

**ADDITIONAL INFORMATION**

January 24, 2024 Regular Council Meeting  
 Agenda Item 9.a) Bylaw No. 360 Q&R  
 - additional questions

Date & Meeting Type	Question Number	Question	Response																		
2024-01-24 Regular	Q.60	RE: Q.16. Provide Council with an update to Q.16: i.e., a table showing a breakdown of the cost savings for the new one-page, double-sided format. I will be making a motion on Wednesday to amend the GL code to reflect this savings.	Annual newsletter production savings are estimated at approximately \$9,373, comprised of paper (\$373), Print cost (\$3,016) and Contractor cost (\$6,000). No change to Canada Post cost. However, this does not include the increased staff time required (Director, Deputy & Admin Assistant) or first template set-up costs. For clarity, the Print cost is charged to GL 01-510-626; however, staff do not recommend reducing this account as with many major new legislative and bylaw projects in 2024, it is anticipated that copying costs will increase. The Contractor costs (per a previous Council motion), were funded from COVID funds to GL 01-5-10-552 Consultants (Administration), resulting in no tax impact. Staff do not recommend reducing this GL for Administration Consultants further as it is already low at \$10,000 as there are other anticipated expenses to this GL, including Administration consultants, and recording Council meetings which may be underfunded if the anticipated return to 2 meetings/month does not transpire.																		
2024-01-24 Regular	Q.61	<p>Page 18 of our open agenda includes a Property Tax Comparison 2023 vs. 2024, showing -7,400 (-0.24%). However, some updates have happened recently, including contractor rate updates and CPI finalization.</p> <p>Would it please be possible to get an updated table for consideration at the meeting?</p>	<p>If we incorporate the tax savings of \$35,864 and summarize it in a table:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1180 922 1982 1187"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>2023</th> <th>2024</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Property Tax General Levy</td> <td>3,067,600</td> <td>3,115,836 (3,151,700 - 35,864)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Gross Increase (Y/Y)</td> <td></td> <td>48,236</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Non Market Change Revenue</td> <td></td> <td>91,500</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Net Decrease \$ (Y/Y)</td> <td></td> <td>-43,264</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Net Decrease % (Y/Y)</td> <td></td> <td>-1.41%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>The alternative is to put \$35,864 of tax savings in reserve and keep the tax levy unchanged at \$3,151,700.</p>		2023	2024	Property Tax General Levy	3,067,600	3,115,836 (3,151,700 - 35,864)	Gross Increase (Y/Y)		48,236	Non Market Change Revenue		91,500	Net Decrease \$ (Y/Y)		-43,264	Net Decrease % (Y/Y)		-1.41%
	2023	2024																			
Property Tax General Levy	3,067,600	3,115,836 (3,151,700 - 35,864)																			
Gross Increase (Y/Y)		48,236																			
Non Market Change Revenue		91,500																			
Net Decrease \$ (Y/Y)		-43,264																			
Net Decrease % (Y/Y)		-1.41%																			
2024-01-24 Regular	Q.62	What was the approximate balance of the Covid Restart Grant before we started the 2024 budget process? The answer to question 58 (in the question and answer green pages of the January 24 agenda), state the balance is 425 735 – but as of what date?	The approximate balance of the Covid Restart Grant before we started the 2024 budget process, as of Jan. 1, 2024, was \$360,000.																		

Date & Meeting Type	Question Number	Question	Response
2024-01-24 Regular	Q.63	<p>One time project Operating reserve. Pg 18 agenda states for the 2024 budget the opening balance of the One Time Project Reserve was 50 000.</p> <p>50 000 was contributed to this reserve in 2022, and 50 000 in 2023. In the 2023 budget, 50 000 was removed from this reserve for the Koers DCC Review.</p> <p>Now that the Housing Capacity Funding Grant, is funding this DCC review, will the 50 000 be returned to the Operating One Time Project Reserve fund? And will the 10 000 needed to fund the DCC Review increase to 60 000, also be returned to where it originated?</p>	<p>The actual One Time Project Operating Reserve balance as of today is \$100,496.57</p> <p>We haven't processed all 2023 invoices and this balance is subject to change.</p> <p>The \$50,000 balance is recorded on the 2022 financial statements.</p>
2024-01-24 Regular	Q.64	<p>The \$40 000 improvements to the District owned Seaview School parking lot, were funded from gas tax.</p> <p>A multitude of different things including gardens and replacing banners in the Phase 2 Village Improvement, are all being funded by gas tax.</p> <p>Hence, cannot the \$25 000 for improvements to the Jacks Beach Road End, also be funded from Gas tax, as the proposed Jacks Rd improvements are the same as the Village improvements – gardens, a walkway, and the redefining the boundaries of the road.</p>	<p>Yes, 25,000 can be funded from Gas Tax if Council passes a motion to do so.</p>

Date & Meeting Type	Question Number	Question	Response
2024-01-24 Regular	Q.65	<p>Is there a cost and big process involving Highways Dept, in a road closure bylaw? In the Council Priorities sheet, such a bylaw is being proposed for the Lavender beach road end. Is it also being proposed for the Jacks beach road end project? Of note, I don't recall such a bylaw being required for closing the Sebastion beach road end to traffic.</p>	<p>Survey cost &amp; not a big process, but too early to determine whether a road closure bylaw will be required - it will be determined after designs are complete (considering the extent of access &amp; legal advice). The process to close a portion of road is legislated, requires public notice, public input, notice to utilities, cannot deprive an owner of access, and does not involve directly MOTH, unless it is located within a 800 m. of Hwy 19, in which case there would be a referral to MOTH. Expense, besides staff time, would be for a survey to append to the bylaw, and to send to Land Title Office to raise land title.</p>
2024-01-24 Regular	Q.66	<p>– An increase in the tax rate was approved for the Managed Forest category. There are two options: a) Use this extra tax income to increase, by that amount, the total tax collected, with the increased portion of the Managed Forest tax income to be allocated to the Road Reserve. b) Use this extra Managed Forest tax income to very slightly reduce the Residential portion of the total tax bill.</p> <p>Does staff have a preference regards these two options, considering the amount of staff work, or are they somewhat equal? (Note – my motion below reflects option a).</p>	<p>Either way works.</p>