

Council Capital Budget Information Session Follow-up

As a follow up to the Committee of the Whole Budget meeting on November 9th and Council Information Session On November 16th additional information with respect to the 2018 proposed capital budget was requested by members of council. The following is a consolidation of the questions and responses. Where appropriate, page numbers from the Proposed 2018 Capital Budget & Forecast book have been referenced.

Capital Budget General

Project: **General Capital Budget Question #1**

Question: Do development charges cover the cost of growth?

Response: The *Development Charges Act, 1997* restricts the calculation of development charges to the historical level of service as well requires a 10% mandatory deduction for prescribed services (transit, parks & recreation, libraries and studies). Historically service levels are capped at the average service level provided for the ten years prior to the development charges background study. Based on the 2014 DC Background study the total cost of the historical level of service cap and the 10% mandatory cost reduction is approximately \$5.1 million for the 10 year period 2014-2023 (average \$510,000 per year). This equates to just under 5% of the total growth costs in the DC study.

Project: **General Capital Budget Question #2**

Question: What is the balance in the Park Dedication Reserve Fund (PDRF)

Response: The uncommitted balance as of September 30th, 2017 is \$15,208,614. The 2018 capital program is using \$4.2 million of this funding and the 10 year capital program forecasts \$29.2M of spending from this source.

Roadways

Project: **Lakeshore Road Resurfacing (E of Nelson Avenue to W of Brant Street) (RD-RA-805) page 60**

Question: In 2017, this project was identified as a reconstruction, slated for the 2021-2026 time period, at a total cost of \$5.470m (pg 272 of the approved 2017 capital/operating budget book). In the proposed 2018 capital budget book, pg 60, the project has become a resurfacing for \$635, with nothing else in the 10 yr forecast. What has changed? Can this project be deferred to the 2019 budget?

Response: Previously, this project was based on the assumption that the road would be fully reconstructed and it included a provision for the widening of Lakeshore Road along this stretch. This assumed the need for property purchase, impacts to existing structures (retaining walls), and significant utility relocation. The previous scope of work also included limits that extended through the Brant/Lakeshore intersection to Elizabeth Street. With pending developments in proximity to that node, this iteration of the project has been scaled back to address only the pavement and other right-of-way infrastructure based on life-cycle considerations.

At this time, any future enhancements to Lakeshore Road (e.g. streetscaping) would need to be identified and introduced into a future version of the Capital Budget. Otherwise they are assumed to be outside of the 10 year forecast. A deferral of this item to 2019 is possible, but the timing is driven by existing asset needs.

Project: **Brant Street at Elgin Street Right Turn Elimination** (RD-RA-1796) page 65

Question: Will right turns be prohibited?

Response: This is only the removal of the right hand turn lane as it creates a conflict situation for pedestrians crossing here.

Project: **Walkers Line Widening** (RD-RA-787) page 70

Question: This is a beautiful rural road. How intrusive will this work be?

Response: This work will be similar in nature to what is proposed for Cedar Springs. The road platform will be widened for paved shoulders.

Project: **Drury Lane Pedestrian Bridge** (RD-BG-1423) page 73

Question: Identified that the condition survey conducted in 2013 was updated in 2017. Can I get an update on the condition survey please?

Response: The Drury Lane structure was inspected and analyzed in 2017 and found to meet the structural requirements of the Canadian Highway Bridge Design Code (CHBDC). However, the vibration / deflection of the structure exceeds the allowances in the CHBDC.

Multiple maintenance items were identified and will be addressed in 2017/18.

The structure is currently scheduled for a major rehabilitation in 2021, with design work commencing in 2020. However, the City is currently coordinating with Metrolinx to jointly replace of the existing bridge with a new overhead structure to be built prior to the GO electrification project (estimated for 2021/22). Additional clearance to accommodate electrification may be required as well replacement post electrification will be much more costly.

Projects: **James Street Minor Reconstruction** (RD-RR-1719) page 86, **John Street Reconstruction & Streetscaping (James Street – Caroline Street)** (RD-RR-1046) page 87 and **John Street Reconstruction & Streetscaping (Lakeshore Road – James Street)** (RD-RR-1454) page 88

Question: I believe we decided to stop streetscaping and that hydro burial was to be at the developers cost. Why is the reverse being implemented?

Response: This hydro burial cost is for the low voltage services that currently exist. This does not include for the high voltage 27kv that will be feeding the incoming development that the City was not going to be paying for. I am not aware of any decisions to stop streetscaping at this time and the downtown streetscape guidelines are currently being developed with this area in mind.

Project: **Hillsdale Ave Slope Stabilization** (RD-RL-1792) page 93

Question: Is the \$500k just to do the study or to address the issues? Why so expensive?

Response: The planned budget was to address the issues. This project came about due to slope failure that occurred as a result of significant rainfall runoff this past spring. During the development of the Capital Budget and Forecast, staff hired a geotech firm to investigate the slope failure, and we are currently in the process of initiating a design to implement the geotech report recommendations.

The \$500k estimate was based on consideration of the potential risk associated with the remediation required. In addition to access issues, if the failure was deemed to be significant there would have been major impacts to the road right-of-way. In order to accommodate this project in 2018, staff made a decision to divert renewal funding from the Local Roads Resurfacing (RD-RL-1452) project.

Fortunately, recommendations received post-budget submission indicate that the failure is shallow and relatively localized. We now believe that the slope stabilization work will be approximately \$100k in 2018.

Project: **Local Roads Resurfacing Program** (RD-RL-1452) page 93

Question: Can I get a list of all projects planned for 2018 (which roads, type of work). This category has gone from a projected \$259k in 2017 approved budget (p297) to \$522 in 2018 budget. Why?

Response: The listing of “shave and pave” roads is generated from our asset management decision support systems. We do not provide a specific listing at this point in time, as it is still deemed ‘tentative’.

Staff identifies and creates a list of prioritized candidates that may exceed the funding we have available. The list then needs to be verified by staff each spring as conditions

over the winter may impact the intended treatment. The listing becomes final in the spring of each year prior to tender issue.

The type of work typically consists of a 40-60 mm removal and replacement of the asphalt wearing surface, as well as localized concrete rehabilitation of the curbs and sidewalk.

The shift from the planned \$259k to \$522k was done to re-balance between the two primary funding sources used for this project (FEDGASTX and IRRF) in order to meet set guidelines.

There is an overall project reduction in 2018 from what was planned last year (\$2.61M to \$1.54M) due to item RD-RL-1792 (refer to answer for question 3) and in large part to the amount of Regional joint projects we are involved with in 2018.

Project: **Road Renewal & Maintenance** (RD-RL-912) page 96

Question: Can I get a list of all projects planned for 2018 (which roads, type of work). This category has gone from a projected \$475k in 2017 approved budget (p298) to \$550k in 2018 budget. Why?

Response: In addition to localized rehabilitation of roadway assets, the specific programs included in this item are surface treatment (in the rural area) and crack sealing (city wide).

The Roads, Parks & Forestry department delivers these programs, and coordinates with Capital Works staff. The planned minor rehabilitation and crack sealing list is verified post-winter each year, and is too extensive to provide. It must also allow for unplanned maintenance and renewal required in-year.

Staff are working to prepare a map showing the surface treatment program for 2018, which we will provide.

The previous amount allocated each year was deemed not sufficient to address the overall maintenance and renewal needs of the roadway network. In order to provide safe, high performing and cost effective infrastructure, a funding increase was required. This will help to achieve pavement useful life targets and minimize reactive maintenance activities.

Project: **Storm Sewer Minor Renewal** (RD-RL-1798) page 97

Question: Is this a new category? I couldn't find reference in the 2017 capital/operating approved budget book. Can I get a list of projects planned for 2018 with this budget?

Response: Yes, this is a new ongoing asset renewal project. Our sewer inspection program has uncovered some minor storm sewer deficiencies that cannot be addressed by RP&F programs so we have created a capital item to deal with these.

The funding will be used to address pipes with scores 4 (poor) or 5 (very poor) where the distress is isolated (localized holes) so they can be replaced as part of capital, aligning underground life cycle to pavement life cycle. Pipes with distress throughout will be addressed with road capital works as they would require full replacement.

Staff also plans to pilot the use of Trenchless Rehabilitation technology which allows us to form a new pipe within the old pipe without cutting the roadway. The process is rather quick with relatively minimal disruption to the community. We have also discovered cross connections in the last 3 years and it is probable that more will be found. These must be dealt with immediately in-year.

We will re-evaluate the project costs annually and adjust this budget item as required.

Project: **Glenwood School Drive Reconstruction and Storm Sewer** (RD-RL-1468) page 103

Question: Why has this project been pushed from 2020 (2017 budget book, p 302) to 2022? Why has the cost changed from \$2.3m (157k capital + \$2.143m reserve) in 2017 to \$2.720m (\$1.201m capital plus \$1.519m reserve) in 2018?

Response: The project has been deferred from 2020 to 2022 in order to align with the replacement and upgrade of Regional water and wastewater services.

Projects beyond the first several years of the budget often have planning level estimates developed. As projects get closer to implementation, and scope of work is more defined, the estimates are updated and are more accurate. The estimate for Glenwood School Drive project was updated prior to the 2018 budget process, before shifting to 2022 to align with the Region.

Project: **Harrison Court Extension** (RD-RL-1303) page 104

Question: Council by amendment to a previous Capital budget ended this project. Why has it reappeared?

Response: This is an oversight and is just a carryover from a previous version and should have been removed as it did not show up in our discussions this year as it was previously outside the 10 year capital forecast

Project: **Active Transportation Initiatives and Infrastructure** (RD-SW-265) page 105

Question: Is all of this funding allocated to cycling? What about trails/paths for walking? Can some of this funding be used to install “stop for pedestrians” signs in the roadway, the same as Milton has in their downtown area?

Response: This funding is not exclusive to cycling. It can be used to implement a wide range of warranted improvements, including signage for pedestrians.

Storm Water Management

Project: Roly Bird Park Creek Bank/Headwall Repairs

Question: Please provide a detailed outline of the repair schedule provided in the 2018 capital budget and forecast.

Response: The repairs to East Rambo Creek at Roly Bird Park will be undertaken using the SD0116 – Minor Erosion Control Projects account. (see next question below)
The following is our scheduled work plan.

Winter 2017/18

- Design for relocation of walking path to move it away from the creek
- Design & CH approval process for the interim repairs to the creek banks.

Spring/Summer 2018

- Construction of the path relocation
- Construction of the interim creek repairs
- Design & CH approval process for the permanent creek repairs

Summer 2019

Construction of the permanent creek repairs

Project: Minor Erosion Control Projects (SM-SD-685) page 134

Question: Funding has increased from \$350 projected in 2017 budget (p330) to \$650 in proposed 2018 budget (p134). Why the significant change? What is the impact to reduce this back to \$350k? Please provide a list of projects anticipated in 2018.

Response: The significant budget increase is related to our consultant's preliminary cost estimate of \$600K to repair a slope stability issues in the ravine behind Heather Hills Drive. This slope stability issue came to our attention in mid 2017. When the detailed slope stability analysis is complete, we will be able to reassess the preliminary cost estimate.

Currently we have 2 projects identified for construction in 2018. Funding from 2017 is being used for these projects:

1. 4400 No 2 Side Road, Culvert outfall Erosion Protection
2. East Rambo Creek erosion repairs in Roly Bird Park

Once we have a better cost estimate for the Heather Hills project, we will be able to determine if other projects can be added in 2018.

Facilities and Buildings

Project: **Lowville Schoolhouse Project**

Question 1: Do you have any update to the information provided at the meeting about two months ago? As a result of the information provided at the recent budget meeting regarding the impacts of unexpected events on the 2018 "new and enhanced" budget I will now submit this as a 2019 construction project. This will allow us to use 2018 to scope out the project and to do the necessary historical research to better mark the contribution of the community to the construction of the school and the park.

This project will also compliment the 2018 completion of the "new and enhanced" elements of the Lowville Park Master Plan and allow for a community celebration to mark the occasion.

Question 2: Provide a list of all of the City owned heritage resources as well as the investments made in them over the past 17 years. What has the City invested in private heritage resources in 2016 and 2017 in the form of tax rebates as well as the 2018 budget amount.

Response:

Facility	Total Capital Investment (20 years)**
Paletta Mansion	\$415,481
Ireland House Museum	\$723,117
Joseph Brant Museum *	\$729,333
LaSalle Park Pavillion	\$715,404
Lowville Schoolhouse	\$17,401
Greenwood Cemetery	\$146,674
Freeman Station	\$70,563
Pumphouse (Beach Strip)	\$113,948
Lakehurst Villa stone wall	\$0
Union Cemetery	\$0

* excludes any expenditures to date for expansion project

** excludes any funding captured in corporate accounts for roofing, electrical, mechanical, etc.

City funding for the heritage property tax rebate program totals \$62,890 as follows; 2015- \$11,934; 2016-\$22,967; 2017- \$27,985. The 2018 budget for the Heritage property tax rebate program is \$35,500.

Project: **Tansley Woods Community Centre (FB-CC-858)**

Question: This seems to have disappeared from the 2018 proposed capital. Was listed in 2017 budget p 363 for \$518k in 2018. What happened to this expenditure?

Response: FB-CC-858 Tansley Woods Repair & Renewal has been added to the new Community Centre project number FB-CC-1810. Funding was reprioritized to the FB-AA-1808 Arena Repair and Renewal and FB-PL-1809 Pool Repair & Renewal projects

Project: **Repair & Renewal - Arenas** (FB-AA-1808) page 159

Question: Is this a new expenditure category? How were we funding these repairs before?

Response: The FB-AA-1808 project is a new project that was broken out from the P&R Facility Repair and Renewal project FB-MB-4.

Project: **City Hall Facility Revitalization** (FB-BD-1387) page 161

Question1: Why has the cost of this project gone from \$1.5m (2017 budget, p352) to \$1.933m in this budget book? Can this be reduced back to \$1.5m?

Response1: Additional funding has been added to advance required work on the tower elevator and HVAC renewal, original funding was renewal works including council chambers and office space rationalization.

Question 2: What is the breakdown of the City Hall Revitalization 2018 budget (\$1,933,000)?

Response2: The following is a breakdown of the 2018 budget:

- Renewal of Council Chambers and associated HVAC - \$85,000
- Customer Services Enhancements, Tower Elevator Renewal and Office Modernization - \$ \$1,083,000

Project: **Repair & Renewal – RPM Operations Centre Facility and Ancillary Buildings** (FB-BD-3) page 165

Question: Why has the cost gone up to \$510k from the projected \$300k in the 2017 budget book (p356)

Response: Additional funding was required for the replacement and relocation of the yard weigh scale that was identified in the Yard study plus additional funding for the RPM operations facility functional design study.

Project: **Repair and Renewal – Transit Facility** (FB-BD-39) page 167

Question 1: Was the hoist replaced in 2010 as part of the major renovation?

Response 1: This hoist was part of the original equipment of the building. The 2010 expansion added additional bays (with new hoist equipment) but this replacement is in one of the original bays. This hoist has been in service over 20 years, is older technology and in need of replacement.

Question 2: Why the spike in costs - we didn't see this coming? 2017 budget has reserve funding of \$56k for 2018, p357. Why no reserve funds to cover the \$287k for renewal? What is the breakdown of this amount and why not projected earlier?

Response 2: The hoist for 2018 was planned to be replaced with 2017 approved facility funding; however this funding was used to replace the air quality monitoring system that did not achieve its anticipated service life and cost more than anticipated. The funding source has changed from gas tax to tax supported funding to begin to address the sustainability of the Transit capital program.

Project: **Fire Training Facility - Fire Station 1** (FB-FI-511) page 176

Question: Why has this cost jumped to \$100k in 2018, from projected \$20k in 2017 budget book (p367.)

Response: Fire Departments are required to arrange for an engineer's structural assessment of their Fire training tower every 5 years. We had one done during 2017. The findings from this identified very specific issues that must be addressed including damaged interior fire brick, loose exterior bricks and damaged concrete floors. The \$20k that had previously been in for 2018 was an amount to cover for expected general wear and tear, not the repairs that are required. The building is approximately 35 years old and well used. In order to keep it up and running from time to time we will face repairs that are over and above general maintenance.

Project: **Corporate Facilities and Buildings Security Implementation** (FB-MB-1077) page 180

Question: Is this a new initiative? Can't find it in the 2017 budget.

Response: This is a new project that was broken out from the original P&R Repair and Renewal FB-MB-4 project in order to track implementation of the security audit measures separately.

Project: **Corporate Roof Replacement** (FB-MB-1139) page 181

Question: Why have costs gone up so dramatically since 2017 budget? 2017 projections for 2018=\$20k, (p373), 2018=\$180k

Response: A 2017 roofing condition assessment was completed in early summer. The report was part of our 5 year schedule roofing condition assessment. The assessment identified a number of major repairs and replacements that are required to maintain the various facility assets.

Project: **Repair and Renewal – Tyandaga Golf Club** (FB-TY-153) page 189

Question: Why is this building (Maintenance Building) not scheduled for replacement? This would be a good use of non tax supported debt paid for through a temporary surcharge on green fees and memberships.

Response: The FCI (Facility Condition Index) number and noted comment in the budget book is derived by the facility asset management software system. After further review of the level of service for the facility, the actual FCI is 0.25 (once the life of some building systems were pushed out to suit the current requirements of the facility) not 0.53 as noted in the budget book. Some work has been done on the building including the removal of asbestos. Based on the opinions of the management of the golf course, the maintenance facility continues to be in a useful state. While it is approximately 53 years old it continues to serve its purpose mainly focused on equipment storage. Staff will plan for a future replacement date approximately 10 years out (2028). The replacement may be done in a variety of ways including the potential purchase of a commercial metal storage system. Staff will continue to explore options over the upcoming years.

Parks and Open Space

Project: **Multi-Use Path** (PO-PR-877) page 202

Question: Are reserve funds already present for this path, so could we advance to 2018? And incur extra \$415k in capital.

Response: The funding identified in this project is for future implementation of the Community Trails Strategy with priorities for future years to be developed and confirmed over the next couple of years. The addition of \$3.392 million to the P&OS work plan is not feasible considering the current resourcing levels. Funding from development charges in future years is not available for use in 2018.

Project: **Lowville Park Infrastructure** (PO-PR-1594) page 208

Question: Why has the cost grown by \$500k capital, and \$138k reserve since 2017 budget book (p404, 2017 budget) for total increase of \$638k?

Response: The increase funding is to replace the existing parking lot that was not included in the 2017 budget & Forecast.

Project: **Paletta Lakefront Park** (PO-PR-1804) page 210

Question: Is this a new expenditure? Couldn't find it in 2017 budget. \$310k capital.

Response: This is a new project; the funding is for the replacement of the lighting systems for the parking lot and pathway lighting. The project also includes funding to provide a detailed analysis of the bridge structure replacement/relocation/repair as a result of damage from the May 2017 storms.

Project: **School Playground Improvement Strategy** (PO-PR-133) page 212

Question: Do we get any contribution from the HDSB for the playground equipment?

Response: We do not get recovery from the HDSB. This approach was approved as part of report PR21-08 Playground improvement strategy. This strategy recognizes the community benefit of school playgrounds, to maintain equitable service levels across the city with consistent standards etc.

Project: **Sherwood Forest Park - Turf Replacement** (PO-PR-1803) page 214

Question: I thought BYSC paid for the turf? Showing a city contribution of \$250, reserves \$100, external \$400k (assume that is BYSC)? Is that for all three domes or one? (CBR)

Response: BYSC has replaced the turf on the most northerly dome (100% at their cost). The replacement is for the main soccer field that has two domes over it. The external costs represent BYSC's contribution for capital renewal under the current agreement.

Project: **Sycamore Park** (PO-PR-1663) page 216

Question: Why did costs go up so high from the projected budget in 2017 book. 2018 budget is \$465k, 2017 budget book projected \$160k, p406 (CBR)

Response: The increase in funding is for the replacement of the tennis courts that are at the end of their useful life.

Project: **Multi-use Path, Hydro Corridor North** (PO-PR-1681) page 245

Question: You may recall that a few years ago that I pointed out that in the West end of this Hydro Corridor the distance between pedestrian benches was over twice that of the East end.
Would it be possible to correct this for the 2024 construction and what would be the cost?

Response: The Hydro Corridor Multi Use Trail project was undertaken as part of the stimulus funding provided in 2009. As part of this project benches were generally provide in locations where the multi-use trail intersected municipal roads.

The Active Aging strategy approved by Council would support the addition of seating areas along our trail system. Considering this we could look at the possibility of incorporating seating areas along our multi-use trails as part of the repair and renewal project in 2024. In the interim we could consult with Hydro One for permissions to establish these structures on their lands. Permits from Hydro One and gas utility providers will be required

In 2017 dollars the cost to provide a bench with accessible concrete pad is approximately \$3500.

Parking

Project: **Electric Vehicle Charging Stations – Downtown** (PK-PK-1795) page 262

Question: Will the old and new stations be changed to pay machines? If not, why not? The capital cost is already heavily subsidized; why should the fuel be free?

Response: Electric Vehicle charging stations can remotely be adapted to accept payment. At the present time the City is not able to re-sell electricity, however we can increase the cost to park to cover the cost of the electricity. It is felt at present because the KWh usage is so low and the consumption charges so nominal, the City should not charge but to continue to encourage more EV use in the Downtown.

Project: **Electric Vehicle Charging Stations – Downtown** (PK-PK-1795) page 262

Question: Would it be possible to slow down the installation from 4 charging stations to just 2 per year?

Response: Yes, that is possible; however the majority of the costs involved are not for the stations themselves but for the infrastructure involved with placing the necessary cable and conduit. It is felt that if the conduit is there, there should be dual stations there too.

Fleet Vehicles, Accessories and Equipment

Project: **Alternative Energy Transit Vehicles**

Question: Is there any funding in the budget to purchase alternative energy transit vehicles?

Response: The City has submitted an application for funding through the Municipal GHG Challenge Fund to participate in the Pan Canadian Electric Bus project being done through the Canadian Urban Transit Research and Innovation Consortium (CUTRIC) if this funding is received Transit will report back to Council on the details

Project: **Video Cameras on Buses** (VE-EN-1839) page 272

Question 1: Given the other transit priorities is this a real need in 2018?

Question 2: What is the lifecycle of the cameras?

Question 3: Data on insurance claims, security issues on buses showing need for video cameras

Response: The cameras provide ongoing benefits beyond the initial costs of implementation. It is expected that potential savings could be realized from a reduction of questionable insurance claims where camera data can assist in determining extent of injury, particularly when injuries are subjective. Cameras could also potentially increase driver awareness and safety.

There is no accepted industry standard for lifecycle for onboard cameras. This would be dependent on technological changes. An estimated lifecycle would be approximately 7 years.

Transit's insurance budget has increased by 43% since 2012. Cameras would provide additional evidence in accident investigation and increase driver awareness. These factors could have a positive impact on our insurance claims and future premiums.

Project: **Presto Fare System** (VE-EN-1501) page 274

Question: Must we do this right now at a cost of \$1.4M given more urgent transit priorities. Looks like \$700 per person if 50% of full time transit users used it.

Response: As per the terms of the Presto agreement in principle the City is required to pay for the capital cost of new Presto devices in 2019. There is no option to defer this expense or opt out of participation as participation in PRESTO is a provincial gas tax requirement. There is potential that the \$1.4M estimated cost could be lower than depending on the vendor chosen and the details of the RFP. The current estimate is \$20k per vehicle x 70 vehicles (including Handivan) - \$1.4M.

Project: **Expansion Conventional Transit Vehicles** (VE-VN-1503) page 276

Question: Why are we proceeding now with new bus services when we don't have an approved transportation plan, transit plan, downtown mobility hub plan or official plan? What ever happened to Jarrett Walker's premise that you build ridership and service improvements around customer density and related service standards. We are putting the cart before the horse here.

Response: There are no expansion buses requested for the 2018 budget year. The 2019-2027 forecast includes a placeholder for potential expansion of the transit service following the finalization of the integrated transportation mobility plan (ITMP) in 2019. Annual requests for capital expansions and operating impacts will come to Council each year for approval.

Project: **Expansion Handi-Van Vehicles** (VE-VN-1502) page 277

Question: Why are 2 FTEs required in 2019, but only 1 FTE in 2020, for the same amount of expansion (one new bus each year)?

Response: 2 expansion Handivan vehicles were purchased in 2017 as part of the PTIF capital funding; however no operating funding was provided for drivers (FTE's) or for expansion to service. If additional expansion vehicles were purchased in 2019 transit would recommend 1 FTE to be used on existing spare ratio vehicles in addition to the expansion vehicle purchased.

Information Technology

Project: **Business Intelligence** (IT-CA-1332) page 299, **Enterprise System Renewal** (IT-CA-1507) page 301, **Office Automation Upgrade** (IT-CA-1711) page 303, **Information Security Framework** (IT-TI-1834) page 306

Question: Why aren't all the above projects collapsed into one project? Any savings that could happen? Why separate funding envelopes?

Response: Each of the above projects is unique and will achieve different outcomes. Consolidation would not result in cost savings as projects will involve different solutions, vendors, and expertise.

The Enterprise System Renewal project was a result of consolidating 2 individual projects. This was due to synergies and dependencies that existed between the 2 initiatives.

Local Boards

Project: **Emerging Technologies and IT Infrastructure - Library** (LB-LI-73) page 313

Question: Why have costs almost doubled from what was projected in 2017? \$563k in 2018, projected \$243k in 2017 budget, p483

Response: The amount to be invested in the Emerging Technologies and IT for 2018 in the 2017 capital budget submission was \$242,500 and the revised amount for 2018 is \$563,000. The primary driver is the reallocation of funds to include of Radio Frequency Identification (RFID) technology in the 2018 capital budget. RFID technology will improve workflow and inventory control. Capital funds have been reallocated from other capital budget lines and projects, additional or new capital funding has not been reflected in the budget.