

## ***Template for CC-GFIG Involvement in City Budget***

Calgary City Council will be debating and approving a three-year budget in November. Completing the budget is a complex, difficult, and potentially controversial process.

CivicCamp's Governance, Finance, and Infrastructure Group (CC-GFIG) has decided to become involved in reviewing and commenting on the budget. Because the City's budget determines what does and doesn't get done at City Hall, CC-GFIG feels it is essential to ensure that debate is as broadly-based and well-informed as possible.

As with all of its initiatives, the extent of CC-GFIG's involvement will depend on the time its members and other CivicCampers can devote to the issue. CC-GFIG's objectives for its participation in the budget process are:

1. Increase the knowledge of CC-GFIG members and other CivicCampers about the content of the budget proposed by City Administration.
2. Inform CC-GFIG members and other CivicCampers about how they can become involved in making known their views on the budget.
3. Analyze the budget. Possible perspectives to use are:
  - a. [CivicCamp values](#)
  - b. [City Council's Fiscal Plan](#)
  - c. The Triple Bottom Line
  - d. The sustainability of municipal finances
4. Make representation to City Council on the budget.

Since this is the first time CC-GFIG has been involved in the budget process, the first objective – increased knowledge – will be the priority.

There are many ways of evaluating the City's budget. Tables 1 and 2 show some of the perspectives CC-GFIG could use in evaluating and responding to the budget. In each table there are also some examples of information that is available and an initial draft of how CC-GFIG might respond.

**Table 1 Evaluating the Budget Based on CivicCamp Values**

CivicCamp Values	Available Information	Draft Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Great public spaces activated by residents.</li> </ul>	➤	➤
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A city and region of vibrant urban villages.</li> </ul>	➤	➤
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>An integrated, interconnected, sustainable, affordable and equitable transportation system for all people and all modes – walk, bike, wheelchair, bus, train, auto, air.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><a href="#">Calgary Transit Customer Satisfaction and Non-User Survey - 2010</a> - Telephone survey in November, 2010.                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There has been a steady increase in the number and proportion of Calgarians who use transit. (pp. 2 &amp; 4)</li> <li>Most transit users are satisfied with the transit service, but less than a quarter consider the service to be excellent. (p. 5)</li> <li>In terms of specific service attributes, no attribute received an excellent rating greater than 32% in 2010. Only the convenience of purchasing tickets and the courteousness &amp; helpfulness of staff received an excellence rating greater than 25%. Overcrowding is the most serious problem. When asked if transit is not overcrowded, less than 45% of transit users gave an excellent or good rating. (pp. 7-8)</li> <li>Being on time, service frequency, and not being overcrowded continue to be the most important factors for transit users. Safety &amp; security is also important. (p. 11)</li> <li>The key area where transit is not meeting customer expectations is time: being on time, service frequency, length of travel time, &amp; convenience of connections &amp; transfers. In terms of overcrowding, transit users' low expectations are matched by poor performance. (pp. 13-14)</li> <li>There is a general decline in customer satisfaction accompanied by a similar decline in whether transit users feel they are getting value for their money. (p.15)</li> <li>When people find transit service has improved, the primary reason is that service frequency has increased. Service frequency and overcrowding are the primary reasons people feel service has gotten worse. (pp. 21-22)</li> <li>Around 40% of Calgarians are regular transit users (7-9 trips per week) and 35 to 40% are occasional users. Generally, non-users are less than 25%. (p. 24)</li> <li>80% of transit users walk to their transit stop. Only 10% use Park and Ride. (p. 28)</li> <li>Close to half of non-users were previously regular transit users. (p. 31)</li> <li>Around half of transits users can be considered committed transit users (i.e., no reason to switch). Another 40% to 45% are ambivalent, that is, with good reasons to use or not use transit. (p. 36)</li> <li>Two-thirds of non-users are committed to their choice of transportation. (p. 38)</li> </ul> </li> <li><a href="#">Calgary Transportation Plan</a> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Primary Transit Network ... will operate every 10 minutes or less over an extended operating period, seven days a week. (p. 3-11)</li> <li>The City currently has a cost-recovery policy for transit that requires 55% of transit's operating costs to be recouped from transits fares and other revenue. (p. A-3)</li> </ul> </li> <li>The City does not have a cost-recovery policy for roads.</li> <li>Canada-wide, revenue that might qualify as road user "fees" only provides an estimated third of the direct cost of public road infrastructure. For Alberta, the estimate is that fees only cover a fifth of road costs.<sup>1</sup></li> </ul>	<p>The transit budget is a key tool in creating a more efficient and sustainable city. Time, along with safety/security and lack of crowding are the key factors in encouraging and keeping transit customers. Forty per cent of Calgarians are regular transit users and half of transit users do not see a reason to stop relying on the service. There are also a large number of occasional users and former users of transit who, if the service is improved, could become loyal customers.</p> <p>The Primary Transit Network will achieve the quality of service that can compete with car travel. The transit budget needs to focus on completing the Primary Transit Network.</p> <p>The City needs a cost-recovery policy for roads.</p>

<sup>1</sup> Economic Analysis Directorate, Transport Canada, [Estimates of the Full Cost of Transportation in Canada](#), 2008, Table 3-1, p. 12 and special computation from Table 3-1 for Alberta prepared by Economic and Environmental Analysis and Research, Policy Group, Transport Canada June 15, 2010:

AB	Infrastructure			Vehicle	Minus	Sector
Mode	Capital	Operating	Land	& Carrier	User charges	Total
Road	4.768	0.952	1.152	17.352	1.407	22.817

Road user "fees" include fuel taxes, licence fees, and parking charges.

**Table 1 Evaluating the Budget Based on CivicCamp Values**

CivicCamp Values	Available Information	Draft Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Coordinated development of transportation and land use.</li> </ul>	➤	➤
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Affordable and accessible housing.</li> </ul>	➤	➤
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ A social environment in which diversity is respected, human rights are protected, responsibilities are fulfilled, individual and community progress is supported, and cooperation prevails over conflict.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ <a href="#">Calgary &amp; Region Social Outlook: 2011-2015</a> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ [interpreted] The world economic downturn shows that, although Calgary enjoys an enviable base of prosperity, it can be significantly hurt when financial conditions deteriorate. Unemployment nearly doubled from 2008 to 2009, while employment in primary industry and manufacturing – key sources of exports – declined by 12%. Mothers who are single parents were affected most severely, followed by younger workers and men in general because of their greater involvement in cyclical industries (e.g., manufacturing, construction). After several years of decline, the number of people living in poverty rose in 2008 as did the number of individuals receiving Income Support. (pp. 13, 15, 24, 28)</li> <li>○ "Low income tends to be concentrated among five population groups: single-parents, off-reserve Aboriginal persons, single persons aged 45 – 64, persons with disabilities and recent immigrants. However, recent immigrants are the only group that has experienced significant increases in the low-income rate absolutely and relative to the Canadian-born population for the past quarter century." (p. 27)</li> <li>○ [interpreted] Cycle of poverty: low income tends to result in (pp. 30-32)                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ lower quality, less affordable housing – even with lower rents during recession</li> <li>▪ lower level of education because of greater need to work, less ability to take on loans</li> <li>▪ reduced spending on food, medical care</li> <li>▪ less recreational/cultural activity</li> <li>▪ lower quality of health, less access to care for chronic conditions, more disease from alcohol, drug use, and smoking, and lower life expectancy</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ Rental stock continues to decline (pp. 33-34)</li> <li>○ "...homelessness should be understood as a cycle of housing instability resulting from the interaction of structural and individual risk factors... Even in cases where risk factors such as mental illness and addictions are at play, it is their interplay with housing costs and available income that precipitate homelessness." (pp. 34-35)</li> <li>○ Types of homeless: ≈ 80% are "transitionally homeless" (≈ less than 1 month) – U.S. data, ≈ 10% are "episodically homeless" (≈ 7.5 months) "typically" with high incidence of addictions, H.S. education, &amp; relatively young, ≈ 10% are "chronically homeless" (≈ 4 years) with "very high needs and complexities." <i>10-Year Plan to End Homelessness</i> focuses on the chronically homeless because they are "the highest system users and most vulnerable people." (pp. 35-36)</li> <li>○ Challenges of increasing ethnic diversity. (pp. 44-53)</li> <li>○ Greater reliance on and greater need for programs and services for the lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgendered community. (p. 55)</li> <li>○ Number of people with disabilities will increase as population ages. Most people with disabilities need assistance with day-to-day tasks. Funding cuts are reducing available aid and threatening independence, productivity, and participation in the community for those with disabilities. (p. 56 &amp; 58))</li> <li>○ Aging population (pp. 60-65)</li> <li>○ The economic downturn led to a greater demand for the services of non-profit agencies and reduced financial support from the public – a 32% drop in the average household contribution in Calgary from 2008 to 2009, primarily from those who had previously given most generously. Evidence from one agency showed that a 4% rise in unemployment led to a 47% increase in demand for its services. (pp. 66-69)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>Poverty is a vicious cycle of inadequate income, poor quality of life, and limited opportunities to increase educational, physical, and psychological capacity. It affects single-parent mothers, off-reserve Aboriginals, immigrants, those with disabilities, and others already faced with significant obstacles to personal advancement.</p> <p>The City has several valuable tools such as its <i>Fair Calgary Policy</i>, social assistance programs, and the Strong Neighbourhoods Initiative. More money in those areas will greatly increase the chances poverty can be substantially reduced.</p> <p>The City must apply other tools in a more targeted manner. Its commitment to the <i>10-Year Plan to End Homelessness</i> is a positive step in the right direction. However, as with the <i>10-Year Plan's</i> focus on the chronically homeless, all efforts at affordable housing need to be specifically aimed at those most in need, those who – if helped – will be able to break the cycle of poverty and reduce their dependence on the government and strengthen their contribution to society. In particular, land use decisions need to be fine-tuned to ensure that affordable housing is built and, over the long-term, provided to those truly in need.</p> <p>The City also needs to manage growth in a way that keeps poverty reduction as a top priority. As Sustainable Calgary's <a href="#">2010 State of Our City</a> report found, the two greatest barriers to progress are persistent inequality and sprawl. The City's ground-breaking <i>Imagine Calgary</i> project and <i>Municipal Development and Calgary Transportation Plans</i> have laid the foundations for removing those barriers. They need to be implemented, though – efficiently, effectively, and decisively. Key to that implementation are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Reducing car dependence for those with low incomes by developing Calgary's nodes and corridors. Making it possible for those of</li> </ul>

**Table 1 Evaluating the Budget Based on CivicCamp Values**

CivicCamp Values	Available Information	Draft Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Kerby Centre study found that, in spite of past volunteering, many "boomer" retirees are "the least socially engaged." (p. 72)</li> <li>o New partnerships and collaboration for non-profits. (p. 73)</li> <li>o Value and challenges of the arts &amp; culture sector. (pp. 75-85)</li> <li>o Barriers to physical activity: (pp. 90-91)               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Lack of time (45%)</li> <li>▪ Cost (8%)</li> <li>▪ Lack of facilities (8%)</li> <li>▪ Access to paths, trails, &amp; green spaces (91%)</li> <li>▪ Convenient transportation to activities (68%)</li> <li>▪ Repairs to aging facilities &amp; need to provide matching funds from community</li> <li>▪ Weather (11%)</li> <li>▪ Lack of motivation (11%)</li> <li>▪ Information on physical activity, health and well-being (74%)</li> <li>▪ Links to people with common interests (64%)</li> <li>▪ Specific coaching or instruction (60%)</li> </ul> </li> <li>o 12 new arenas for hockey &amp; change in league boundaries to increase ice time (p.91)</li> <li>o Crime statistics (pp. 93-99)</li> <li>o Emergency responses (p. 99)</li> <li>o Transportation safety (p. 99)</li> <li>o Injury statistics (pp. 100-101)</li> <li>o Neighbourhoods (pp.103 -115) including some data on consumption</li> <li>➤ <a href="#">City of Calgary Homelessness Strategy</a></li> <li>➤ <a href="#">Calgary &amp; Region Economic Outlook:2011-2021, "Executive Summary"</a></li> </ul>	<p>limited financial means to live close to work, shopping, school, health care, recreation, and other services will substantially reduce the need for and cost of car ownership.</p> <p>➤ Simply intensifying nodes and corridors will not be enough. Public transit serving the nodes and corridors needs to be substantially upgraded. This will benefit all Calgarians. However, the greatest value of public transit is its service to those whose mobility is restricted by health, resources, or age. They deserve transit service that does not disadvantage them further. If we provide a level of transit service for low-income Calgarians that is equal to or higher than the level of service provided by other motorized vehicles, the burden of poverty can be significantly diminished.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ An intimate connection to the land and the food that sustains us with food security as a high-priority issue.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ <a href="#">Calgary &amp; Region Social Outlook: 2011-2015</a></li> <li>o Food insecurity ("inability to acquire or consume an adequate diet or sufficient quantity of food in socially acceptable ways, or the uncertainty that one will be able to do so.") results from not having enough money. In Canada, 48% of the lowest income households and 29% of lower middle income households are food insecure. 80% of Alberta households on social assistance are food insecure, far above the national average of 60%. It is estimated that two-thirds of the food insecure use "emergency food assistance programs, such as food banks." (pp. 38 &amp; 40)</li> <li>o It is estimated that two-thirds of the food insecure use "emergency food assistance programs, such as food banks." [interpreted] This is probably higher in Calgary where survey results show that 18% are "concerned about not having enough food," while only 3% used the Food Bank. (pp. 38 &amp; 43)</li> <li>o Results of food insecurity include reduced "physical, mental, social well-being," "feelings of powerlessness," and "reliance on energy dense foods over nutrient dense foods." Among those who are not homeowners and single-parent households, a fifth are food insecure. (pp. 39-40)</li> </ul>	<p>Food insecurity affects 18% of Calgarians. However, statistics indicate that only a fifth of those people are using the Food Bank. The remainder are finding other ways to deal with the problem – going without, relying on unsafe sources of food, or eating cheap, energy dense, but not nutritious food.</p> <p>What are the things the City can do to alleviate the problem?</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Child, youth, senior, and disability friendly development.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Transparent, fair, and citizen-driven governance.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ A network of citizens that can respond quickly to issues.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ A healthy and sustainable environment.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤</li> </ul>

Source for Values: [CivicCamp Charter](#)

**Table 2 Evaluating the Budget Based on Council's Fiscal Plan for Calgary (2012-2014)**

Principle	Questions	Available Information	Draft Response
General	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ <b>Basic questions</b> when using the principles to evaluate the budget:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ How much money is in the budget for each principle?</li> <li>○ Who benefits?</li> <li>○ Who pays? How is it financed?</li> <li>○ Is the balance between who benefits and who pays fair? Progressive/regressive? Efficient? Effective? And so on ....</li> <li>○ What are the "Triple Bottom Line" benefits &amp; costs?</li> <li>○ Is a principle a "sacred cow"?</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ <a href="#">Council Policy Library</a></li> <li>➤ <a href="#">"Council's Direction to Administration"</a></li> <li>➤ <a href="#">Public Engagement Process &amp; Results</a>, Our City, Our Budget, Our Future</li> <li>➤ City of Calgary, <a href="#">"Plans, budgets, and financial reports"</a></li> <li>➤ <a href="#">2011 City of Calgary Citizen Satisfaction Survey</a> – telephone survey August 25 – September 1, 2011                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The most important issue to residents is "infrastructure, traffic &amp; roads" – a category that mixes several issues. The second most important issue is transit, followed by "crime, safety &amp; policing" and education. (p. 12)</li> <li>○ Most Calgarians feel their quality of life is good, but few rate it as very good. (p. 15)</li> <li>○ Most Calgarians feel their quality of life has stayed the same or improved – a return to how people felt in 2005. (p. 16)</li> <li>○ The top reasons for thinking quality of life has improved are improvements to public transportation, "roadwork/improvements to roads/easing congestion," and other improvements to infrastructure. (p. 17)</li> <li>○ The top reasons for thinking quality of life has worsened are "overpopulated/speed of growth," "increased traffic congestion/increased travel time," and "poor infrastructure/bad roads/not enough roads." (p. 18)</li> <li>○ Most Calgarians (70%) feel the quality of City services is good. Only 26% feel the quality is very good. (p. 22) Similarly, 61% are satisfied with the <b>"level and quality of services and programs</b> provided by the City," while only 14% rated the services &amp; programs higher. (p. 25)</li> <li>○ Importance of services &amp; programs. (pp. 26-7)</li> <li>○ Performance of services &amp; programs. (pp. 31-32)</li> <li>○ Comparing importance &amp; performance, primary weaknesses were "roads &amp; infrastructure" and control of traffic flow. Secondary weaknesses were land use planning, Calgary Transit, bylaw services, and blue cart recycling. (p.36)</li> <li>○ 61% feel the state of Calgary's environment is good and 31% feel it is very good. (p. 42)</li> <li>○ Most people feel they get good value (49%) for their property tax or are neutral (34%). (p. 48)</li> <li>○ 34% favor increasing taxes to maintain services at current levels. 27% would like taxes increased to expand services. 23% want to cut services to maintain the current tax level. (p. 50)</li> <li>○ If more revenue is needed, consistently over time 70% want new or expanded user fees rather than an increase in property taxes. (p. 52)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>Generally, Calgarians think the service they receive from the City is good. However, the City does not receive top marks from most residents. Calgarians deserve better and are willing to pay more to maintain and possibly expand services.</p> <p>There is a general displeasure "infrastructure, traffic, and roads. This is primarily the result of not managing growth so that infrastructure keeps up with development. The <i>Framework for Growth and Change</i> will avoid making the same mistake in the future.</p> <p>In the meantime, as Council has directed, more money needs to be put into transit to reduce traffic congestion and use tax dollars more efficiently.</p>

**Ensuring every Calgarian lives in a safe community and has the opportunity to succeed**

Principle	Questions	Available Information	Draft Response
1. Maintain current investment for the Calgary Police Service, while encouraging cost-efficiencies and recognizing Federal and	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ What is the basis for maintaining current investment?</li> <li>➤ What are the prospects for cost-efficiencies?</li> <li>➤ Is there a relationship between safety and</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ - Telephone survey during the summer (June 27-August 21)</li> <li>○ A trend toward Calgarians believing that Calgary is a safe city to live in. 95% agree – 42% strongly, 53% somewhat (p. 8)</li> <li>○ City-wide, the safety or crime issues of greatest concern are: B&amp;Es, gang activities, drug activities, and traffic violations. In neighborhoods, B&amp;Es are by far the greatest concern, followed by drug activity, damage to property, auto theft, and traffic violations. From a personal point-of-view, gang activity, drug activity, B&amp;Es, identity theft, and youth-related crime</li> </ul>	<p>Police service has been good. However, it has not achieved the level of excellence both the public and members of the service expect. The public's greatest concern is inadequate funding and staffing. To the public, the major threats cover a wide variety of issues from drug and gang activity to break and enters to property damage, auto theft, and traffic violations.</p>

**Table 2 Evaluating the Budget Based on [Council's Fiscal Plan for Calgary \(2012-2014\)](#)**

Principle	Questions	Available Information	Draft Response
Provincial funding obligations.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ money spent on policing?</li> <li>➤ Have the obligations from the feds and province been met?</li> </ul>	<p>dominate. Concern about traffic violations continue to increase. (pp. 9-11)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The performance of the police service is increasing, but overall remains below excellent with concern about the level of service and, to a lesser extent, competence. In all categories measured, the CPS's "excellence" rating is below 30%. ( pp. 15-16 &amp; 18)</li> <li>○ Confidence in the police service is good but needs work. Among those who are not confident in the service, lack of money and staffing is the primary concern. (p. 21)</li> <li>○ On factors such as being fair, being visible, providing adequate service, and being respectful, competent, and fair, the CPS reputation gets an "excellent" rating below 50%. The dominant concern is adequate staffing. (pp. 21-23)</li> <li>○ An increasing number of victims of crime are not reporting incidents, primarily because they did not want to bother the police or felt the police could not do anything anyway. Although a majority of Calgarians are satisfied with their contact with the police, the number who are dissatisfied is increasing. (pp. 26 &amp; 28)</li> </ul>	
2. Focus on community-based policing and crime prevention, in partnership with related community and city agencies, particularly around crime prevention and harm reduction strategies.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ What do we know about the effectiveness of community-based policing &amp; other crime prevention strategies?</li> <li>➤ Who are the "partners"?</li> <li>➤ Do "partnerships" result in less crime?</li> <li>➤ Do effective "partnerships" mean less money for police and more money for others, or vice versa?</li> <li>➤ Is there a difference between "crime prevention" and "harm reduction"? And how should that influence the budget?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ <a href="#">Center for Problem-Oriented Policing</a></li> <li>➤ <a href="#">Intelligence-Led Policing: The New Intelligence Architecture</a></li> <li>➤ <a href="#">"Top Secret America," Frontline</a></li> <li>➤ Calgary Police Service, <a href="#">Budget – 2009-2011</a></li> <li>➤ Calgary Police Service, <a href="#">Annual Statistical Report – 2005-2009</a></li> <li>➤ Calgary Police Service, <a href="#">Environmental Scan 2007</a></li> </ul>	<p>Conventional policing (random patrols, rapid response, criminal investigations) should continue to be funded so those services are maintained and improved. Increased funding should be provided for "<a href="#">problem-oriented</a>" and "<a href="#">intelligence-led</a>" policing. As well, additional or reallocation of funding is needed for partnership programs such as the Strong Neighbourhoods Initiative, New Roads, YARD, MASST, and Gateway that deal with the root causes of crime and deviant behavior. "Community-based policing" is desirable, but should not be used to download the policing and social service responsibilities of governments to individuals and community associations.</p>
3. Partner with CPS and related community agencies on the root causes of crime, through enhancement of social inclusion and crime prevention through environmental design (CPTED).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ What are the "root causes" of crime?</li> <li>➤ What does "social inclusion" mean?</li> <li>➤ How effective are "social inclusion" and CPTED in preventing crime?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ <a href="#">Community and Neighbourhood Services 2010 Annual Report</a></li> <li>○ <a href="#">Calgary AfterSchool</a> program (p. 6)</li> <li>○ <a href="#">City Links Home Maintenance Program</a> that provides home maintenance services for those over 65 on low fixed income (graduated income scale for up to 3 people) who need help with "instrumental chores" to remain in their homes. (p. 8)</li> <li>○ <a href="#">Property Tax Assistance Program</a> for low income households based on a graduated income scale for up to 7 people. (p. 9)</li> <li>○ <a href="#">Community Home Assistance and Maintenance Program for Seniors</a> to help seniors access funding for "major home repairs and identified basic needs such as medical expenses." (p. 9)</li> <li>○ <a href="#">Youth Employment Centre</a> to assist with education, career development, and employment opportunities. (p. 10)</li> <li>○ Youth Justice <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <a href="#">Youth Probation</a></li> <li>▪ <a href="#">New Roads</a></li> <li>▪ <a href="#">Calgary Community Conferencing</a></li> <li>▪ <a href="#">Youth at Risk Development (YARD)</a> program</li> <li>▪ <a href="#">Gateway</a></li> <li>▪ <a href="#">Multi-Agency School Support Team (MASST)</a></li> </ul> </li> <li>○ Community Recreation Coordinators (p. 14)</li> <li>○ Stay 'n' Play/Park 'n' Play, Staples for Education, Move 'n' Mingle (p. 17)</li> <li>○ Family &amp; Community Support Services (p. 18)</li> </ul>	<p>The Calgary AfterSchool program is a positive development that should be expanded, better publicized, and the fees either reduced or eliminated so that children with the greatest need for after-school activities can be reached. The City should work closely with school boards to better integrate after-school programs with extra-curricular activities and capacities to improve service and reduce costs.</p> <p>The City Links Home Maintenance, Property Tax Assistance, and CHAMPS programs make a positive contribution. However, the need for homes that seniors can maintain on their own needs to be specifically incorporated into the City's planning and design decisions so that seniors have viable options for moving to more manageable accommodation of equal or better quality in their neighborhoods.</p> <p>Community Recreation Coordinators are extremely valuable in helping community associations, not only supplying recreational services and managing association activities, but</p>

**Table 2 Evaluating the Budget Based on [Council's Fiscal Plan for Calgary \(2012-2014\)](#)**

Principle	Questions	Available Information	Draft Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Strong Neighbourhoods Initiative (p. 19)</li> <li>o <a href="#">Social Planning &amp; Policy</a> – including Ward Profiles (p. 20)</li> <li>o <a href="#">Fair Calgary Policy - Council's Policy</a> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Includes a "Fairness Filter" "to optimize the capability of Calgarians' use of The City's programs, services, facilities and public spaces, is applied in The City's planning and implementations.</li> </ul> </li> <li>o <a href="#">Family &amp; Community Support Services</a></li> <li>o <a href="#">Family &amp; Community Support Services: Funding Priorities</a> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <a href="#">Preventing Concentrated Poverty and Social Isolation</a> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Changing social conditions (p. 1)                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o "more complex &amp; challenging social issues"</li> <li>o "increased demand for services due to demographic changes and population growth"</li> <li>o "inadequate resources to meet this demand"</li> <li>o "the precarious state of the nonprofit sector"</li> </ul> </li> <li>• "<b>Spatially-concentrated poverty</b> is defined in terms of the percentage of households in a geographic area that live below the Statistics Canada Low-Income Cut-Off. The threshold at which problems begin to emerge appears to be about 26%. The "tipping point" for serious problems, which can be very hard to reverse, is about 40%." (p. 4)</li> <li>• <b>Social isolation</b> is defined as the absence of social interactions, contacts, and relationships with family and friends, neighbours, and the broader society. (p. 4)</li> <li>• Precursors of concentrated poverty &amp; social isolation (p. 4)                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o More seniors, immigrants/refugees, Aboriginals. Fewer young people.</li> <li>o More people without the education and skill to "compete in the economy"</li> <li>o "increasing labour market polarization between high-skill, high-wage stable jobs and low-wage precarious jobs"</li> <li>o Greater gap between the rich &amp; poor</li> </ul> </li> <li>• "Evidence from around the world indicates that spatially-concentrated poverty can be prevented through: (p.5)                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o "thoughtful urban planning (with respect, for example, to new neighbourhood design and established neighbourhood re-design, public transportation, location of affordable and non-market housing), along with changes to provincial and federal policies addressing issues such as immigration, income supports, and education and training, among others; and</li> <li>o "comprehensive community initiatives to increase residents' personal capacities and economic capital, build social networks and reduce social isolation, strengthen families, encourage the positive development of children and youth, and improve neighbourhood conditions, all of which are inter-related."</li> </ul> </li> <li>• "efforts to prevent social isolation must include urban planning considerations, as above, along with the provision of city-wide supports and a range of population-specific and cross-population initiatives." (p. 5)</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>in helping CAs understand City information, requirements, and opportunities.</p> <p>The Strong Neighbourhoods Initiative and other programs run by Family &amp; Community Support Services are key to, among other things, maintaining a strong social fabric, building a vibrant and sustainable economy, and preventing health problems and crime. Their focus on strengthening and renewing the most at-risk neighbourhoods deserves more funding, funding that will leverage additional resources from other organizations and generate a significant return on investment by reducing costs such as policing, justice, and addiction treatment and increasing economic productivity. (p. 18)</p>

**Table 2 Evaluating the Budget Based on [Council's Fiscal Plan for Calgary \(2012-2014\)](#)**

Principle	Questions	Available Information	Draft Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Desired outcomes (p. 6)</li> <li>• The plan was to effect change during 2012 – 2014. (p. 7) Is this still true?</li> <li>• <a href="#">Research briefs</a></li> <li>▪ <a href="#">What Makes a Socially Sustainable City?</a></li> </ul>	
<p>4. Ensure people feel safe in public spaces and on public transit.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ What are the data on how safe people feel and how safe they are?</li> <li>➤ What do they mean by a “public space”?</li> <li>➤ Which public spaces are at greatest risk? Where is the “biggest bang” for the buck?</li> <li>➤ What will be done to increase safety in public spaces and on public transit?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤</li> </ul>
<p>5. Maintain Calgary standards for fire safety and coverage.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ What are the fire safety standards? Are they adequate?</li> <li>➤ What is “coverage” and how is it measured? Is it adequate? If not, why not?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ <a href="#">Calgary Fire Department 2010 Annual Report</a></li> <li>○ “We need to be in every community and able to reach every citizen within a safe amount of time. Growth in both our established and new communities puts pressure on maintaining low response times.” - Bruce Burrell, Fire Chief (p. 8)</li> <li>○ New Louise Fire Station example of “a shifting approach to station planning by addressing the impact of densification and vertical sprawl in established areas of the city.” (p. 11)</li> <li>○ Key services beyond fire &amp; emergency response: safety inspections, business safety audits, home safety advocacy, clean-up of spills from traffic accidents, and hazardous waste recycling.</li> <li>○ Medical assist calls account for 45.7% of incidents. False alarms (17.2%), hazardous conditions (e.g., fuel leaks – 15.1%), investigations (10.1%), fire calls (4.1%) (p. 14)</li> <li>○ Estimated property value saved from fires \$1.16 million in 2010.</li> <li>○ The department is not meeting its performance measures. (pp. 20-23)</li> <li>○ Sustainability challenges (p. 36) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Rapid growth <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Service to new communities</li> <li>• Densification</li> <li>• Traffic congestion</li> <li>• Higher density housing</li> <li>• Rezoning of R1 areas</li> </ul> </li> <li>▪ Stations constructed 30-40 years ago when populations, infrastructure, and nature of incidents were different <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Barriers from changing communities: roadways, interchanges, walkable community designs</li> </ul> </li> <li>▪ Proactive planning to get ahead of development</li> <li>▪ Demand for fire &amp; emergency medical services does not change regardless of economic, environmental, &amp; social conditions.</li> <li>▪ Department developing a 10-year Sustainability Plan</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>The Fire Department is not meeting its performance measures because of a lack of funding and the City not adequately taking into account fire service when managing growth. The Department is now better involved in the planning process. Until growth issues are brought under control, more money will be needed in the Department's budget to ensure that service is brought up to standard.</p>

**Table 2 Evaluating the Budget Based on [Council's Fiscal Plan](#) for Calgary (2012-2014)**

Principle	Questions	Available Information	Draft Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ 2010 Community Services &amp; Protective Services Citizen Expectations and Perceptions {no link found}</li> </ul>	
<p>6. Work cooperatively with the Province to improve building codes for fire safety.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ What improvements in building codes are needed?</li> <li>➤ What is the cost to the City?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤</li> </ul>
<p>7. Implement a financial plan to ensure the financial sustainability of City of Calgary Water Services.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Is there a financial plan for water sustainability?</li> <li>➤ Why aren't the Water Services sustainable?</li> <li>➤ Which other City services aren't sustainable?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤</li> </ul>
<p>8. Establish a 10-year plan on reducing poverty, using the 10-year Plan to End Homelessness as a model, engaging community partners and other levels of government; and including a commitment to streamlining city processes for nonprofit organizations and community partners.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Why isn't the 10-Year Plan to End Homelessness adequate?</li> <li>➤ What financial commitment from the City and others is required to implement the 10-Year Plan to End Homelessness?</li> <li>➤ What do we gain from reducing poverty in terms of the cost of City services?</li> <li>➤ What "streamlining" is planned/required?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤</li> </ul>
<p>9. Develop a comprehensive approach to the City's delivery of affordable housing for Calgarians; concentrating on partnerships with other service deliverers and other levels of government.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ What is the current approach to delivering affordable housing? How is the current approach working? How would a "comprehensive" approach improve the situation and increase/decrease costs?</li> <li>➤ Is the problem a lack of money or lack of focus, rather than a lack of "comprehensiveness"?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤</li> </ul>

**Table 2 Evaluating the Budget Based on [Council's Fiscal Plan](#) for Calgary (2012-2014)**

Principle	Questions	Available Information	Draft Response
	<p>?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ How do “partnerships” help?</li> </ul>		
<b>Investing in great communities and a vibrant urban fabric</b>			
Principle	Questions	Available Information	Draft Response
<p>1. Ensure an appropriate inventory of serviced and planned land for community development in accordance with the Municipal Development Plan (MDP).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ How does the budget meet or not meet our criteria?:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Keep developable land supply to the minimum necessary to maintain a competitive land market to minimize new infrastructure expenditures and accelerate build-out of communities being developed.                                     <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Develop and implement approval and financial policies to achieve specific thresholds for the location of growth, competitive residential, industrial, and commercial markets (greenfield, brownfield, in-fill, high density), and the City's capacity to provide services to support complete communities.</li> <li>○ Direct growth to strategic areas that support neighbourhood and economic vitality. (MDP, p. 2-8)</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Optimize existing public investment, municipal infrastructure, and facilities. (MDP, pp. 1-6, 2-7, &amp; 2-10)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>
<p>2. a. Continue operating budget support for</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Is “continue” adequate for operations?</li> <li>➤ What about capital</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ <a href="#">Recreation Annual Report</a></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤</li> </ul>

**Table 2 Evaluating the Budget Based on [Council's Fiscal Plan](#) for Calgary (2012-2014)**

Principle	Questions	Available Information	Draft Response
Arts and Culture, and b. Continue operating budget support for Sport organizations.	budgets? ➤ Are for-profit organizations that do not need financial help being funded? ➤ Are there non-profit groups that don't need funding? ➤ What levels/types of sport are being funded: elementary, junior/senior high, university, amateur adult, professional, etc.?		
3. Support Calgary Arts Development Authority (CADA) in the implementation of its arts spaces plan.	➤ What is the "arts spaces plan"? ➤ Are for-profit organizations that do not need financial help being funded? ➤ Are there non-profit groups that don't need funding?	➤	➤
4. Build more recreation facilities, including four major facilities, considering P3 Canada funding, while maintaining current facilities.	➤ What is the state of current facilities? Is funding adequate? ➤ Why are four new major facilities needed? Why are they better than alternatives, e.g., smaller neighbourhood facilities, outdoor options? Is funding adequate? If not, why not? ➤ What are the pros & cons of P3 projects?	➤	➤
5. Increase the number of outdoor sports fields.	➤ Are current outdoor facilities adequately funded? ➤ What is the need for outdoor sports facilities? Will they be adequately funded? ➤ Why "sports fields" instead of other outdoor recreation?	➤	➤

**Table 2 Evaluating the Budget Based on [Council's Fiscal Plan](#) for Calgary (2012-2014)**

Principle	Questions	Available Information	Draft Response
<p>6. Invest in lifecycle maintenance of existing community infrastructure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ What is community infrastructure?</li> <li>➤ What is "lifecycle maintenance"? Does it include operations, replacement costs? Why not include all lifecycle costs?</li> <li>➤ Are other programs &amp; infrastructure assessed in the same way – a level playing field?</li> </ul>	<p>➤</p>	<p>➤</p>
<p>7. Maintain or increase green space/capita, with an emphasis on areas of the city that are parks deficient and link directions in MDP, urban corridors and TOD to the need for recreation &amp; social facilities, as well as review all sources of funding.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Does this apply just to "parks" or to "recreation &amp; social facilities" as well?</li> <li>➤ How is "parks deficient" defined?</li> <li>➤ How do areas of the city compare in terms of parks deficiency?</li> <li>➤ How will parks be linked to the MDP, urban corridors, &amp; TODs?</li> <li>➤ Will other programs &amp; infrastructure be linked to the MDP, urban corridors, &amp; TODs?</li> <li>➤ What are the sources of funding? Are they adequate?</li> <li>➤ Will other programs &amp; infrastructure be reviewed in terms of sources of funding?</li> </ul>	<p>➤</p>	<p>➤</p>
<p>8. Protect natural/environmentally sensitive areas.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ What are "natural areas" &amp; "environmentally sensitive areas"?</li> <li>➤ What does "protect" mean?</li> <li>➤ How are other natural or environmental resources managed?</li> <li>➤ What other programs &amp; infrastructure involve "protection" &amp; are the criteria/level of protection similar or</li> </ul>	<p>➤</p>	<p>➤</p>

**Table 2 Evaluating the Budget Based on [Council's Fiscal Plan for Calgary \(2012-2014\)](#)**

Principle	Questions	Available Information	Draft Response
	different?		
9. Develop and implement comprehensive waste diversion strategies, and a capital plan, which continue progress towards 80/20 by 2020.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ What are current waste diversion strategies &amp; how will making them comprehensive change things?</li> <li>➤ Is there currently a "capital plan"?</li> <li>➤ What is 80/20? Why was it developed &amp; why was that particular ratio chosen?</li> </ul>	➤	➤
10. Re-engineer and simplify the planning process, including consideration of a new land use regime in order to implement the MDP.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ What is the current planning process? Why is it necessary to "re-engineer and simplify" the process?</li> <li>➤ How does a new "land use regime" affect the planning process &amp; the budget?</li> </ul>	➤	➤
11. Improve new community and established community development standards in pursuit of MDP goals.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ What are the current standards?</li> <li>➤ Is this the <i>Growth Management Framework</i> or something different?</li> </ul>	➤	➤

**Moving people and goods throughout the city efficiently and sustainably**

Principle	Questions	Available Information	Draft Response
1. Align our transportation decisions with the modal split identified in the Calgary Transportation Plan (CTP).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Is the budget based on these thresholds:</li> <li>➤ Projected private vehicle kilometres per capita will need to be 50% less than current and less than 55% of all trips.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ <a href="#">An Independent Expert Review of the Calgary Regional Transportation Model</a> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Economic modeling insensitive to infrastructure &amp; policy effects. (p. 5)</li> <li>○ "Several consultants reported that the high rate of growth in Calgary resulted in forecasted flows being lower than current traffic counts in several cases... This appears to be particularly true at the periphery of the modeled area and near major retail developments... this is where the action is for the consultants." (p. 6)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>Economic modeling needs to be sensitive to infrastructure &amp; policy changes. Similarly, the transportation model itself needs to be more adaptable – e.g., better at dealing with demand from individual projects and "what-if" land use/transportation scenarios – and better at evaluating sustainability and incorporating financial constraints.</p> <p>As well, just as it incorporates economic factors and to some extent household transportation choices, the transportation model needs to incorporate social and environmental modeling so that policy, people's needs and willingness to pay and/or shift modes, and environmental constraints are better reflected.</p>

(*Imagine Calgary*, pp. 6 & 9, MDP, p. 5-10)  
 (To reach the target of 20% fewer private vehicle kilometers per

○ "The inability to easily craft and test multiple "what if" scenarios was cited several times by the [transportation planning] managers. Several of them noted that understanding a range of forecasts would be more helpful to them than a single forecast of unknown reliability." (p. 9)

**Table 2 Evaluating the Budget Based on Council's Fiscal Plan for Calgary (2012-2014)**

Principle	Questions	Available Information	Draft Response
	<p>redevelopment must generate 49% fewer private vehicle kilometers within the area for an equivalent of the additional population served.)</p> <p>➤ Development and redevelopment will need to generate a net change in peak period travel to downtown that exclusively increases transit, walking, cycling, and carpool. (Imagine Calgary, p. 6) (To reach the city-wide minimum target of 65% trips by car, we estimate that future development and redevelopment must generate a proportion of car trips of less than 55% within the area for an equivalent of the additional population served. Achieving a lower percentage of car trips city-wide (e.g., the MDP's maximum limit of 55%) will require a lower percentage of car trips generated by future development and redevelopment.)</p>	<p>conjunction with traffic impacts studies and for infrastructure studies near the fringes of the modeled area, where forecasts have been found to be lower than current volumes." (p. 9)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o "Perhaps not surprisingly, there was considerable discussion about assumptions regarding the share of regional growth allocated to established areas in the City versus new areas on the fringe. Moreover, it appears that one limitation of the current process is that the rate of growth — and pace of development — is faster than the two and a half year update cycle of the land use allocations. It was noted that development plans are not included in the allocations until approved by the City Council. Known plans in preparation are therefore not included, even when they are common knowledge among land developers and planners.</li> <li>o "One topic that deserves attention is the subsequent adjustment of socioeconomic allocations by the Forecasting Division staff. This practice, apparently common, is never coordinated with the GD staff. Several examples were cited of developers questioning the socioeconomic forecasts, only to discover that they were correct but had been adjusted in an ad hoc manner by the modeling group. Such adjustments might be made to fine-tune model validation for small area studies, but the rationale for unilaterally adjusting the estimates without collaborating with the GD staff is not apparent." (p.11)</li> <li>o "... the suitability of a strategic model like the RTM for tactical and detailed operational assessments is an open question. It appeared that the RTM is used for such analyses not so much because it is ideally suited, but rather because it is the only such tool available." (p. 12)</li> <li>o The Calgary RTM was developed based primarily on a 2001 home interview survey that included a sample of households in the region. This included about 9,800 households in the Calgary region. A 24-hour activity diary was used in this survey. The survey and model are designed to represent an average fall day. In addition to the home interview survey, a commodity flow, Civic Census, work place, and external surveys were also available. Supplementing this local database, the Canadian national census, taken in 1996 and 2001 was used to help identify regional statistics. (p. 13)</li> <li>o Commercial Truck Model is ambitious &amp; unprecedented. Based on Fall of 2000 survey. (p. 32)</li> <li>o "A healthy land development market in North America typically translates into pressures at the periphery of the urban area. Successive waves of suburbanization in U.S. cities has led to increasing congestion that cannot be overcome by investments in infrastructure alone. The relatively low densities of suburban development, with their increased</li> </ul>	<p>More than just an "ad-hoc land use-transport modeling framework" is needed. The City needs a model or models that can handle not only land use and transportation factors, but economic, social, environmental, financial, and policy factors in a way that will support the <i>Framework for Growth and Change</i>. This will take additional money and will need to start now to get ahead of the curve.</p> <p>The transit portion of 60% of transportation spending needs to be increased. This is not a question of charging transit users more. It is a question of how do we pay for roads.</p> <p>Canada-wide, revenue that might qualify as road user "fees" only provides an estimated third of the direct cost of public road infrastructure. For Alberta, the estimate is that fees only cover a fifth of road costs.<sup>2</sup></p> <p>The City needs a cost-recovery policy for roads.</p> <p>It is good the City is receiving a greater share of gas tax revenue. However, gas tax is equal to 38% of the road portion of the City budget well above the 20% average for the province. Other parts of the province are being shortchanged, a situation the City can not expect to continue.</p>

<sup>2</sup> Economic Analysis Directorate, Transport Canada, *Estimates of the Full Cost of Transportation in Canada*, 2008, Table 3-1, p. 12 and special computation from Table 3-1 for Alberta prepared by Economic and Environmental Analysis and Research, Policy Group, Transport Canada June 15, 2010:

AB Mode	Infrastructure			Vehicle & Carrier	Minus User charges	Sector Total
	Capital	Operating	Land			
Road	4.768	0.952	1.152	17.352	1.407	22.817

Road user "fees" include fuel taxes, licence fees, and parking charges.

**Table 2 Evaluating the Budget Based on [Council's Fiscal Plan](#) for Calgary (2012-2014)**

Principle	Questions	Available Information	Draft Response				
		<p>distance from major employment centers and urban services, has pushed the cost and time associated with travel upward. Calgary is one of many cities that have realized that the traditional solution of expanding their roadway network will not keep pace with the demand. As the emphasis changes from public investment in major network enhancements to management and operation of the transportation system the range of issues is changing how and why travel demand models are deployed. Current models must continue to evolve in order to meet these new challenges." (p. 40)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o "While well-suited for evaluating large capital investments in infrastructure and broad policies, contemporary travel demand forecasting models have been used much less for evaluating sustainability options." (p. 41)</li> <li>o For validation, "an onboard transit origin-destination survey and overhaul of the transit modeling components is urgently required as the only means of overcoming this deficiency." (p. 43)</li> <li>o Need a LAN isolated from the City's system &amp; fewer restrictions on software content &amp; end-user administration. (p. 46)</li> <li>o Changing context: (pp. 47-48) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Impact of ring road uncertain – location and extent of new growth &amp; secondary (induced) effects</li> <li>▪ Recommend development of an "ad-hoc land-use-transport modeling framework"</li> <li>▪ Transit component is the "Achilles heel"</li> <li>▪ Impact of increasing car ownership</li> <li>▪ Competition between suburbs &amp; downtown for employment &amp; services</li> <li>▪ "Increasing dispersion of everything" from higher incomes leading to greater personal travel</li> </ul> </li> <li>o Develop advanced "tour &amp; activity-based travel models." (p. 50)</li> </ul>					
<p>2. Implement the following capital investment split for this budget cycle: Transit: 60%, Roads: 35%, Active transportation (both cycling and pedestrian):5%.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ In 2009, two-thirds of the City's transportation capital budget was spent on transit? Was this continued in 2010?</li> <li>➤ How was the 60/35/5 split determined? Why was a lower transit target of 60% chosen?</li> <li>➤ Will this split achieve the thresholds identified above?</li> <li>➤ What is the situation for operating costs?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ <a href="#">City of Calgary 2010 Annual Report</a></li> <li>o 2010 expenditures <table border="0" style="margin-left: 20px;"> <tr> <td>Transit</td> <td style="text-align: right;">\$307,957,000 (58%)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Roads, traffic, &amp; parking</td> <td style="text-align: right;">\$219,802,000 (42%)</td> </tr> </table> </li> </ul>	Transit	\$307,957,000 (58%)	Roads, traffic, & parking	\$219,802,000 (42%)	
Transit	\$307,957,000 (58%)						
Roads, traffic, & parking	\$219,802,000 (42%)						
<p>3. Craft a new TIIPs list reflecting the direction of the CTP.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ What is the current TIIPs list?</li> <li>➤ How is the TIIPs list changed by the CTP?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ <a href="#">Transportation Infrastructure Investment Plan: 2009-2018</a></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤</li> </ul>				

**Table 2 Evaluating the Budget Based on [Council's Fiscal Plan](#) for Calgary (2012-2014)**

Principle	Questions	Available Information	Draft Response
4. Create a new long-term plan for Calgary Transit, including capital priorities and a new overall network, in accordance with the CTP and based on transparent evaluation criteria.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ What is the current long-term plan for Calgary Transit? How will/should the CTP change that &amp; how is it reflected in the budget?</li> <li>➤ What is the long-term plan for roads?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤</li> </ul>
5. Strive to continuously improve the customer-oriented culture at Calgary Transit.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ What is the "customer-oriented culture"?</li> <li>➤ What is needed to "continuously improve"?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤</li> </ul>
6. Develop a long-term level of cost recovery in Public Transit in the range of 55/45 to 50/50.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ The current cost-recovery policy is 55%.</li> <li>➤ Why was this range chosen?</li> <li>➤ What is the current/projected cost-recovery policy for roads?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤</li> </ul>
7. Review the long-term parking strategy and the role of the Calgary Parking Authority.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ What is the strategy &amp; role for the Calgary Parking Authority?</li> <li>➤ What is the budget &amp; cost-recovery for the CPA?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ <a href="#">A Parking Policy Framework for Calgary</a></li> <li>➤ <a href="#">Parking Governance Roles and Responsibilities</a></li> <li>➤ <a href="#">Calgary Parking Authority Financial Returns to the City</a></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤</li> </ul>
8. Focus road investments on chokepoints in the existing road network (e.g. Macleod Trail in the deep south, Crowchild between 24th Avenue and Bow Trail).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ How is a "chokepoint" defined?</li> <li>➤ What are the chokepoints?</li> <li>➤ Can more road investments in chokepoints help more than other options, e.g., transit, telecommuting, office relocations?</li> <li>➤ What chokepoint improvements provide the biggest bang for the buck?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ <a href="#">Calgary Transportation Plan</a></li> <li>○ <a href="#">"Calgary Transportation Plan Explained"</a> (videos)</li> <li>➤ <a href="#">Transportation Infrastructure Investment Plan: 2009-2018</a></li> <li>➤ <a href="#">"Calgary Roads: Operations, maintenance and upgrades"</a></li> <li>➤ <a href="#">Environmental Capacity Guidelines for Roadways Policy</a></li> <li>➤ <a href="#">Truck Route Network Development Policy</a></li> <li>➤ <a href="#">High Load Truck Route Network Development Policy</a></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤</li> </ul>
9. Maintain increased investment in Snow and Ice Control (SNIC) and	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ What is "improved service delivery" for SNIC?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤</li> </ul>

**Table 2 Evaluating the Budget Based on [Council's Fiscal Plan for Calgary \(2012-2014\)](#)**

Principle	Questions	Available Information	Draft Response
improve service delivery.			
10. Reprioritize pedestrian infrastructure investment to high-use and high-potential areas.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Where is pedestrian infrastructure investment going now?</li> <li>➤ Where would it go under this principle?</li> <li>➤ How is "high-use" or high-potential" defined?</li> <li>➤ Does the budget fix the key pedestrian infrastructure deficiencies in high-use &amp; high potential areas?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ <a href="#">Pedestrian Policy</a></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤</li> </ul>
11. Invest in better commuter cycling infrastructure throughout the city.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ What is "better" cycling infrastructure?</li> <li>➤ How does the budget align with the Cycling Strategy?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ <a href="#">Cycling Strategy</a></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤</li> </ul>
12. Review overall Capital Budget allocations to determine what is funded in this business cycle and what is deferred.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Create an ability to compare what is funded with what is deferred.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤</li> </ul>

**Changing the rules of the game to ensure better financial capacity**

Principle	Questions	Available Information	Draft Response
1. Advocate aggressively for a new relationship between the city and the province, including a potential city charter and the reduction of our reliance on the property tax.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ What is the current "relationship" between the city and the province?</li> <li>➤ Provincial funding to municipalities in the Calgary region has not kept pace with growth in the provincial economy, Alberta's inflation rate, or population growth. The overall deficit in funding to the region since 1992 ranges from \$320 million (2008\$) compared to inflation to \$3.8 billion compared to growth</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ "Provincial Funding Fails Fairness Tests," <i>Moving Beyond Now – Calgary 2010</i></li> </ul>	<p>We encourage City Council to advocate for better treatment from the provincial government. Keep in mind, though, that</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ The additional funding you seek is taxpayers' money.</li> <li>➤ The additional powers you seek may already be available – even if they might be less than perfect. Don't use a lack of perfection in the authority you have as an excuse for inaction in making revenue-raising fairer, more efficient, and more effective.</li> <li>➤ You face some significant philosophical challenges. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The provincial government has followed Ernest Manning's policy to "Encourage greater market growth than would otherwise occur," particularly in the oil and gas sector. This has created an artificial economic</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

**Table 2 Evaluating the Budget Based on [Council's Fiscal Plan for Calgary \(2012-2014\)](#)**

Principle	Questions	Available Information	Draft Response
	<p>in the provincial economy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ What is a "city charter"?</li> <li>➤ What is the current distribution of the revenue burden? How does the budget change that?</li> <li>➤ Does the budget meet these key targets:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The dependence on property taxes is no more than 25 per cent of revenue. (Imagine Calgary, p. 8)</li> <li>○ All publicly provided goods and services are affordable, accessible and priced in accordance with their public benefits. (Imagine Calgary, p. 8)</li> <li>○ All general revenues are based on the principle of progressive taxation. (Imagine Calgary, p. 8)</li> </ul> </li> <li>➤ How does the budget create alternate methods of raising revenue to, at least temporarily, make up for a lack of provincial help – either in funds or authority?</li> <li>➤ What other alternate methods of raising revenue should be considered?</li> <li>➤ What are the pros and cons of different methods of raising revenue?</li> </ul>		<p>bubble which has placed greater strains on the City to keep up with growth.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The provincial government has also adhered to Don Getty's view that <i>"We are going to work to maintain the strength and vitality of our smaller centres. We know the cities can take care of themselves."</i> The result has been that from 1992 to 2008, provincial grants to Calgary did not keep up with population growth and inflation, much less growth in the economy. In the Calgary region, this has meant a deficit of \$3.8 billion in terms of keeping up with economic growth. During that period, grants to Calgary averaged \$292 per capita per year compared to the top 25% of municipalities in provincial giving which received \$791 per capita per year.</li> <li>○ There is also a view, expressed by Roger Gibbins, that when dealing with municipalities the senior levels of government need to <i>"Hold local taxpayers' feet to the flames."</i></li> </ul>

**Table 2 Evaluating the Budget Based on [Council's Fiscal Plan](#) for Calgary (2012-2014)**

Principle	Questions	Available Information	Draft Response
<p>2. Work with the federal government for sustainable predictable funding for infrastructure needs, particularly for transit, roads, housing, and water.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Despite being erratic, federal grants to Alberta municipalities have kept pace with rising population and economic activity.</li> <li>➤ What is "sustainable" or "predictable" funding?</li> <li>➤ How does the budget create alternate methods of raising revenue to, at least temporarily, make up for a lack of federal funds?</li> <li>➤ What other alternate methods of raising revenue should be considered?</li> <li>➤ What are the pros and cons of different methods of raising revenue?</li> </ul>	<p>➤</p>	<p>➤</p>