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Providing services that bring our City to life!
Vision:
• To be the best place in Canada to raise a child, promote innovation, engage citizens and provide diverse economic opportunities.

Mission:
• We will supply quality public services that contribute to a healthy, safe and prosperous community, in a sustainable manner.
Alignment with Strategic Plan

Strategic Priority #1 – A Prosperous & Healthy Community
• 1.2 Prioritize capital infrastructure projects and optimize community benefit.
• 1.6 Enhance Overall Sustainability (financial, economic, social and environmental).

Strategic Priority #2 – Valued & Sustainable Services
• 2.1 Implement processes to improve services, leverage technology and validate cost effectiveness and efficiencies across the Corporation.
• 2.2 Improve the City’s approach to engaging and informing citizens and stakeholders.

Strategic Priority #3 – Leadership & Governance
• We work together to ensure we are a government that is respectful towards each other and that the community has confidence and trust in.
Moving Citizen Engagement Forward

To advance corporate citizen engagement priorities:

• Through this project we will develop a corporate citizen engagement policy
• All departments will be training staff in citizen engagement (capacity building)
• Information will assist the State of the Infrastructure Process (a corporate advisory team established)
• This project will assist the Service Delivery Review project
• Citizen engagement tools will be established and owned by the City
  » Web Site Tools, Mobile Apps, Social Media, Communication Tools
• A citizen engagement approach that can be used as a template for other departments will be developed
Citizen Engagement of Value Based Infrastructure Management
Project Background

- State of the Infrastructure Reports - presented to a number of capital workshops & committees (both Public Works and Community Services).
- At Public Works Committee in January 2010, staff were directed to provide further information to raise the asset grades.
- Council also raised concerns over community affordability.
- How do we balance Level of Service with affordability / or willingness to pay?
Project Background

• In June 2010, a follow-up report went to Public Works Committee:
  • What level of service should be provided by the City?
  • What public values or issues affect that level of service?
  • What are the costs of different levels of service?
  • How does the public view the pros, cons and trade-offs of those levels of service?
• The report, as approved by Council, recommended the need to develop and implement a public engagement process, for all City Infrastructure, to involve Council, staff, citizens and the general public in this important conversation.
The Asset Management Goal

- How can we manage ageing infrastructure, build for the future, and deliver the cost-effective services that meet the needs of the current and future community?

- The desired outcome of this process is to achieve a clear connection between the infrastructure services the City delivers and public values, priorities, needs and affordability for those infrastructure services.
General Project Overview

Phase 1 - Public Engagement

April to Sept 2012
- Planning the Process
  - Identify all customer groups

Sept to Dec 2012
- Consult to identify customer values
  - (All City Services)
- Review service standards, focusing on customer value areas

Jan and Feb 2013
- Assess options and costs to make service level changes

March 2013
- Consult to identify preferred options
  - (Infrastructure Services)

Phase 2 - Public Engagement

Report to Council
### Phase 2 Engagement - All City Infrastructure


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Asset Group</th>
<th>2008 Rating</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Projected 2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Significant deficit in capital funding. Detailed analysis using New Zealand Toolkit to better assess risk and liability.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Analysis not done for all facilities. Strategic plan required by asset categories, as they are not all at the same level of deterioration and liability. Detailed analysis using New Zealand Toolkit.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Limited asset inventory data. No capital contribution in the budget. Significant deterioration of assets is ongoing.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-Term Care Facilities</td>
<td>C-</td>
<td>Limited asset inventory data. No capital contribution in the budget. Lodges are in relatively new condition. Growth in the number of seniors will be a serious challenge.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
1. The 2008 rating was created on the same basis as the previous 2005 / 2006 reports and is comparable based on the combined consideration of the following three (3) criteria: Condition and performance, Capacity vs need, and Funding vs need.
2. Anticipated future trend based on current programming, level of investment and practices.
Project Branding

Our Voice
Our Hamilton

Making Decisions Together.
ourvoice.hamilton.ca

Understanding needs so we can deliver services for today & tomorrow.
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