>LON</th>
<th>MUSK</th>
<th>NIAG</th>
<th>OTT</th>
<th>SUD</th>
<th>TBAY</th>
<th>TOR</th>
<th>WAT</th>
<th>WIND</th>
<th>WINN</th>
<th>YORK</th>
<th>MED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: EMDS229 (Service Level)
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