



Off-site Levy Bylaw Review – Community Services Working Group Meeting Notes

Date/Time: November 3, 2022 / 1:00 – 2:30 PM

Location: MS Teams – video conferencing and The Water Centre – 625 25 Avenue SE

Attendees:

Internal	External
Quinn Eastlick	Jamie Cooper
Pam McHugh*	Shameer Gaidhar
Angela Sedor	Brian Hahn
Rachel Gill	Guy Huntingford
Brian Arthur	Jackie Stewart
	Thilo Kaufmann
	Marcello Chiacchia
	Graeme Melton
	Mohamed Mohamed
	Graminder Brar

*Note taker

Agenda

- 1. Welcome & Agenda Overview** – Quinn Eastlick
- 2. Meeting Norms (Hybrid)** – Quinn Eastlick
- 3. Work Plan Update** – Angela Sedor
- 4. Team Update** – Angela Sedor
- 5. Libraries** – Angela Sedor
- 6. Benefit Update** – Angela Sedor
- 7. Discussion** – Quinn Eastlick

Feedback collected:

General Feedback/Comments

- Skyview Ranch Library appears twice in the list. Are there 2 Skyview libraries or just one?
- If the Seton Library is complete, why are you not showing the actual cost as opposed to what appears to be a budget number? Doesn't the cost stand to be less? Let's get clarity on this because it might potentially have contingency and then if the project came in less, it could impact the rate that gets calculated. Same question for Genesis and QP libraries. Do the totals include contingencies? These are very round numbers. In addition (referring to slide 10), if they are budget numbers, do they carry contingency (such as 10%)? Might we be adding contingency on top of contingency?
- What municipalities are utilizing the 0.36ft²/person figure?



- Can we get the basis behind the 0.36ft²/person? How has this rate changed over time relative to how libraries may have changed over time? Almost two years ago, someone came in from the library system with their projects and costs. They revised it down to 0.3 feet per person specification. This seems like close to a 20% difference---this is a dramatic difference. The change was understood to be due to changes in how patrons were using the libraries.
- For those libraries that are under construction or are complete, is it possible to get a column showing actual costs so that there is a proper comparison?
- For Belmont and Walden, are they using a different model? In other words, they've decided they don't need as many square feet or what has been built to date. If that is the direction the library is going, and the fact the unfunded list is 2027 and out, have you pressed the CPL to see what others will be using this different model? These numbers seem high and will affect the levy being paid. What about Nose Creek? Going forward, the odds of libraries being the same size they've been in the past seem unlikely.
- What might help us understand these numbers is the basis behind them. I'd like to see the catchment, for example, in Belmont---the population it services and the actual size of the library. What rate is determined to provide the project cost? We always want to know what is behind it. Please provide us with a detailed background on how these numbers are arrived at (Slide 8).
- The information was not provided in a timely way. We trust your team is working hard and there are a lot of moving parts. We need to be allotted the appropriate amount of time for this process to be successful. When these meetings move, it causes calendar juggling. December is a very busy month and dates will need to be committed to. We'd prefer adequate time to review and then to have questions answered in the session.
- For the Walden Library, it is in a developed community so is this coming from an existing balance? What is contributing toward the \$6.5 M total project estimated cost and how it is accounted for?
- Slide 8, we are looking at 2022 numbers, yes? Is it possible to get a sense of when these other unfunded projects will be likely to plug into the equation? What is the triggering event? Is it, "There are X numbers of houses here now?" How do we anticipate when these projects are likely to happen?
- What is the impact, if any, of grants on these project costs?
- Population forecasts: Has there been another update, and will this be provided to us? How will you provide population assumption so that we can work back on how you got these project costs?
- For those libraries that are under construction or are complete, is it possible to get a column showing actual costs so that there is a proper comparison? For the projects that are done or underway, like Seton, is a presentation of where it ended up. What is more? What is less? Similar to Symons Valley: what are the project costs to date and what is anticipated? It might provide context on the cost side (slide 8 table).
- How do these costs (actuals) relate to the Annual Report? Seton showed \$2 Million in OSL Report.
- Because the benefit is a population estimate it is essentially 100%, right? Capital cost is defined by the population which is already accounting for the benefit. You are not building more libraries than the ASP can handle. Going to the infrastructure list, the very important inputs are what is the population per library we are using. A lot of ASPs predict population and jobs. Are



we taking estimates and comparing them to actuals? Should we be comparing to maximum population potential?

- Looking at the formula, you probably can shortcut the entire top area if your formula is based on these assumptions. The ones that matter most are square feet per population and dollar per square foot that would be contained in that area. Although we like having a project list, might we save time if we know the population estimates and the connected area? In Providence, you wouldn't need to do double the math. If you reduce the formula, you'd have something much simpler.
- Some of these projects are joint sites, like Symons Valley and Walden. What might be helpful is to know the facility's total cost and then the components. Depending on how The City appropriates costs, there is a huge amount of estimation that someone is going to do. It would be helpful in the notes to understand, "This much went to the library, this went to supportive housing, etc." Ultimately, we want to know if it is a fair allocation.
- When we talk about a multi-service facility, what do we mean by that? In Seton, the library is part of the larger recreational complex, yes? What is Walden part of?
- For each of the existing, complete, underway and "2023 -2025" libraries are shown on the map. Please confirm the name and street address of the library. Referring to the Infrastructure Map.
- Please provide a table assigning each of the complete, underway, unfunded, and "2023 -2025" libraries to their applicable ASP.
- Below is a slide from the July 14, 2020, City presentation. Does this concur with what is being presented today?
- Do any of the existing libraries fall in the temporary site category? It will be helpful to know the address of the future libraries and what ASP they are a part of.
- Table 41 is from the 2016 OSL Bylaw Update. Are there updated actual costs or revised estimates for future project costs based on cost per square footage?
- Page 64 of 80 in the 2021 Annual Report shows the total budget of the project for the Seton – Library as \$2M. How does the Annual report connect with Table 41 above?
- Genesis – where is this shown in any OSL Annual Report?
- Quarry Park – We do not see specific costs for the library in the 2021 OSL Annual Report, are they included in the recreation facility? If so, help us understand how costs are reconciled between the rec facility and the library.
- Are the assumptions in Table 26 below still applicable? Have these assumptions been validated? In general, we need an understanding of how the current balances will be factored in, including investment income correction.
- What is the difference between a standalone and incorporate into a multi-service building? I think there is a discrepancy between the costs in Table 41. I want to make sure we are being efficient with levy dollars. If combining the facilities to get that efficiency makes sense, then we want to better understand if there is a cost estimate difference per square foot. We'd hope an integrated facility would be cheaper.
- Slide 10, are these budgets, contingencies, or actuals---this is where we need clarity and a response.
- What is meant by "options to simplify the benefit"? If we look back to the current methodology, and we are adjusting how many people and how many hectares are needed to service these people, are these assumptions significantly different when looking at the leviable land base? Is



that what we will be looking at next? Have any drafts of the levy rate been conducted? The more information that can be provided to build up that trust with industry will be very helpful.

- Is benefit determined per individual project or a percentage of all the projects combined? Will it be summed all together into a rate?
- How is benefit % calculated?
- Please provide the population forecasts for the leviable land base that is used to determine benefit allocation.
- Please provide details of how the leviable land base (denominator) was determined.
- Regarding grants, it always seems to be one of those issues that are muddy, and how that affects the levy. How are you going to deal with the grant money as we go forward with this? We will be interested to follow this matter.
- In summary, we are looking for a procedure. We will really appreciate getting things in a timely basis. This process has taken a while and part of the reason is that all Industry questions, it is often the basis of numbers and the numbers behind numbers. Moving forward and in future reviews, The City comes forward with that information upfront as part of the calculation. I am unsure when we get the answers and if we have time to discuss these items again.
- Working group still needs to see:
 - Population estimates: Are we using anticipated or maximum across the ASP area? Are we using .3 or .36 and what is that based on? What about jobs versus people?
 - Project list accompanying details will be good to see.
 - If possible, the cost of standalone versus combined facilities.
 - We want to understand the methodology behind grants and how that works.
 - We want to understand facility cost estimates versus actuals and see how close it hit the mark.
- Looking forward to the discussion on benefit.