New challenge for Hamilton

2013 Tax implications for Flamborough
Flamborough is largest Ward population 45000 dwellings 15000

139.9 k

139.2 k

Flamborough a city within a city

New solutions for Flamborough are required to insure a fair return for our tax dollars
No growth in Hamilton since 2001

2006 Statistics Canada Census for the City of Hamilton

The City of Hamilton experienced a positive growth rate of 2.91% from 2001 to 2006, somewhat lower, in comparison to the Ontario's growth rate of 6.6%, which exceeded that of the Canada's national average.

Both the communities of Glanbrook and Ancaster show the highest population change for a community. Hamilton, Glanbrook and Ancaster had a population of some 8,895 individuals. Generally, all Communities contributed to the city's growth except the exception of Ancaster seeing a slight decline in its overall population but remaining consistent at 20.91%.

The percentage of unit change for the City of Hamilton leading to growth has been in proportion since 2001.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton</td>
<td>329,820</td>
<td>331,121</td>
<td>-1,301</td>
<td>-0.39%</td>
<td>142,559</td>
<td>138,093</td>
<td>3.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoney Creek</td>
<td>62,292</td>
<td>57,327</td>
<td>4,965</td>
<td>8.66%</td>
<td>22,294</td>
<td>20,103</td>
<td>10.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glanbrook</td>
<td>15,293</td>
<td>12,145</td>
<td>3,148</td>
<td>25.92%</td>
<td>5,939</td>
<td>4,148</td>
<td>22.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ancaster</td>
<td>33,232</td>
<td>27,485</td>
<td>5,747</td>
<td>20.91%</td>
<td>11,088</td>
<td>9,680</td>
<td>40.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dundas</td>
<td>24,702</td>
<td>24,394</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>1.26%</td>
<td>9,680</td>
<td>9,680</td>
<td>61.91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flamborough</td>
<td>39,220</td>
<td>37,796</td>
<td>1,424</td>
<td>3.77%</td>
<td>13,362</td>
<td>12,062</td>
<td>3.49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Hamilton</td>
<td>504,559</td>
<td>490,268</td>
<td>14,291</td>
<td>2.91%</td>
<td>204,922</td>
<td>194,154</td>
<td>5.55%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Statistics Canada, 2001 and 2006 Census
Note: Population and Dwelling Counts have been aggregated to Community from Census tract data.
2006 - 2012 projected debt table:

**Projected Outstanding Debt - Tax & Rate**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>External Debt</th>
<th>Internal Debt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Yearly Expenditure**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Funded from Tax Levy</th>
<th>Funded from Rates</th>
<th>Funded from DC's</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>681</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>647</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>1,029</td>
<td>1,072</td>
<td>1,073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>1,008</td>
<td>1,008</td>
<td>435</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The table above illustrates the projected outstanding debt for taxes and rates from 2005 to 2015. The graphs on the right side show the breakdown of annual expenditure funded from different sources for the years 2012 to 2021.
Hamilton Debt is out of control
We will exceed $1 BILLION

Projected Outstanding Debt - Tax & Rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$ Millions</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Funded from Tax Levy**
- **Funded from Rates**
- **Funded from DC's**
Hamilton Employee Related budget is out of control

2012 Gross Tax Expenditures by Type - $1.25 billion

- **Employee Related** 52%
- Agencies/Support Pymnts 21%
- Capital Financing 8%
- Material/Equipment 10%
- Contractual/Consulting 8%
- Reserves/Recoveries/Financial 1%
at $60,000 salary
$109,440,000 added to yearly budget

1824 people in 12 years
added to payroll

Employee headcount City of Hamilton
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at $60,000 salary
$109,440,000 added to yearly budget

1824 people in 12 years added to payroll

yearly Employee growth
Household Income - 2005

Percent (%) of Total Private Households

- Ward 1
- Hamilton

Income Ranges:
- Under $10,000
- $10,000 to $19,999
- $20,000 to $29,999
- $30,000 to $39,999
- $40,000 to $49,999
- $50,000 to $59,999
- $60,000 to $69,999
- $70,000 to $79,999
- $80,000 to $89,999
- $90,000 to $99,999
- $100,000 and over
Toronto residential property tax remains the lowest in the GTA

2009 Property Taxes Paid on a Residential Property assessed at $387,680*

- Municipal (Upper and Lower)
- Education

*2009 average assessed value of residential properties in Toronto
Flamborough taxes

Flamborough - 2000 Taxes

2000 Municipal Taxes
$28.5 million

2000 Total Taxes
$44.0 million

Flamborough - 2007/08 Taxes

2007 Total Taxes
$62.8 million

2008 Total Taxes
$70.5 million
Flamborough’s taxes will continue to climb year after year.
Flamborough’s skyrocket taxes since 2000

Taxes 11th Concession home valued at $315,000 today
Retired couple

Forecast to 2015
What will happen to the unspent Budget?

### CAPITAL FUND

#### THE CITY OF HAMILTON

#### BUDGET VARIANCE REPORT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACCOUNT</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Year To Date</th>
<th>Life to Date</th>
<th>O/S Req / PO</th>
<th>Available</th>
<th>% Complete</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>53415</td>
<td>Furniture &amp; Equipment</td>
<td>562,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>562,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55706</td>
<td>Architectural Fees</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>206,980.97</td>
<td>212,934.45</td>
<td>120,108.79</td>
<td>(333,043.24)</td>
<td>(627.90)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55713</td>
<td>Building Permit Fees</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>627.90</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>(627.90)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55725</td>
<td>Development Charge Fees</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>7,303.53</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>(7,303.53)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55772</td>
<td>Other Fees &amp; Services</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>40.31</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>(40.31)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55801</td>
<td>Consulting Services</td>
<td>420,000.00</td>
<td>30,579.54</td>
<td>194,338.42</td>
<td>20,376.15</td>
<td>205,285.43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59212</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>5,700,000.00</td>
<td>35,385.07</td>
<td>111,750.16</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>5,588,249.84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59236</td>
<td>Feasibility Study</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>47,500.00</td>
<td>900.00</td>
<td>(48,400.00)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59271</td>
<td>Other Capital Expenditures</td>
<td>420,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>420,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59801</td>
<td>Cap-Cur_Recovery_Sal,Wage,Ben</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1,417.31</td>
<td>23,518.28</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>(23,518.28)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59803</td>
<td>Cap-Cur_Recovery_Contracts</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4,160.97</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>(4,160.97)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenditure</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>7,102,000.00</td>
<td>274,362.89</td>
<td>602,174.02</td>
<td>141,384.94</td>
<td>6,358,441.04</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SUBJECT: Financial Update on Paid Parking In Waterdown & Stoney Creek
(PED11104(a)) (Wards 9 & 15)

Information:

The annual revenues expected from paid parking in Waterdown are $48,000.00 and $128,000.00 in Stoney Creek. However, actual revenues are $17,766.94 in Waterdown and $35,645.53 in Stoney Creek.

Staff conclude that the reduced revenues can be attributed to several factors including;

- non-acceptance of paid parking by the community,

- budget estimates were based on paid parking both on and off-street, and with Council's decision to retain free parking in the off-street lots, more motorists are parking in the municipal car parks where there is no charge, rather than paying to park on the street; and,

- the net loss of 12 meters in Waterdown (Mill Street Heritage District).

Notwithstanding the fact that the meters in these areas are underperforming financially, the revenue picture has improved somewhat since the last staff report (PED11104) to the Planning Committee on June 7, 2011. Staff anticipates that the resistance to paid parking will continue to subside over time and that revenues will increase slightly. However, until such time as paid parking is implemented in the adjacent municipal car parks, staff are of the opinion that the original budget forecasts cannot be obtained.

Committee should also be aware that on November 16, 2011, City Council approved pre-Christmas free parking within the Waterdown BIA resulting in an estimated reduction of $1,700 in revenues.
Chart 1 illustrates that while the downtown area represents 10% of Hamilton’s population, it has 13% of the city’s female lone parents, 16% of Hamilton’s Aboriginal population, 19% of the city’s visible minority population, 20% of the city’s population with activity limitations, 23% of the city’s population of persons living on incomes below the poverty line, 26% of the city’s recent immigrants, and 32% of the city’s renters living in unaffordable housing.

Chart 1. Downtown area’s share of selected groups within the City of Hamilton
Equality for Flamborough

- The Flamborough Downs revenue was taken from Flamborough and placed in City revenue and distributed for all of Hamilton.
- Yet with introduction of Area Rating Waterdown and Binbrook received large tax increases and the old Hamilton wards received tax decreases and discretionary spending allowances totaling millions of dollars.
- WHY were these discretionary allowances not dispersed equally to all the councilors in all wards?
Mill Street traffic

- Judy Partridge, the Mayor and the traffic department must assist the Mill Street committee to resolve the traffic problem.
- The recent traffic count showed 10,000 cars in a one week period traveling southbound, a northbound study should have been done also, which could result in doubling the true traffic.
- Red tape and political haggling must be put aside for the good of the school children on this very busy street.
Reduce possible waste

- Let's look at Parking meter Department they should be self-supporting requiring no additional budget.

- Look at the tree cutting Dept and ask what they are doing with city vehicles and city equipment.

- Commend Councilors Merulla and Ferguson for their stand on Maintenance Dept and outright refuse their 6.2% budget increase request.
$109,440,000 added to yearly budget at $60,000 salary

1824 people in 12 years added to payroll
Mayor’s promise

• We want to remind the mayor about his election promise to review and outline amalgamation costs as they pertain to Hamilton and to the amalgamated wards