TO: Members of Council

FROM: Ms. K. Power, City Clerk

DATE: Tuesday, January 21, 2020

SUBJECT: Additional Information – Committee of the Whole – Special Session (2020 Capital and Budget Meeting) January 22, 2020

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE – SPECIAL SESSION

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

1. Memorandum from Ms. L. Prentice, Manager – Community & Cultural Development, dated January 17, 2020 containing a motion relative amending the 2020 Community, Youth & Cultural Funding Program Budget.

2. Memorandum from Ms. L. Paradis, Manager – Budgets & Long-Term Planning, dated January 17, 2020 containing a revised Victoria Ave BIA Budget submission, for information.

3. Memorandum from Mr. N. Gale, City Manager, dated January 20, 2020 containing a motion relative to a proposed Budget amendment - Legal Services.

4. Memorandum from Ms. K. Dixon, Director – Engineering & Operations, dated January 20, 2020 containing information requested at the January 14, 2020 Committee of the Whole – Special Session meeting, relative to data on the condition of the City’s pavement network.

5. Memorandum from Ms. L. Paradis, Manager - Budgets and Long Term Planning, dated January 20, 2020 containing information requested at the January 14, 2020 Committee of the Whole – Special Session meeting, relative to travel and training budgets.

6. Memorandum from Ms. L. Paradis, Manager - Budgets and Long Term Planning, dated January 20, 2020 containing information requested at the January 8, 2020 Committee of the Whole – Special Session meeting, relative to a summary of full time equivalents (FTEs) by Department from 2015 to 2020 (Proposed).

7. Memorandum from Ms. L. Paradis, Manager - Budgets and Long Term Planning, dated January 21, 2020 containing information requested at the January 14, 2020 Committee of the Whole – Special Session meeting, relative to amounts paid to City owned utilities in 2019.
Memorandum

TO: Members of Council

FROM: Leah Prentice, Acting Director – Recreation & Culture Division

DATE: January 17, 2020 (for January 22 Budget Session)

SUBJECT: Amendment of 2020 Community, Youth & Cultural Funding Program Budget

This memo provides recommendation to increase the submitted 2020 Community, Youth & Cultural Funding Program (CYCFP) grants by $31,000 for allocation of an Operating Grant to the Lakehead Social Planning Council (LSPC) and to increase the CYCFP 2021 recommendation cap for the Operating Category by $10,000 to $170,000.

Council received the 2020 CYCFP funding recommendations for information on January 13, 2020 (Report No. R 13/2020 Community Services – Recreation & Culture). At that time it was noted that LSPC had not been recommended for funding through the annual review and appeal process, and that Administration was working with the organization to clarify outstanding questions and would report back to Council should the 2020 funding recommendation change as a result.

Based on the information received, Administration and the Funding Program Appeal Committee recommend that LSPC receive 2020 funding consistent with their 2019 allocation of $31,000. This recommendation will result in a total recommended allocation of $163,000 in the CYCFP Operating Category. The Grant Review Team’s Council-approved recommendation cap for 2020 was $160,000. In order to reflect the actual allocation in 2020 and account for new applications and/or increases in 2021, a higher recommendation cap would be required in 2021.

The proposed 2020 budget included $2,775,700 for the Community, Youth and Cultural Funding Program and would need to be increased by $30,000 to accommodate this recommendation.
RECOMMENDATION:

With respect to Report No. R 1/2020 (Corporate Services and Long Term Care – Financial Services) Proposed 2020 Operating and Capital Budget we recommend that the tax supported budget be amended to provide a Community, Youth & Cultural Funding Program Operating Grant to the Lakehead Social Planning Council by adding $30,000 gross and net.

AND THAT the Grant Review Team’s 2021 Operating Grant recommendations not exceed $170,000.

Sincerely,

Leah Prentice

cc Norm Gale – City Manager
Krista Power – City Clerk
Kelly Robertson - General Manager, Community Services
Linda Evans – General Manager, Corporate Services & Long Term Care & City Treasurer
Lauren Paradis – Manager of Budgets & Long Term Planning
TO: Mayor & Council

FROM: Lauren Paradis, Manager,
      Budgets and Long Term Planning

DATE: January 17, 2020

RE: Revised Victoria Ave BIA Budget Submission

Please find attached a revised requested budget from the Victoria Ave BIA which replaces the request on pages 7-73 – 7-74. The requested levy and city contribution are unchanged.

Thank you.
The City of Thunder Bay 2020 Budget Overview

Department: Outside Boards
Prepared by: Executive Committee

Division: Victoria Ave BIA
Date: January 10 2020

The Fort William Business District is the voice of the business community. It is committed to improving and promoting the area through investment and advocacy to maintain its position as one of Thunder Bay’s shopping, business, entertainment and historical downtown destinations.

- **Enhance** the beautification maintenance and improvements that the City of Thunder Bay provides
- **Encourage** property owners to maintain beautify and enhance their businesses
- **Advocate** on behalf of the business community
- **Work** with community and municipal partners to address safety and the perception of safety
- **Promote** the business district as a desirable place to eat shop work and play

**FWBIA 2020 Revised Operating Budget Submission**

We are resubmitting our proposed operating budget for the Fort William Business Improvement Area for 2020 as new developments have changed our original budget submission since September. This budget reflects the needs of our membership and allows us to continue the work towards meeting our objectives and advocating for the business community.

**Tax Levy**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administration - payroll, audit and outside contracts</td>
<td>$ 35 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction and Beautification</td>
<td>$ 25 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$ 60 000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**City Contribution**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction and Beautification</td>
<td>$ 25 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media – social, website media events</td>
<td>$ 18 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration – fixed</td>
<td>$ 9 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration – other</td>
<td>$ 8 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$ 60 000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Budget Request for 2020**

$ 120 000
2020 Budget Request Breakdown

Construction and Beautification

- Façade Incentive Program: $10 000
- Maintenance contract: $7 000
- Eye In the Sky: $1 000
- Repair and Maintenance: $7 000

**TOTAL** $25 000

Media

- Social Website Radio: $5 500
- Sponsorships: $2 500
- Networking Area promotions Events: $10 000

**TOTAL** $18 000

Administration (fixed)

- Rent/Storage: $6 000
- Insurance: $2 000
- Telephone/Internet: $1 000

**TOTAL** $9 000

Administration (other)

- Office Supplies AGM board meetings: $8 000

**TOTAL BUDGET REQUEST** $60 000
TO: Mayor and Members of Council

FROM: Norm Gale, City Manager

DATE: January 20, 2020

RE: Proposed Budget Amendment – Legal Services

SUMMARY

You are receiving this memorandum because Legal Services seeks to amend its proposed 2020 Budget with respect to its operating, legal fees, and insurance fees budgets. More particularly, this memorandum advises that Legal Services:

- has reorganized its office to accommodate the hiring of a second Deputy City Solicitor by eliminating the position of Articling Student from its current complement,
- seeks to amend its budget by also eliminating the position of Junior Solicitor, as currently proposed,
- seeks to amend its budget by increasing its operating budget to accommodate the elimination of the Articling Student and Junior Solicitor and the addition of a second Deputy City Solicitor, and
- correspondingly, seeks to amend its legal and insurance fees budgets to reflect the expected savings in these respective budgets due to the addition of a second Deputy City Solicitor and Litigation Law Clerk.

In short, by implementing these changes to Legal Services’ corporate structure and budgets, we are increasing effectiveness while, concurrently, reducing the overall operating budget.

DISCUSSION

As you are aware, the position of Deputy City Solicitor has been vacant since July 2019. Late last year, the City Solicitor conducted interviews to fill this position. Among those interviewed, two candidates specifically stood out to her given their significant legal experience (each with more than 15 years as practicing lawyers in Northern Ontario) and expertise in two areas of law, which Legal Services currently requires, being: (a) litigation and (b) real estate, development, and planning.
Legal Services has recently reorganized and both of these individuals have been offered positions as Deputy City Solicitors. Consequently, the position of Articling Student (1.00 FTE) will be eliminated from Legal Services’ corporate structure as of May 1, 2020. It is expected that this reorganization will save the Corporation money within its insurance fees and legal fees budgets of approximately $183,000 in 2020.

Also, as a result of this reorganization of Legal Services, the 2020 proposed budget will need to be amended to eliminate the requested position of Junior Solicitor, as this position is no longer a requirement. However, Legal Services still requires a Litigation Law Clerk, who will provide administrative support to the Deputy City Solicitor (Litigation). With the addition of this position, we expect that additional savings will be found within the legal and insurance fees budgets. The Deputy City Solicitor (Litigation) will have greater capacity to take on more litigation files with appropriate administrative support rather than outsourcing these files to external legal counsel.

Over the course of three (3) years (2015-2018), Legal Services expended between $152,251.01 and $296,656.00 within its legal and insurance fees on external legal counsel with respect to small to mid-sized litigation files; files that could have been handled in-house had Legal Services been sufficiently staffed to do so. It is this range of dollars that we are targeting, specifically, with the addition of a Litigation Law Clerk, who will work alongside the Deputy City Solicitor (Litigation). Conservatively, we expect that the addition of a Litigation Law Clerk (who is estimated to start in July 2020) will save the Corporation within its legal and insurance fees budget (collectively) approximately $76,000.00 in 2021.

Expansion currently in the proposed budget for Legal Services:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2020 FTEs</th>
<th>2020 Budget</th>
<th>2021 FTEs (Additional Impact)</th>
<th>2021 Budget (Additional Impact)</th>
<th>Total FTEs</th>
<th>Total Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City Solicitor &amp; Corporate Counsel *</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>$108,700</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>$108,800</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>$217,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Phase in of positions over 2 years

The proposed revised expansion for Legal Services:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2020 FTEs</th>
<th>2020 Budget</th>
<th>2021 FTEs (Additional Impact)</th>
<th>2021 Budget (Additional Impact)</th>
<th>Total FTEs</th>
<th>Total Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City Solicitor &amp; Corporate Counsel *</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>$126,500</td>
<td>(0.3)</td>
<td>$63,500</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>$190,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Legal Fees</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>($156,000)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>($38,000)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>($194,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance Claims</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>($27,000)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>($38,000)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>($65,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>($56,500)</td>
<td>(0.3)</td>
<td>($12,500)</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>($69,000)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Phase in of positions over 2 years
RECOMMENDATION

Administration recommends that following budget amendment be made:

“With respect to Report No. R 1/2020 (Corporate Services and Long Term Care – Financial Services) Proposed 2020 Operating and Capital Budget we recommend that the City Solicitor and Corporate Counsel budget be reduced by 0.7 FTEs and increased by $17,800;

AND THAT the corporate legal fees budget be reduced by $156,000;

AND THAT the insurance claims budget be reduced by $27,000.”
During budget deliberations, Administration was asked to provide data on the condition of the City’s pavement network. Provided below are excerpts from Corporate Report 161/2016 for your information. Please refer to the attached full report for further detail. Pavement condition index information is collected every 5 years and is rated on a scale of 0-10. Pavement is considered to require reconstruction when rated from 0-5 (poor condition), rehabilitation when rated from 5-7 (fair condition) and maintenance only when rated from 7-10 (good condition).

Network Average Condition Rating
2000 – 7.49
2005 – 7.46
2010 – 7.55
2015 – 7.51

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Reconstruction</th>
<th>Rehabilitation</th>
<th>Maintenance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>34.7%</td>
<td>65.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>35.6%</td>
<td>62.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
<td>72.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>68.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The average pavement condition of the network has remained relatively consistent with the investment the City is making in rehabilitation projects, but we are seeing more roads needing reconstruction.

Modelling indicates that spending $12M a year on pavement rehabilitation will maintain the existing average network condition. Administration recommended $1M in additional funding be dedicated to complete reconstruction projects on low volume residential streets which are not prioritized in the Pavement Management System. The City has spent on average $7M annually on pavement rehabilitation over the last five years.

Please let me know if you have further questions.

Attachment 1: Corporate Report 161/2016

cc: EMT
Lauren Paradis, Manager Budgets And Long-Term Planning
Dawn Paris, Director Financial Services
Krista Power, City Clerk
Leanne Lavoie, Committee Coordinator
**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

This report provides an update on the overall pavement condition rating for the asphalt surface road network and outlines road maintenance and rehabilitation strategies. Inspection and data analysis confirms increased spending on road infrastructure is maintaining the overall condition of the City’s asphalt road network at year 2000 levels. Increased investment since 2010 has reduced the rate of increase of roads degrading into the costly reconstruction category. However, funding targets remain below recommended levels restricting any improvement in the overall road network condition.

**LINK TO STRATEGIC PLAN**

This report directly supports Goal 18 of the City of Thunder Bay's Corporate 2015-2018 Strategic Plan to become “Sustainable through enhanced infrastructure renewal,” and directly links to Strategic Goal 18.1, to “Build on Recent Progress in Infrastructure Renewal for all City Capital Assets.”

**DISCUSSION**

*Pavement Asset Management – Inspection & Rating System*

Inspection and data analysis confirms the average road network condition has been relatively static since 2000. Detailed physical inspections of the entire paved road network are completed every five years. The first inspection was completed in 2000 and the City now has four years of consistent benchmarks to evaluate the condition of the network overtime. Physical inspections consist of measuring the roughness of each lane kilometer of road using vehicle mounted laser measuring tools, and visual logging of pavement defects and their severity; including cracking, potholes, rutting, etc. From the inspections, data ratings are developed for each road segment based on a 0-10 scale called the Overall Condition Index (OCI).
The OCI rating scale rates the road segments on a scale of 0-10, with better condition roads having a higher numeric value. Average OCI ratings of Thunder Bay’s paved road network, since 2000 are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average OCI Rating</td>
<td>7.49</td>
<td>7.46</td>
<td>7.55</td>
<td>7.51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Investment Options – Maintenance, Rehabilitation & Reconstruction**

Options are modeled and prioritized taking into account the various defects and investment alternatives (maintenance, rehabilitation or reconstruction) using a cost benefit ratio that considers the road traffic volume and costs. Modeled prioritization results and annual road reviews completed by Engineering and Roads Sections are used in conjunction with asset management principles to develop the pavement surface work program.

Maintenance options are low cost activities that are generally completed by the Roads operations sections and involve crack sealing, pot hole filling, minor padding, etc. Maintenance activities are performed on all roads. Ideally, actively maintaining roads with a 7-10 rating keeps them in good condition longer, and delays them from falling into the rehabilitation category.

Rehabilitation options are moderate cost activities that correct road surface defects and extend the life of the pavement structure. They include pavement strategies such as milling the top layer of asphalt and resurfacing or removing all the asphalt and replacing it. Roads rated within the 5-7 range are generally considered for this type of work. Ensuring roads are rehabilitated at the correct time prevents them from entering the much more expensive reconstruction category.

Reconstruction options are very expensive and are required where simply resurfacing will not correct the issues with the roadway. These kinds of issues require the removal of all the asphalt, and replacement of the granular materials beneath the road surface, sometimes coupled with drainage improvements. Roads with severe rutting, alligator cracking and other base related deformations are typical of those that fall within this category. Typical ratings of roads within the reconstruction range are 0-5.

Further breakdowns of the OCI ratings per kilometer of roadway are shown in the table below and indicate an increase in centerline kilometres of roads within the reconstruction and maintenance categories, and a decrease of roads within the rehabilitation category.
In the context of current strategies, based on best practices and Asset Management principles, trends indicate goals of performing more minor and major rehabilitations have increased the kilometers of roads in the maintenance range. However, some road segments are not being rehabilitated at the proper time allowing them to fall into the more costly reconstruction range.

### Annual Investment in Asphalt Road Surfaces

The following table outlines the approved budget dollars spent on road rehabilitation work since 2005 (values in $000,000’s):

<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>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Road Budget</td>
<td>$7.4</td>
<td>$10.0</td>
<td>$7.6</td>
<td>$8.4</td>
<td>$8.1</td>
<td>$5.7</td>
<td>$6.7</td>
<td>$8.8</td>
<td>$9.7</td>
<td>$8.9</td>
<td>$10.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Following the Pavement Asset Management update in 2011, average road spending increased to $9.4M/yr (2012-2015) versus $7.4M (2008-2011). Increases in spending have assisted in completing more major and minor rehabilitation strategies, which reduced the amount of roads in the rehabilitation category falling into the reconstruction category. Roads in the reconstruction range increased at a similar pace over 2000-2005 and 2005-2010, but the rate of increase has been reduced drastically between 2010 to 2015.

While the back log of work in the reconstruction range has increased in the most recent 5 year date range, additional funding for pavement has limited that increase to its lowest point since pavement ratings have been implemented. It is noted that the average funding of $12M is still below the dollar value recommended in 2011.

Modelling exercises to estimate future spending requirements to maintain or improve the road network will be reported to Council when the analysis is complete.
Quality of Paving Materials

Paved roads consist of four distinct layers: the subgrade, the sub-base, the base, and the asphalt. The subgrade is the native soils the road is constructed on, while the sub-base and base granular materials are of a specified thickness and grading following most current design principles and Provincial Standards. The asphalt consists of two main items, the asphalt cement and granular materials that are specified and proportioned based on the asphalt mix design.

Granular sub-base and base materials provide a well-draining compacted base for the asphalt to be placed upon. The materials placed are of a specified thickness and designed to ensure the traffic load is disbursed enough to not cause deformation of the subgrade, in conjunction with the asphalt layer.

Asphalt provides the wearing surface for traffic and has a significantly higher load carrying capacity than granulars. Within the City of Thunder Bay, the asphalt mix design typically used is HL4, with a move to Superpave mix designs more recently for higher volume arterial roads. HL4 asphalt performs well on roads with lower traffic volumes, low truck traffic, is 20% less expensive than Superpave mixes, and is considered a good value.

In recent media, there have been concerns with respect to the poor performance of asphalts in Southern Ontario. Superpave mix designs were implemented by the MTO in 1998 to deal with issues of asphalt’s rutting at high temperatures and cracking at low temperatures. This was to be accomplished with the introduction of performance graded asphalt cements (PGAC) that are graded based on high and low temperatures expected to be experienced by the asphalt. Thunder Bay asphalt surfaces did not generally experience the wheel track rutting that was seen in other areas of the province with higher volumes of truck traffic. When specified, the city uses a standard PGAC to help resist cracking at lower temperatures in its mix designs.

Recent studies have indicated additives used in modified PGACs have caused issues with premature deterioration of the pavement in some locations in Southern Ontario. The standard PGAC the City specifies for Superpave mix designs does not contain additives supplied in the higher temperature PGACs specified in Southern Ontario.

The MTO is currently implementing additional testing methodologies for asphalts and asphalt cements that ensure that the additives causing the issues with premature pavement deterioration are no longer used. These testing methods have been used by the MTO since 2012 in trial areas. Currently, the new testing methods have not been adopted in municipal portions of Provincial Standards.

The excessive early cracking seen in Southern Ontario has not been seen in Thunder Bay to date. Both HL4 and Superpave asphalts have generally been performing well in recent paving contracts. Administration will continue to monitor the performance of pavements locally and adopt OPS specifications as suitable.

Engineering has shifted its priorities based on current asset management planning principles and best practices, to perform more mill and pave projects which extends the useful life of a roadway. These resurfacing exercises are prone to reflective cracking within one or two years of paving.
Quality of Paving Materials, cont.

Over the life cycle of the pavement, resurfacing more frequently has been shown to be a significant cost savings compared to full reconstructions, and maintains the pavement’s condition in a better state overall. This type of cracking does not relate to the asphalt cement issues described above and is expected.

Council also expressed a concern with respect to the quality of materials including the use of recycled materials in City asphalts. Existing City specifications are more stringent than Provincial specifications, and allow for the use of up to 20% recycled material in the base lift of asphalt, with none allowed in the top lift of asphalt. Asphalts using recycled materials must meet the requirements outlined in the Ontario Provincial Standards and Specifications document, and must pass all material testing checks. The use of recycled asphalt products have a long proven track record in the Province and North America, and promote sustainability and environmental benefits.

Quality Control During Construction Projects

The City currently uses the most recent version of the Ontario Provincial Standards and Specifications when preparing contract documents. These specifications and standards outline best practices the contractor must follow when performing work for the City, and specify requirements for materials used in municipal projects. Contract Monitoring is conducted by City Inspectors on a full time basis to ensure construction methodology meets these specifications. The contractor is still responsible for construction methodology, workmanship and final performance.

Materials used during construction projects are tested in various ways to ensure they meet required standards and specifications. For pavement materials, including granulars and asphalts, numerous checks are performed in the field and lab to ensure the materials meet the contract’s standards and specifications.

Any granular materials or asphalts not meeting the testing specifications are rejected.

Newer Technologies in Capital Projects and Road Maintenance

The Engineering and Roads staff continually gather information on new road maintenance and road building technologies, in order to extend the useful life of existing pavements. This research can reduce lifecycle costs, as well as provide opportunities to pilot materials and evaluate them as suitable.

The City has trialed the use of various geotextiles, which are materials used within the pavement or granular layers, to increase the strength of the road base. One recent trial included a geotextile layer in the first stage of the Cumberland Street reconstruction project in 2014. Geotextiles can help reduce the anticipated cracking that would occur due to the old remaining concrete road base. In this case, the geotextile did not perform and future stages included removing the underlying old concrete.

A proven technology for extending the life of newer pavement that has just started to crack, is the use of crack sealing. Recent recommendations to council have included doubling the capital crack sealing budget to ensure all newer pavements receive this treatment to extend their life.
Four localized pavement deformations were repaired in 2015 with a technology new to Thunder Bay. The applied technique uses infrared heat and emulsifiers to recycle asphalt in place. The locations piloting this technology are performing well, and will be reviewed to determine if this technology provides value for its cost.

The City has also been looking at automated pot hole repair equipment. Local Trials have been conducted and the Roads staff is gathering information to determine what savings or productivity gains could be achieved by purchasing this type of equipment. Future results will be reported to Council once available.

**Concrete versus Asphalt Roadways**

Within the City of Thunder Bay, asphalt pavements have been used almost exclusively for the construction of roadways. Concrete pavement has been used and remains on small sections of streets within the City, and can be a viable alternative to asphalt. Selection of asphalt pavement for roadway surfaces in the City is based on a number of factors; including economics, ease of construction, ease of repairs, traffic volumes and superior safety performance in winter conditions.

When looking at the life cycle costs over the entire lifespan of pavement, a number of studies have indicated that the cost of comparable concrete roadways can be up to 40% higher than those of asphalt, particularly on lower volume roads. This is largely attributed to the initial high construction costs of concrete versus asphalt. The life cycle costs include initial construction and maintenance over the entire life of the pavement. From an economic standpoint, concrete roadways do become more viable when considering higher traffic volumes and heavy truck loads, due to their increased durability and load carrying capacity. There are no streets in Thunder Bay that require concrete due to traffic volumes or truck loads.

Timing for construction and repairs must be considered as concrete roadways take longer to construct than their asphalt counterparts. Surface repairs to concrete for the purpose of restoring a safe riding surface, while less frequent, are generally more expensive and take much longer to complete. Removal of entire sections of concrete roadway may be required while asphalt can be patched and padded relatively quickly. This is of particular concern when looking at utility cuts, and underground infrastructure repairs. Options to rehabilitate asphalt over its lifecycle are quicker and more cost effective when compared to concrete rehabilitation options.

Another important consideration in the selection of asphalt over concrete roadways is the weather. In winter climates, asphalt proves to be superior to concrete as the surface is generally rougher and provides more traction, which enhances the safety of the road. Additionally, salt on concrete pavement is required for winter road safety in cold weather environments, but salt adversely affects concrete’s performance, consequently decreasing the road’s useful life.
Road Network Condition Comparison’s

The City’s road network is generally performing better than other Canadian municipalities. The City of Thunder Bay currently participates in the Ontario Municipal Benchmarking Initiative (OMBI). It is a collection of municipalities that collect and share information between the cities. Part of this benchmarking process includes sharing information on Road Assets and their overall conditions. Relevant to this discussion, the Initiative tracks statistics of roads within the networks that are in ‘Good’ to ‘Very Good’ condition.

Based on our existing pavement rating system, Thunder Bay would consider roads in the 7-10 range as good to very good (i.e. not in need of any capital work such as re-surfacing). As noted in the statistics above this equates to approximately 68% of our road network. Based on the 2014 data obtained from the municipalities participating in OMBI, the average percentage of roads falling into this category is just over 50%.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATION

None

CONCLUSION

It is concluded that increased spending on the pavement network to more closely match funding requirements as determined by using Asset Management principles, has had a positive effect on the backlog of road reconstruction required within The City of Thunder Bay, and has maintained the current level of service and condition of the road network. However, funding targets have still been below recommended levels restricting any improvement in the road network condition.

Further modeling of future budgeting scenarios will outline recommended spending levels for paved assets, to maintain and improve the City’s road network, and will be reported to Council in 2017.

BACKGROUND

In 2011, Engineering presented a report to council (R140.2011) outlining administration’s pavement asset management strategy. The report included an analysis of the City’s paved road network and recommendations on funding levels to sustainably maintain its paved assets.

REFERENCE MATERIAL ATTACHED

None

PREPARED BY: Mike Vogrig P. Eng. – Project Engineer
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MEMORANDUM

TO: Mayor & Council

FROM: Lauren Paradis, Manager, Budgets and Long Term Planning

DATE: January 20, 2020

RE: Travel and Training Budgets

As requested at the January 14, 2020 Special Committee of the Whole budget deliberation meeting please find attached a summary of the travel and training proposed 2020 budget by department compared to 2019.

Thank you.
### Summary of Travel and Training Costs 2020 and 2019 Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>2020 Budget</th>
<th>2019 Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Personnel Costs: Employee Training and Corporate Committee Travel &amp; Training Expenses</td>
<td>Materials Costs: Travel &amp; Convention and Corporate Committee Expenses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayor &amp; Council</td>
<td>6,200</td>
<td>88,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Manager's Office</td>
<td>98,500</td>
<td>36,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Services</td>
<td>126,600</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Services &amp; Long Term Care</td>
<td>125,700</td>
<td>42,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development &amp; Emergency Services</td>
<td>159,300</td>
<td>53,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure &amp; Operations - Tax</td>
<td>48,900</td>
<td>28,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure &amp; Operations - Rate</td>
<td>195,900</td>
<td>36,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>761,100</td>
<td>285,800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MEMORANDUM

TO: Mayor & Council

FROM: Lauren Paradis, Manager,
        Budgets and Long Term Planning

DATE: January 20, 2020

RE: Summary of FTEs 2015 to 2020 (Proposed)

As requested at the Long Term Financial overview presentation on January 8, 2020 please find attached a summary of full time equivalents (FTEs) by Department from 2015 to 2020 (Proposed). The D-listed Homes (Dawson Court and Grandview Lodge) are included in Chart #1 and excluded in Chart #2.

Thank you.
### CHART #1  D-Listed Homes Included

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mayor, Council &amp; City Manager’s Office</td>
<td>86.3</td>
<td>85.9</td>
<td>86.4</td>
<td>82.8</td>
<td>84.3</td>
<td>82.7</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development &amp; Emergency Services (Note 2)</td>
<td>459.2</td>
<td>457.2</td>
<td>453.0</td>
<td>445.7</td>
<td>449.0</td>
<td>443.7</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Services</td>
<td>421.9</td>
<td>417.9</td>
<td>409.9</td>
<td>412.7</td>
<td>419.0</td>
<td>420.9</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Services &amp; Long Term Care (Note 3)</td>
<td>289.4</td>
<td>289.2</td>
<td>291.7</td>
<td>291.4</td>
<td>334.6</td>
<td>588.0</td>
<td>(298.6)</td>
<td>-50.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure &amp; Operations - Tax</td>
<td>320.7</td>
<td>318.2</td>
<td>317.5</td>
<td>314.6</td>
<td>322.0</td>
<td>321.7</td>
<td>(1.0)</td>
<td>-0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure &amp; Operations - Rate</td>
<td>146.5</td>
<td>147.0</td>
<td>146.0</td>
<td>145.8</td>
<td>145.8</td>
<td>144.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,724.0</td>
<td>1,715.4</td>
<td>1,704.5</td>
<td>1,693.0</td>
<td>1,754.7</td>
<td>2,001.0</td>
<td>(277.0)</td>
<td>-13.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note 1: Historical FTE data is being presented consistent with current organizational structure
Note 2: SNEMS increased by 20.5 FTEs between 2015-2020
Note 3: Corporate Services & Long Term Care numbers reflect closure of 2 Homes in 2016 and 2017. In 2015 there were 297.0 FTEs at these homes.

### CHART #2  D-Listed Homes Excluded

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mayor, Council &amp; City Manager’s Office</td>
<td>86.3</td>
<td>85.9</td>
<td>86.4</td>
<td>82.8</td>
<td>84.3</td>
<td>82.7</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development &amp; Emergency Services (Note 2)</td>
<td>459.2</td>
<td>457.2</td>
<td>453.0</td>
<td>445.7</td>
<td>449.0</td>
<td>443.7</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Services</td>
<td>421.9</td>
<td>417.9</td>
<td>409.9</td>
<td>412.7</td>
<td>419.0</td>
<td>420.9</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Services &amp; Long Term Care (Note 3)</td>
<td>289.4</td>
<td>289.2</td>
<td>291.7</td>
<td>291.4</td>
<td>334.6</td>
<td>588.0</td>
<td>(298.6)</td>
<td>-50.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure &amp; Operations - Tax</td>
<td>320.7</td>
<td>318.2</td>
<td>317.5</td>
<td>314.6</td>
<td>322.0</td>
<td>321.7</td>
<td>(1.0)</td>
<td>-0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure &amp; Operations - Rate</td>
<td>146.5</td>
<td>147.0</td>
<td>146.0</td>
<td>145.8</td>
<td>145.8</td>
<td>144.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,724.0</td>
<td>1,715.4</td>
<td>1,704.5</td>
<td>1,693.0</td>
<td>1,754.7</td>
<td>1,704.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note 1: Historical FTE data is being presented consistent with current organizational structure
Note 2: SNEMS increased by 20.5 FTEs between 2015-2020
Note 3: Does not include the D-Listed Homes
Note 4: Included in the 20.0 increase is 10.8 FTEs fully funded by the Fed Govt related to the Youth Inclusion Program
MEMORANDUM

TO: Mayor & Council

FROM: Lauren Paradis, Manager, Budgets and Long Term Planning

DATE: January 21, 2020

RE: Amounts Paid to City Owned Utilities

As requested at the January 14, 2020 Special Committee of the Whole budget deliberation meeting the estimated annual amounts paid to City owned utilities in 2019 are as follows:

- Synergy North - $7.9 million
- Tbaytel - $2 million
- Water/Wastewater for City owned facilities - $1.3 million.

The amounts for December billings are based on estimates.

Thank you.