TO: Bert Meunier, Chief Administrative Officer

FROM: Lance Thurston, Commissioner, Department of Community Services

PREPARED BY: Tanie Steacy, Manager of Program Delivery, Social Services
Adele Lafrance, Manager of Administrative Services, Social Services

DATE OF MEETING: November 9, 2004

SUBJECT: Action Plan for Emergency Hostel Bed Shortage

RECOMMENDATION TO COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE:
That Council approves an action plan to address a potential emergency hostel bed shortage over the winter months including:

- Increase the utilization efficiency of current beds within existing Emergency Hostel service providers
- Approve in principle the allocation of $45,000 from the Social Services Stabilization Reserve Fund as part of the 2005 Department of Community Services Operating budget for the continued funding of the Tenant/Housing Support Worker position at the Housing Help Centre operated by Home Base Housing
- Reallocate up to $18,400 in unexpended funds from the 2004 Social Services Homeless Supports Budget allocation to the Kingston Youth Shelter Program to provide “contingency funding” for a bed expansion pilot of up to 7 additional beds for the cold weather season commencing December 1st, 2004 and extending to March 31, 2005
- Facilitate exit strategies for hostel bed clients by authorizing the Social Services Managers (OW Administrator) to approve assistance beyond the current local benefit levels approved by Council as authorized within the limits and criteria of the OW Regulations.
- Increase the use of “off season, low costs” hotels as an alternative for family emergency accommodation requirements where suitable
- Direct staff to enter into agreements with providers for the implementation of the above, these agreements being in a form acceptable to Legal Services

ORIGIN/PURPOSE:
The purpose of this report is to inform Council of a potential hostel bed shortage as advised to staff by the current emergency hostel service providers and to seek Council’s approval of an action plan developed to address this matter. Alternate response options are provided for Council’s consideration as well.

OPTIONS/DISCUSSION:
As Council is aware, the growing incidence of homelessness and related need for additional emergency hostel beds is a concern faced both by the City of Kingston and most other medium and large urban centres across the Country. The reasons for the increased utilization of emergency hostel services are numerous, complex and interdependent. In Ontario, social assistance reforms, health care restructuring,
elimination or reduction of funding of mental health programs and shortages of appropriate affordable accommodations have all contributed to this problem. In Kingston, the latter factor, the shortage of appropriate affordable accommodations is among the worst in Ontario as we continue for the past three years to experience vacancy rates well below the acceptable benchmark of 3%.

It is recognized that Emergency Hostel beds are at best a short term or "bandage" remedy for homelessness and as such longer term strategies are under development by both the City’s Housing Division and community agencies within the Kingston-Frontenac area. Appendix B provides a summary of initiatives under the purview of the Housing Division focused on Preventing Homelessness and Enhancing Supportive Service Delivery. Nonetheless, immediate consideration of the potential emergency bed matter is required.

In response to this emergency bed shortage forecasted by the service providers at a meeting on September 21, 2004, consultation was undertaken with them, as well as with Department of Community Services management staff (Policy & Support Services, Housing and Social Services) to consider contingency options.

**Current Service Context and Clientele:**
In considering contingency options to address the forecasted emergency hostel bed shortage, the current service provision and clientele were considered:

- Ontario Works Directive 4.0-17 describes Emergency Hostel Services as the provision of board, lodging and personal needs to homeless people on a short term and infrequent basis.
- 4 Regular and 1 Overflow Service Providers currently offer approximately 61 Emergency Hostel beds per night within the Community; the City has standing purchase of service contracts in place for 53 of these beds.
- Since 1999, the City of Kingston has increased its emergency hostel purchased bed service by 114% from 6,322 bed nights in 1999 to 13,540 bed nights in 2003. The resultant cost increase represented an additional expenditure of more than $393K gross or $78.6K in net municipal dollars per year (from $132,070 gross in 1999 to $525,354 gross in 2003).
- In July 2004, Council approved the immediate reopening of the local winter overflow hostel, the In from the Cold, based on stakeholder advisement that many homeless people were displaced onto the street with the end of season closure of the overflow hostel April 30, 2004.
- Kingston is one of the few municipalities within the Montreal, Ottawa, Toronto triangle providing emergency hostel services. Neighbouring CMSMs of United Counties of Leeds and Grenville, Prince Edward and Lennox and Addington Counties, Hastings County and Lanark County do not directly operate or purchase Ontario Works Emergency Hostel Services.
- A very recent survey of 6 other CMSMs reveals that while most have an OW caseload to population ratio similar to Kingston’s their Emergency Hostel Bed service levels are significantly higher. (See Appendix C for comparison of Emergency Hostel Bed services in other CMSM and Appendix D for the Chronology of Kingston Emergency Hostel Service Development)
- Lack of affordable appropriate attainable housing remains the most significant cause of homelessness
- An increasing incidence of chronic homelessness similar to that experienced in larger municipal centres for the past 5-10 years is being seen locally. Individuals who lack the self care skills to access available support services and/or to obtain and retain permanent housing, regardless of its availability are becoming chronically homeless people.
Options:
Several options were identified through the consultation with both service provider representatives and Department of Community Services management staff. Options include:

1. **Increase Utilization Efficiency of Current Beds Available:**
   - Reduce need for Emergency Hostel usage by preventing evictions before they occur
   - Ensure that all existing beds among current service providers are fully utilized; request existing service providers refer/transfer suitable users to other hostels with available beds where possible; ensure all regular Hostels beds are utilized before filling In from the Cold Overflow beds.
   - Could be implemented within existing 2004 and submitted 2005 budget allocation

2. **Increase Community Bed Complement by Expanding Purchase of Service:**
   - Solicit additional bed purchases through expansion of existing service providers or through the addition of new service providers
   - May require start up or pilot funding in 2004 and potentially an increase to 2005 budget allocation if undertaken on a permanent regular basis as increased utilization is anticipated and related per diem costs will exceed the allocation included in the 2005 operating budget submission

3. **Increase Bed Complement by establishing and implementing a municipally owned hostel:**
   - Identify a vacant municipal property suitable for renovation into a hostel; either initiate direct operation or contract service delivery with a 3rd party agency
   - Would require significant start up funding as well as a significant increase to 2005 budget allocation as increased utilization and related costs would be anticipated

4. **Facilitate exit strategies for hostel bed users**
   - Increase OW Assistance for both OW and non OW hostel users to:
     - facilitate securing new permanent accommodations
     - assist with relocation to a stable address through familial reconciliation or access to affordable permanent housing in other municipalities
     - assist with relocation to pursue employment opportunities
   - Requires Council to authorize the Ontario Works Managers (Administrator) to approve assistance beyond the current local discretionary benefit levels approved by Council as authorized within the limits and criteria of the OW Regulations
   - Could be implemented within existing 2004 Operating budget allocation to December, may result in a small increase in OW Allowance costs in 2005 however, a 3% allowance increase has been included within the 2005 budget submission which would likely offset most of the resultant additional benefit cost increase

5. **Use “off season” low cost hotels for emergency accommodation:**
   - Implementation options vary; research is currently underway
   - Financially is feasible for families with 3 or more members
   - Has consequence of separating homeless individuals from community supports to assist them to secure permanent accommodation and thus may result in longer periods of homelessness
   - A limited special circumstances/overflow implementation can be undertaken, within existing 2004 and submitted 2005 budget allocation

6. **Take No Action:**
   - The municipality does not have a legislated mandate to provide board, lodging and personal needs to every individual. While Emergency Hostel Services are cost shared as basic financial assistance within the Ontario Works Regulations, this service provision is intended to be a “service alternative” to basic financial assistance for individuals who are eligible for Ontario Works and not a mandatory benefit in and of itself. Historically, OW Emergency Hostel services were provided as a component of the mandatory “Access to Application” requirements of delivery agents.
- Potential consequences of taking no action may include: more people sleeping on the streets, possible increase in property crimes, increased loitering in public places, increase pressure on health care system (both emergency and in hospital) and increase requirement for Police interventions
- Would require no additional increase to the Social Services budget but may have increase costs to the City resulting from the potential consequences

**Proposed Action Plan:**

The following criteria were considering when evaluating the feasibility of each of the above options:
- Provide a timely, realistic and workable contingency for the forecasted bed shortage
- Recognize the efficiency and expertise of the existing service providers within the community
- Remain compatible with the intent of the provincial OW Directives (funding source)
- Be financially viable and sustainable for the City, recognizing the current financial pressures and related Internal Efficiencies and Service Review Initiatives currently underway.

Based on these parameters the following options are recommended:
- **Increase Utilization Efficiency of Current Beds Available**
- **Increase Community Bed Complement by Expanding Purchase of Service**
- **Facilitate exit strategies for hostel bed users through increase OW assistance**
- **Use off season low cost hotels for emergency accommodation**

Through discussions with existing service providers, front line staff and DCS management staff these immediate actions were determined to be suitable means of addressing the service pressure, manageable actions to implement and compatible with the identified criteria. Implementation of these options will include the following components:

**Increase utilization efficiency of current beds available:**
- Continue funding the Housing Help Centre’s Tenant/Housing Support Worker position from the municipal Social Services Stabilization Reserve Fund for 2005 recognizing that in the 4 month period from March 1 to June 30, 2004, through the assistance of this position, some 27 tenancies were saved, 19 clients assisted with relocation and 34 clients assisted with utility assistance; 209 children were assisted within 101 files handled during this period
- Hostel Service providers will be asked to work collaboratively to ensure that all available beds are filled; this strategy will include:
  - increasing communications among service providers and willingness to refer and transfer hostel bed clients to other agencies where alternate beds are available
  - requesting the consent from hostel bed clients to share personal information among service providers to effect the referrals and transfers necessary to increase bed utilization efficiency
- Hostel Service providers will be asked to strongly encourage and assist hostel clients with means to access alternate temporary accommodations elsewhere to do so

**Increase Community Bed Complement by Expanding Purchase of Service**
- Service Providers collectively identified that the only suitable expansion space within the existing system is located at the Kingston Youth Shelter Project.
- In response to this suggested strategy, the Board and Executive Director of the Kingston Youth Shelter Project considered the feasibility of expanding their operation and have offered to undertake a four month expansion Pilot to operate from December 1, 2004 to March 31, 2005 with the objective of making up to 7 additional beds available.
While it is recognized that OW Emergency Hostel Per Diem funding is the only available ongoing funding source for Emergency Hostel Services, the KYSP is requesting a one time operating grant to “Pilot” this expansion; this contingency funding would ensure KYSP does not suffer any financial loss if the related additional per diem funding does not adequately offset the cost associated with this bed expansion as detailed in the budget KYSP has proposed for the expansion.

A similar funding arrangement was provided to Home Base Non Profit Housing for the immediate reopening of the In from the Cold Overflow Hostel this summer as a contingency against financial harm in the event that the bed utilization was less than the forecasted need and projected operating costs. This contingency grant funding was allocated from the new municipal Homeless Supports funds included in the 2004 Social Services Operating budget. In the case of the In from the Cold Overflow Hostel, the bed utilization met or exceeded the operations financial requirements and no operating grant funds were required as sufficient funding was accessed through the provincially shared OW Emergency Hostel Per Diem funding.

Details of the forecasted additional operating costs and proposed funding are as follows:

### PROPOSED KYSP BED EXPANSION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Additional Monthly Operating Expenses</td>
<td>$8,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Available Additional Per Diem Revenue from Existing Approved Allocation</td>
<td>$2,420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(based on 2 additional regular beds filled to a total of 8 beds/night)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Revenue Required for Expansion</td>
<td>$5,830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential Additional Per Diem Revenue Based On:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Additional Beds/Night (total 10/night):</td>
<td>$2,420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Additional Beds/Night (total 12/night):</td>
<td>$4,840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Additional Beds/Night (total 13/night):</td>
<td>$6,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Capacity-7 Additional Beds/Night (total 15/night):</td>
<td>$8,470</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Per diem rate for above estimates are at $40.00 per night based on KYSP’s YTD actual billed rate

It is recognized that any operating deficit will occur if average utilization falls between 9 and 12.8 beds per night at the expanded KYSP. As the City is initiating this service delivery request, KYSP should not be placed at risk of incurring a significant financial deficit associated with this expansion. Therefore it is recommended that one time monthly contingency funding to a maximum of $4,600 (representing a total of $18,400 over the course of the four month pilot) be approved to offset the differential between the additional operating costs incurred for the expanded service delivery and expanded per diem revenue earned. As the funding from the municipal Homeless Supports allocation (Social Services 2004 Operating budget) which were originally committed as contingency funding for the In from the Cold reopening were not required, it is recommended that these funds be reallocated for the same purpose (contingency funding) to the KYSP for service provision expansion.

**Facilitate exit strategies for hostel bed users:**

- Increase supports from Ontario Works to assist with traveling, relocation and/or new accommodation costs as a means of addressing homelessness. The increase support would include increasing client referral to OW by community agencies and more extensive financial support by OW.
- Increased assistance through Emergency Assistance, Discretionary Benefits and Community Start Up would be provided where it is determined that it will effectively move the client out of an emergency hostel.
- Where necessary, the administrator would approve assistance beyond the current local discretionary benefit levels approved by Council, but remaining within the limits and criteria of the OW Regulations.

Use “off season low cost” hotels for emergency accommodation:
- This option is most financially feasible for families of three or more members using either OW Emergency Assistance (for non OW recipients) or Discretionary Benefits (for ongoing OW recipients)
- Canvas local “economy” hotels and develop a listing of those who will accept homeless families
- Develop referral and service path documents to share with Emergency Hostels

While these actions will only address the forecasted upcoming winter bed shortage, it is recognized that direct interventions to prevent homelessness and remedy it by assisting homeless people to locate and secure permanent accommodation remain essential and cannot be reduced or replaced by the contingencies proposed in this report. Within the Kingston-Frontenac area, there are indeed, a number of direct homeless interventions, many funded by either provincial or municipal governments. Appendix E lists current homeless prevention/resolution programs within the Community funded by or through the City.

Other Related Municipal Strategies:
In recognition of both the growing incidence of homelessness and the complexity of the matter, two further strategies will be included for Council’s consideration in the upcoming 2005 Operating Budget.
- A three percent increase (3%) to the Emergency Hostel Service Provider per diem effective January 1, 2005 is included, in keeping with the provincial rate increase announced by the Province of Ontario for Basic Allowance and Shelter Allowance under the Ontario Works and Ontario Disability Support Programs (a subsequent report with further details will be provided).
- A reallocation of the previous $50,000 municipal funds for Homelessness Supports to the Department of Community Services Commissioner’s office has also been included in the submission. This proposed reallocation is earmarked to fund a dedicated Homeless Service Facilitator to research and develop a local Homeless Service Plan. It is anticipated that the province will announce the streamlining of provincial Homelessness funding in early November. Accordingly, the development of a municipal Homeless Service Plan will assist the City as the CMSM to ensure that these funds are managed strategically to address local needs. As a significant portion of this undertaking will align with the Ontario Works Directives and Service Plan, the costs associated with this initiative will be claimed for subsidy (@50%) as eligible Ontario Works Administration.

EXISTING POLICY/BY-LAW:
Ontario Works Policy Directive: 10.0-6 details the meaning of Emergency Hostel Services and the intent of this service delivery within the context of broader OW assistance.

LINK TO STRATEGIC PLAN:
While this matter is not identified outright as a priority in the Kingston Community Strategic Plan, the plan does identify the need to develop an affordable housing strategy and the concern addressed in this report results in part from a lack of affordable housing.

FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS:
OW Emergency Hostel Service per diems and all OW Community Start Up and Discretionary Benefits identified in this report are cost shared with the Province on an 80/20 basis.
The Social Services Stabilization Reserve Fund and the Social Services Homeless Support allocation (2004 Social Services Operating Budget) are 100% municipal programs with no provincial cost sharing eligibility.

Cost sharing of Emergency Hostel Services with the County of Frontenac in the pending cost sharing agreement has been proposed on the basis of the ratio of the actual OW Allowance Expenses.

**2004 Funding Implications:**
The strategies proposed in the above action plan for the balance of 2004, can all be implemented within the existing approved Social Services Budget.

**2005 Funding Implications:**
All of the strategies proposed in the above action plan for 2005 are included in the Community Services Operating budget submission except any additional Emergency Hostel Per Diem costs above and beyond the proposed allocation of $727,835 gross dollars ($145,767 net). It is anticipated that if the In from the Cold Overflow Hostel remains open for 12 months in 2005 and the KYSP bed expansion is fully utilized for 12 months in 2005, the above allocation will be insufficient.

Quarterly reviews of emergency hostel utilization will continue over the course of 2005 and in the event that utilization exceed the bed night projection and budget allocation staff will apprise Council of the matter, recommend further contingencies and recommend funding from appropriate sources including the Social Services Stabilization Reserve Fund as a last resort.

**CONTACTS:**
Adele Lafrance, Manager of Administrative Services, 546-2695 ext 4801
Tanie Steacy, Manager of Program Delivery, 546-2695 ext 4802
Cheryl Mastantuono, Manager, Policy and Support Services, Community Services 546-4291 ext 1253

**DEPARTMENTS/OTHERS CONSULTED AND AFFECTED:**
Greg Grange, Manager of Housing Division
Elizabeth Fulton, Chief Administrative Officer, County of Frontenac
Mike Henessey, Assistance Executive Director, Kingston Harbour Light (Salvation Army)
Terry Fleming, Director, Ryandale Shelter for the Homeless
Wendy Eakins, Acting Director, Dawn House
Jayne Negus, Director, Kingston Youth Shelter Project
Tom Greening, Director, HomeBase Not for Profit Housing
   (operator of In from the Cold Overflow Hostel)
Pam Sorensen, Ontario Works Casemanager
Kathy Cabral, Ontario Works Supervisor
Helga Bellmore, Social Services Administration Supervisor
Gerard Hunt, Manager of Finance Division
Alan Mcleod, Senior Legal Council, Legal Services

**NOTICE PROVISIONS:**
N/A
APPENDICES:

Appendix A: Comments from Joint Management and RULAC (under separate cover)
Appendix B: Summary of Preventing Homelessness and Enhancing Supportive Service Delivery (Reproduced from Report to Council 04-089 of July 14, 2004 and updated to current)
Appendix C: Comparison of Population, Caseload and Emergency Hostel Bed Capacity of Other Ontario Urban CMSMs
Appendix D: Chronology of Emergency Hostel Service Expansion (reproduced from Report to Council 04-089 of July 14, 2004 and updated to current)
Appendix E: Summary of Current Local Homeless and Housing Interventions Supported by or Funded By the City
Appendix B:
City of Kingston Housing Division Fact Sheet
Preventing Homelessness and Enhancing Supportive Service Delivery

**Municipal Services and Initiatives:**
- Administration and funding of 13 supportive housing providers, including 3 alternative housing providers with transitional accommodation for homeless and population at risk
- The Social Housing Registry with integrated supportive services
- Additional allocation of 24 rent supplement units under Provincial Homelessness Initiative available “The New Tomorrow Rent Supplement Program” until 2023
- “Off the Street Into Shelter” program to accommodate costs of hostel outreach workers
- Training for private and non-profit housing provider to prevent evictions in partnership with the Institute of Housing Management
- Affordable Housing Forum held in October 2004.
- Working towards creating new affordable housing units in the City of Kingston

**Municipal administration of the Provincial Homelessness Initiative:**
- Supports to Daily Living to sustain the provision of supportive housing providers: Bridge House, Kaye Healey Homes, Dawn House, and Home Base Housing
- Community Partners Program to accommodate the Housing Registry services and secure access to rent-gared-to-income assistance provided by the Social Housing Registry of Kingston and Frontenac
- Provincial Homelessness Funding Initiatives to fund the Tenant Assistance Program, Voice Mail Service, and Housing Help Centre
- Energy Emergency Fund to help pay for energy arrears (including hydro, oil and gas), as well as the costs for security deposits and reconnection fees
- Provincial Rent Bank Program to allow low income individuals to access financial assistance to address rent arrears

**Implementation of National Homelessness Initiative by local non-profit groups:**
- Supporting Communities Partnership Initiative (SCPI) - delivered by local non-profit groups (Dawn House Women Shelter, Ryandale Shelter for Homeless, Tipi Moza, Migizi Wigwaam, Social Planning Council, Kingston Municipal Non-Profit (Town Homes Kingston), Home Base Housing) through 12 projects. Targeted outcomes included: provision of sheltering facilities, community capacity building, support services, transitional housing, homelessness prevention worker, expansion of eviction avoidance program, and expansion of drop-in centre
- Youth Homelessness Strategy - funded Home Base Housing, Kingston Youth Shelter and Dawn House Women Shelter through 6 projects to address homelessness among youth
- Urban Aboriginal Strategy – delivered by Tipi Moza and Migizi Wigwaam to provide sheltering facilities and support services for Aboriginal people

**Community partnerships to address housing and homelessness issues:**
- Community Homelessness and Housing Advisory Committee to address the priority issues identified under the Community Plan as discharge planning, supportive housing, overflow shelters, affordable housing and second stage housing, health care outreach, storage, and data collection.
- Social and Economic Inclusion Initiative, Social Planning Council of Kingston and area funded by Health Canada
## APPENDIX C:
Comparison of Population, Caseload and Emergency Hostel Bed Capacity
Of Other Ontario Urban CMSMs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>URBAN CMSM: *Population &amp; **Caseload</th>
<th>3rd Party Operated Emergency Hostel Beds</th>
<th>Directly Operated Emergency Hostel Beds</th>
<th>Ratios</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pop to Bed Ratio: 585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Toronto</strong></td>
<td>2,982 + 212 overflow motel units for families</td>
<td>1264</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population: 2,481,944</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Caseload to Bed Ratio: 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OW Caseload: 63,640</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caseload as % of Pop: 2.56%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Durham</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pop to Bed Ratio: 3,840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population: 506,901</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Caseload to Bed Ratio: 37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OW Caseload: 4,873</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caseload as % of Pop: 0.96%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ottawa</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 Family Shelters, total: 66 rooms with 4 members/room</td>
<td>Pop to Bed Ratio: 838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population: 774,072</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Caseload to Bed Ratio: 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OW Caseload: 18,017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caseload as % of Pop: 2.33%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>London</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>none</td>
<td>Pop to Bed Ratio: 1,222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population: 403,185</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Caseload to Bed Ratio: 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OW Caseload: 8,171</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caseload as % of Pop: 2.03%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Peterborough</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>none</td>
<td>Pop to Bed Ratio: 1554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population: 125,856</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Caseload to Bed Ratio: 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OW Caseload: 2,372</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caseload as % of Pop: 1.89%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cornwall</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>none</td>
<td>Pop to Bed Ratio: 10,952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population: 109,522</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Caseload to Bed Ratio: 199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OW Caseload: 1,985</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caseload as % of Pop: 1.81%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kingston</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>none</td>
<td>Pop to Bed Ratio: 2615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OW Caseload: 2,791</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caseload as % of Pop: 2.01%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* CMSM Population as of December 2003, ** Average Caseload as of December 2003 per MCSS OW Data Source Guide
## Appendix D:

**Chronology of Emergency Hostel Service Expansion:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Key Emergency Hostel Service Undertakings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1998 | ➤ City continues pre amalgamation POS agreements for Emergency Hostel Service provision with 2 providers: Ryandale and Salvation Army Harbour Light  
➤ Due to uncertain cost share funding for Domiciliary Hostels related to provincial social services downloading, City negotiates with Province to change Dawn House funding from Domiciliary Hostel funding to cost sharable Emergency Hostel funding  
➤ Provincially set sharable per diem maximum is $34.50 per day (plus $3.70 PNA) |
| 2000 | ➤ Council approves service expansion to include funding for Kingston Youth Shelter Project in November 2000  
➤ Province announces Municipalities may be funded through OW Emergency Hostel Service funding for direct operation of Winter Overflow Shelters |
| 2001 | ➤ Province increase Emergency Hostel Per Diem to $38.00 but OW Directives are unclear as to whether Hostel users are still entitled to PNAs |
| 2002 | ➤ Province clarified that Emergency Hostel per diem funding maximum may be $38.00 plus $3.70 for PNA = $41.70  
➤ City undertakes review of existing OW Emergency Hostel Service provision, in consultation with service providers  
➤ Council approves entering into service agreement with In From the Cold as a winter overflow shelter for Emergency Hostel Service provision for 2002-2003 winter season  
➤ Council approves recommended changes to local OW Emergency Hostel Service funding policies and business practices including:  
  o Increased bed night purchases by 15 beds per night  
  o Increased per diem rate to $41.70 per day  
  o Some exemption of user OW & ODSP income in per diem calculations  
  o Extended pre approved length of stay at hostels up to 45 nights  
  o Removed restrictions for 16 and 17 year old hostel residents  
  o Discontinued 100% core funding for Kingston Youth Shelter and alternately increase its POS allocation for per diem funding  
  o Approved continuation for future years of emergency funding for In from the Cold overflow hostel |
| 2003 | ➤ Expanded ongoing consultation process with emergency hostels to include a representative from the local ODSP office in recognition of the high use frequency of ODSP recipients  
➤ Issued RFP for Winter Overflow Hostel services and awarded to In from the Cold for 2003-2004 season with a future year renewal option |
| 2004 | ➤ anticipate ongoing service and funding levels with 5 service providers through POS agreements representing a annual financial commitment of $663,640 gross dollars / $132,728 net municipal dollars for 17500 bed nights in 2004  
➤ Council approves extension of the In from the Cold Seasonal Contract to permit the reopening of the Hostel in July 2004 due to bed shortage concerns; approval for potential additional funding of up to $54,270 in municipal dollars |
## Appendix E:
### Current Local Homeless & Housing Interventions, supported or funded by the City

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intervention</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Funding Description</th>
<th>$$ Allocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ontario Works: Emergency Hostel Purchase of Services</strong></td>
<td>Intended as the provision of board, lodging and personal needs on a short term and infrequent basis to homeless people in crisis seeking temporary housing and supports pending resolution of the issues that gave rise to the emergency (OW Dir: 10.0-6)</td>
<td>80/20 shareable program with the Province through the Ontario Works program</td>
<td>$ 707,600 gross ($141,520 net) 2004, annualized allocation within Social Services OW Operating Budget OW Allowance line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Centralized Social Housing Registry</strong></td>
<td>Requirement of the Social Housing Reform Act, 2000. The Registry manages the application process for rent geared to income assistance</td>
<td>100 % municipal funding</td>
<td>$210,000 annual budget included in funding allocation to KFH Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regular Rent Bank</strong></td>
<td>Loans to low income individuals to help avoid evictions due to arrears Administered by the Salvation Army Family Services for Kingston and Central Frontenac Community Services for the Frontenac Townships</td>
<td>Annualized 100% Provincial Homeless Initiative Fund (PHIF) Fund allocation reviewed by RULAC, approved by Council annually</td>
<td>$23,800 annual allocation for administration expense and top-up to rent bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Voice Mail Service</strong></td>
<td>Resource for individuals without a phone to maintain contact with prospective employers and landlords</td>
<td>Annualized 100% Provincial Homeless Initiative Fund (PHIF) Fund allocation reviewed by RULAC, approved by Council annually</td>
<td>funding included in Support to Housing Help Centre (see below)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Support to Housing Help Centre</strong></td>
<td>Resource for individuals looking for emergency or permanent housing</td>
<td>Annualized 100% Provincial Homeless Initiative Fund (PHIF) Fund allocation reviewed by RULAC, approved by Council annually</td>
<td>$68,000 annual budget to Home Base Non Profit Housing Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Partners Program</strong></td>
<td>Clients receive counseling on housing related issues such as budgeting and interaction with landlords and other tenants; service is provided through the Housing Help Centre</td>
<td>100 % Provincial funding (CPP)</td>
<td>$62,929 annual budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intervention</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Funding Description</td>
<td>$$$$$ Allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supports for Daily Living</td>
<td>Clients receive life skills training. Clients are generally prone to chronic homelessness, may have history of domestic violence, mental illness and substance abuse Service Providers funded include: Home Base Non Profit Housing, Elizabeth Fry Society, Bridge House, Dawn House</td>
<td>▪ 100 % Provincial funding (SDL)</td>
<td>$1,004,499 annual budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off the Street and Into Shelter</td>
<td>2003 allocation awarded to Home Base Non Profit Housing Inc for a part-time hostel outreach worker</td>
<td>▪ 80/20 split between the Province and the City of Kingston</td>
<td>$5,890 annual budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing/Tenant Support Worker</td>
<td>Housing/Tenant Support Worker position at Housing Help Centre. Provides support for those at risk of eviction &amp; utilities disconnection</td>
<td>▪ Municipal funding of this position initiated in Jan 2004, from the Social Serv Stabilization Reserve Fund ▪ Renewal of this funding is proposed as a strategy in this report</td>
<td>$45,000 in 2004 as 100% municipal one time funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Door Ways Fund</td>
<td>Start Up Loan/Grant service operated by HomeBase Non Profit Housing Inc for homeless low income families who are residents of the City of Kingston, to assist in securing and moving into a permanent accommodation</td>
<td>▪ One time 100% municipal grant (Homelessness Supports allocation) approved by Council in July 2004 ▪ future municipal funding to be determined</td>
<td>$10,000 net municipal dollars in 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Provincial Rent Bank Program</td>
<td>One time funding announced in May 2004 to assist low income individuals/families avoid evictions</td>
<td>▪ 100 % Provincial funding</td>
<td>$121,477 for the Kingston-Frontenac Service Manager area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Provincial Emergency Energy Fund</td>
<td>One time funding to assist low income individuals /families avoid eviction due to utility arrears and for security deposits and reconnection fees</td>
<td>▪ 100 % Provincial funding</td>
<td>$23,770 for the Kingston-Frontenac Service Manager area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relocation Assistance Initiative</td>
<td>Financial supports (up to $500 per household) for relocation for eligible rent geared to income assistance households including all age groups and types of families, including special needs households</td>
<td>▪ Initiative approved by Council Sept. 2003; ▪ funded through the OW Enhanced Funding earned for exceeding OW performance targets for 2001, 2002</td>
<td>$ 40,000 one time funding, net municipal dollars for the Kingston-Frontenac Service Manager area for 2003-2005</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix A

Comments from County of Frontenac staff

At the Joint Management meeting of Wednesday, October 27, 2004 comments were made by County of Frontenac staff:

*Report No.: 04-409 Action Plan for Emergency Hostel Bed Shortage*

There were no notable comments.

Comments from RULAC

At the RULAC meeting of Monday, November 1, 2004, the following comments were made by County of Frontenac representatives:

*Report No.: 04-409 Action Plan for Emergency Hostel Bed Shortage*
TO: Bert Meunier, Chief Administrative Officer

FROM: J.A. Keech, President and C.E.O., Utilities Kingston

PREPARED BY: CAPITAL BUDGET SHORTFALL STRATEGY COMMITTEE
D. Wells, Operations Department
N. Taylor, Utilities Kingston
T. Newton, Community Services
D. Leger, Corporate Services
J. Keech, Utilities Kingston, Committee Chair
S. Kanellos, Planning and Development Services
C. Belanger, Utilities Kingston

DATE OF MEETING: November 9, 2004

SUBJECT: Capital Budget Shortfall Strategy

RECOMMENDATION TO COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE:

It is recommended that a staff committee be established comprising of at least one representative from each City Department and Utilities Kingston, for the purposes of determining strategies and completing a workplan to address the City's recurring capital budget shortfall, within the first quarter of 2005.

- And further -

That the Committee use this report as a guideline to:

- Revisit the definition of capital and clearly communicate the definition of capital to staff following this exercise, and at the start of every budget cycle. This should include examples of what is/is not a capital expenditure.
- Establish a process for corporate guidance on the collection of data to complete an inventory of existing assets and all new capital assets.
- Develop a corporate direction for life cycle planning including operating expenditures for maintenance and capital expenditures for existing and new assets.
- Establish a process to ensure that when a new capital asset is added to the inventory, steps are in place to track the ongoing condition of this asset.
- Investigate completing a high level condition assessment of key existing assets.
- Develop a decision process with weightings of appropriate criteria for prioritizing all corporate capital projects, and a process for utilizing this matrix to prioritize capital projects each year.
Develop a plan for dealing with those projects which continually are not a priority.

Develop guidelines for the establishment of departmental and corporate multi-year plans that lead to a multi year budget process.

Establish a matrix in which each of the broad categories of capital expenditures be listed recommending the appropriate percentage funding mix.

Identify the required policies to the Executive Management Team.

**ORIGIN/PURPOSE:**

At the regular meeting of Kingston City Council on April 20, 2004, the following Committee of the Whole Motion, was reported out to regular Council and approved:

Moved by Councillor G. Sutherland
Seconded by Councillor G. Stoparczyk

**WHEREAS** the City of Kingston has a multi-million dollar capital budget shortfall to fund its 10-year forecast;

**THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT** Council approve in principle the following five-point strategy:

1. Reduce and/or optimize our asset base
   - Stranded assets no longer needed
   - Assets not required for mandate
2. Obtain better financing items with the help of senior governments (e.g. OMEIFA loans)
3. Increase user fees for certain types of assets, fundraising, third-party equity/partnerships
4. Obtain infrastructure grants from senior governments (e.g. Strategic Infrastructure Fund, Municipal Rural Infrastructure Fund)
5. Obtain authority for new sources of revenues (e.g. gas tax)
   - and further –

**THAT** staff be directed to bring back to Council a draft action plan, before the end of 2004 during the 2005 budget final approval, which would identify how to achieve over time a sustainable capital infrastructure plan.

**OPTIONS/DISCUSSION:**

This motion provides direction to staff to produce a draft action plan for Council’s consideration during the 2005 budget process which would attempt to achieve, over time, a sustainable capital infrastructure plan. The intent of the plan is to deal with the existing capital requirements and is not meant to account for new growth or special projects.

To produce this draft action plan, a staff committee was established which represented all departments of the City of Kingston and Utilities Kingston. The mandate of the committee was to determine which elements of the plan needed to be addressed to attempt to deal with the ongoing capital budget shortfall. This committee was to provide a general approach but the details of the workplan and associated timelines are best left to the group who will be carrying out this endeavour.

Each year during the capital budget process, it is evident that sufficient financial resources are not available to fund all the capital requirements recommended for consideration. This is true for both the
requirements of the current year and the capital backlog which has been discussed since amalgamation in 1998. It is a concern that not only is the backlog not being dealt with but that it continues to grow.

To better quantify this, we need to determine what the current gap is in capital funding each year, and investigate potential means of closing this gap. To determine just what the gap is, the new committee must first review the current situation.

**Definition of Capital**

What is the definition of a capital expenditure and is it known and widely understood?

The current corporate definition of a capital expenditure is one whereby:

- costs are equal to or more than $10,000; and
- the material or service has a useful life greater than one year.

Although it was generally agreed that this is the accepted definition, there are a number of questions regarding what is a capital and what is an operating expense. Generally the confusion is around details such as when studies are considered capital, what internal labour is capital, what tools are capital, and when replacing or repairing equipment what determines if it is an operating expense, or a capital expense. With the current pressure on lowering operating budgets there is increased consideration to capitalize items.

It would be advisable to create a clear picture as to why we need to differentiate between what is an operating expenditure and what is a capital expenditure. It is important for the municipality to distinguish between operating and capital expenditures.

Capital expenditures are made to benefit tax or ratepayers in the current and future years. Typically, these expenditures may be financed through debt as a method of obtaining a payment from future beneficiaries. To be financed through debentures, the life of the asset must be longer than the term of the debenture. Municipalities are limited in terms of the debt they may incur so some portion of capital expenditures must be financed in the current year. It is capital expenditures that may be eligible for grant financing.

Operating expenditures must be expended in the current year on items that are typically not considered "assets". Some examples might include utility expenses, fuel expenses and office expenses. These items must be funded within the current year. Debt cannot be incurred for these expenses and they are not eligible for grants.

**Action**

- As a first step revisit the definition of capital and clearly communicate the definition of capital to staff following this exercise, and at the start of every budget cycle. This should include examples of what is/is not a capital expenditure.

**Asset Inventory**

After establishing a clear definition of what capital is and in turn what assets are considered capital, it is necessary to establish an inventory of all capital assets. In simple terms this is just a compilation of the
existing capital assets. Initially, it should include a number of broad categories into which these assets can be classified.

As a starting point the inventory could include:

- Roads
- Bridges
- Storm water systems
- Water and Sewer Pipes, Plants, Stations etc.
- Gas pipes, stations etc.
- Buildings and systems
- Parks/equipment
- Information Technology Systems and software applications
- Communications Systems
- Furniture and major office equipment
- Walkways
- Streetlights and traffic lights
- Equipment/vehicles
- Tools

Part of the plan should focus on how to complete this inventory and what details should be included. A critical part of the plan will be to ensure that all future assets get captured in the inventory listings. This part should be simpler than determining what assets exist but must not be overlooked. It would require a process to ensure all new assets are inventoried. The plan also needs to include details of timelines and standards for collecting the data as this will take some time to complete.

Included in the detailed inventory for each asset should be:

- Identity of each component (existing and new)
- Quantity (existing and new)
- Location (new)
- Installation Date (new)
- Initial cost (new)
- Replacement cost (existing)

Action

- Establish a process for corporate guidance on the collection of data to complete an inventory of existing assets and all new capital assets.

Life Cycle

Another key part of this plan is life cycle planning for capital assets. As with the definition of capital, there are different interpretations as to what this means. For capital planning it can be as simple as determining the theoretical life of a major asset, and establishing a policy to direct finances to a replacement reserve fund so there will be money available to replace the asset at the end of its useful life. Or in the case where there are numerous assets of a certain category, for example roads, it may be
determining how much money must be spent on a yearly basis to maintain the overall current condition of these assets, and not create a further backlog. Attached in Appendix A is an example of a life cycle maintenance plan for roads.

There is however another component that needs to be addressed. That is a plan for appropriate expenditures during the life of the asset to maximize its life span. This would include yearly maintenance costs which would likely be an operating expenditure, and major periodic maintenance costs which would be classified as a capital expenditure. The goal would be to maximize life span and reduce overall costs.

In parallel with the data collection for inventorying our capital assets, a corporate picture of life cycle planning must be established. This would utilize the listing of the asset categories and establish the following:

- Theoretical life expectancy of the asset category
- A regular maintenance component for the asset
- Plan for expenditures during the life including maintenance and capital costs
- Replacement plan to determine the extent of yearly contributions to reserve funds for replacement at the end of its life
- Process to have this completed on every new asset going forward as well as existing

Proper life cycle planning will likely require the establishment of guiding policies dealing with these issues. This may increase some operating costs while reducing costs overall.

**Action**

- Develop a corporate direction for life cycle planning including operating expenditures for maintenance and capital expenditures for existing and new assets.

**Condition Assessment**

In parallel with the inventorying of assets and development of life cycle strategies, a condition assessment of assets should be considered. At a high level there needs to be an understanding of the general condition of our existing assets, and this generally exists in most departments. We then need to focus our attention in keeping detailed information, using the above two topics on the condition of all new assets moving forward.

If the fiscal health of the organization was such that on a yearly basis the necessary amount was spent on ensuring the capital assets were not deteriorating faster than they were being replaced (i.e. the gap was not growing) then it would be beneficial to establish a detailed understanding of the condition of the current assets. However in the case of the City of Kingston where we are aware that the gap is growing, this is an area where it will not be a valuable use of time to provide a lot of detail or do a lot of investigation. The condition assessment of existing assets could be as simple as estimating their age, a broad condition rating (i.e. good, fair, poor, extreme), and the importance of the asset.

We need to focus now on how we are going to stop the gap from growing going forward.
**Actions**

- Establish a process to ensure that when a new capital asset is added to the inventory, steps are in place to track the ongoing condition of this asset.
- Investigate completing a high level condition assessment of key existing assets.

**Criteria**

With the current gap between funds required and funds available for capital expenditures, criteria should be established to prioritize which projects are funded. Following this, strategies need to be established to deal with those items not identified as priorities, which may include the abandonment of those assets that we cannot afford to keep. It may be necessary to provide weighting to some of the criteria as they may not all be of equal importance. This process could be used to determine corporate priorities and which projects receive capital funding, as opposed to the departmental envelope approach. Some items that could be considered in establishing this criteria may include:

- Health and Safety
- Environment
- Risk
- Cost reduction – make an investment to reduce costs
- Funding/partnering opportunities
- Public good & value
- Mandated/Regulated

**Actions**

- Develop a decision process with weightings of appropriate criteria for prioritizing all corporate capital projects, and a process for utilizing this matrix to prioritize capital projects each year.
- Develop a plan for dealing with those projects which continually are not a priority.

**Multi-Year Plans**

As in the case of the definition of capital, these plans (10 year capital) differ across the organization. Differences range from understanding the purpose of the plans to their value to departments and the organization. Confusion also exists as to whether these plans are what we need, or what we can afford, or a balance of the two.

It is suggested they be revisited looking at the following:

- Increase consistency within all the groups
- Determine their value
- Establish a listing of requirements
- Prioritize by the Corporation not by Departments
- Move towards a financing plan that includes tax and rate adjustments, debentures, reserves, etc.
- Develop an integrated multi-year capital financial plan that takes into consideration the life cycle planning of the City’s assets
- Integrate capital and operating budgets
Recommendation to adopt a 3-year budget

**Action**
- Develop guidelines for the establishment of departmental and corporate multi-year plans that lead to a multi-year budget process.

**Funding Sources**

The main focus of the motion of Council was to investigate the various means of funding capital requirements. The components of the plan to this point have been to provide a better understanding of the requirements and levels of funding necessary, on a long term basis. The next step will be to examine all funding sources available, how realistic it is they will materialize (i.e. grants) and the percentage each source should be relied on for each of the capital categories (i.e. it would be anticipated the funding for all gas capital assets would be 100% rates, whereas for sewer it would be a combination of rates and grants).

The funding sources that need to be investigated would include:

- Taxes
- Grants
- User pay (rates and fees)
- Public/Private Partnerships
- Sale of assets to support remaining capital
- New revenues (Gas tax, GST exemption, etc.)
- Assessment growth

**Actions**
- Establish a matrix in which each of the broad categories of capital expenditures be listed recommending the appropriate percentage funding mix.
- Appropriate funding framework be developed leading to discussions with other levels of governments and potential partners.

**Policies**

The final step of the plan would be to establish the required policies utilizing the data collected and research completed to provide long term guidance in stabilizing the capital funding gap. Policies may be required in the following areas:

- Funding source
- Cost recovery
- Long-range planning
- How to deal with new initiatives
- Stranded assets

**Action**
- Identify the required policies to the Executive Management Team.
Next Steps

The mandate of this committee and the purpose of this report is to provide an outline of certain steps required over time to realize a sustainable capital infrastructure plan for existing capital requirements. This plan would assist in stabilizing, reducing, and over time, possibly eliminating the gap between yearly requirements and the financial capacity to fund those requirements. This plan does not deal with growth or special projects.

Whenever this gap is discussed, it is often done in the context of both the ongoing growing gap (current year gap) and the capital backlog. There has been a great deal of debate over the magnitude of this capital backlog since amalgamation in 1998. One of the recommendations of this committee is that the municipality should focus on eliminating the ongoing yearly gap, thus ensuring the backlog does not continue to grow at an alarming rate. If we can focus on today and take steps to ensure the necessary expenditures are funded and the work is done, over time the backlog will eventually take care of itself.

It is recognized that closing the gap will be a major challenge. By completing the steps as outlined, there will be accurate information available to determine what the magnitude of the annual gap is. It will then become necessary to balance the requirements and the funding available to achieve corporate priorities until the gap can be stabilized.

To carry this plan forward and stabilize today’s gap, the committee is recommending the motion at the beginning of this report.

EXISTING POLICY/BY-LAW:

Not Applicable

LINK TO STRATEGIC PLAN:

- Long term infrastructure initiative
- Getting our house in order initiative

FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS:

Not Applicable

CONTACTS:

- Damon Wells, Manager, Roads, Department of Operations (542-1436, Ext. 103)
- Nancy Taylor, Vice President, Utilities Kingston (546-1181, Ext. 2460)
- Tracy Newton, Assistant to the Commissioner, Department of Community Services (546-4291 Ext. 1251)
- Denis Leger, Commissioner, Department of Corporate Services (546-4291, Ext. 1328)
- Speros Kanellos, Manager, Engineering Services, Department of Planning & Development Services (384-1770, Ext. 3133)
- Jim Keech, President & C.E.O., Utilities Kingston (546-1181, Ext. 2217)
- Carol Belanger, Assistant to the President & C.E.O., Utilities Kingston (546-1181, Ext. 2226)
DEPARTMENTS/OTHERS CONSULTED AND AFFECTED:

- Office of the Chief Administrative Officer
- Department of Corporate Services
- Department of Operations
- Department of Planning and Development Services
- Department of Community Services
- Utilities Kingston

NOTICE PROVISIONS:

Not Applicable

APPENDICES:

Appendix A – Example of a Life Cycle Maintenance Plan for Roads
Appendix B – Gantt Chart showing proposed Timelines
## LIFE CYCLE COSTING 2004

### ROAD RECONSTRUCTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Life Cycle of Road</th>
<th>Local</th>
<th>Upper Tier</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5-8 years</td>
<td>Untouched</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 8</td>
<td>Crack Sealing Required</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 25</td>
<td>Overlay Required</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 28</td>
<td>Crack Sealing Required</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 35</td>
<td>Overlay Required</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 38</td>
<td>Crack Sealing Required</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 50</td>
<td>Reconstruction Required</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Crack Sealing | 0.16/m² | 0.16/m² |
| Overlay | 20.06/m² | 31.48/m² |
| Reconstruct | 71.46/m² | 88.53/m² |
| **Cycle Cost** | **112.10/m²** | **151.97/m²** |
| **Total Km.** | 416,9928 | 400,597 |
| **Total Surface Area** | 3,335,942.40 m² | 3,405,074.50 m² |
| **Life Expectancy** | 50.00 years | 50.00 years |
| **Replacement per year** | 66,718.85 m² | 68,101.49 m² |
| **Replacement Cost per year** | $7,479,182.86 | $10,349,383.44 |
| **Total Cost for Replacement cost over 50 years** | $891,428,314.81 |  |
| **Proposed Funding Level for 2005** | $3,640,000.00 |  |
| **Our Existing Roads must Last** |  | 244.90 years |
Capital Budget Shortfall Strategy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Task Name</th>
<th>Nov '04</th>
<th>Dec '04</th>
<th>Jan '05</th>
<th>Feb '05</th>
<th>Mar '05</th>
<th>Apr '05</th>
<th>May '05</th>
<th>Jun '05</th>
<th>Jul '05</th>
<th>Aug '05</th>
<th>Sep '05</th>
<th>Oct '05</th>
<th>Nov '06</th>
<th>Dec '06</th>
<th>Jan '06</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Report 04-405 Capital Budget Shortfall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Establish Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Preparatory Work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Define Capital</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Define Asset Inventory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Define Condition Assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Define Life Cycle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Finalization of Definitions - Report to Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Budget-Dependent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Funding Sources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Policies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Municipal Budget Preparation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Multi-Year Plans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Data Compilation (ongoing task)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Asset Inventory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Condition Assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Life Cycle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is anticipated tasks 15 through 17 may take several years to complete. Sub-committees should report to Council in 2006 regarding progress.