

Yesterday, from the lectern we heard about

1. inadequate public engagement on a 600+ page document that will affect the lives of every household and business in Burlington.
2. A repeat of the failure in the eyes of several members of the public to provide the truth about the Burlington budget increase
- 3 And the requirement for need over wants in these economic times.

Twice the Chair had to rule Council members out of order in terms of their “clarity questions” of those at the lectern.

Today we are addressing lack of transparency on one budget item and it is never too late to do the right thing,

We are grateful for the information that we managed to get from staff in time for this delegation, but would have preferred to have done our own research as we used to up to Q2 2022. With Council and senior admin blessing according to the previous Clerk we now only have access to documents beginning in 2018.

The one item addressed today is the 2.6 million item on JBH tax levy brought to our attention by journalist Lawson Hunter. We wished to determine if it could after 19 years be removed from the budget and

become part of the much needed Infrastructure fund which council repurposed it for in 2016.

An email in late 2009 from JBH Board member Marianne Meed Ward began this transfer of \$61 million (that cost \$85m) of municipal funding to our local hospital to purchase equipment that staff's research tells us is still a secret in terms of what that equipment was.

600 Burlington homeowners and renters were surveyed as to their blessing on this \$61m gift using the example of a 10 year tax levy rather than what it was and still is a 2009 – 2028 burden.

Documents supplied by the Clerk's office (CORPSERVE-5-09) clearly showed the City Budget Executive Committee that warned of the municipal financial stress such a "gift" would cause, was ignored.

While the Mayor, CAO et al were dancing in Japan streets last month, the Big Cities of Ontario of which our Mayor is the Chair were very vocal in terms of the Province are responsible for health care funding, not municipalities. They are right and Page 11 of CORPSERVE-5-9 demonstrates the internationally acclaimed hospital in Hamilton where I worked never received a penny from Hamilton to pay down our short falls or for much needed equipment.

Mr. Basit is on the record with regard to the 2025 Meed Ward Strong Mayor's budget:

I don't see any shiny objects in this budget, but I do see it being inspired by where I where I feel the community wants us to go.

A bit of a stretch when the budget rate is what it is and still contains the JBH 2.6m tax levy that a 2009 survey of 600 residents were told would be a 10 year commitment.

We and likely many others who understand the history of the \$2.6 million JBH Provision on page 261 of the budget book are concerned that we are still paying off an 85 million dollar debt for a \$61 million gift to JBH to buy hospital equipment for which Finance staff tell us the archives has no publicly accessible list of what that equipment was.

As Mr. Bentivegna and Councillor Kearns were the last two municipal representative on the JBH Board, we believe they should put forth a staff direction at this meeting of Council to bring the JBH purchases with our \$85 million \$61m gift to the next CoW. It's called transparency and is demanded by the *Municipal Act*.

IN SUMMARY AS PER 239 (7) OF THE MUNICIPAL ACT

Anne and Dave Marsden, Community Health, Safety and Access Advocates discussed the background to the 2.6m JBH Tax Levy (Provisions) debt repayment. They drew attention to:

- it cannot be completely repurposed to the Infrastructure Fund as approved in 2016 until 2028;
- an issued caution of the Executive Budget Committee that a \$61m gift to the hospital would cause financial stress to the municipality was ignored.
- Surveyed residents were lead to believe the tax levy impact on the budget would be for 10 years rather than 2009 - 2028

Councillors Kearns and Bentivegna were requested to put forward a staff direction to identify the equipment bought using the \$61m for the next CoW agenda to comply with the *Municipal Act* transparency requirements.