

**Appendix E – Summary of Comments Received since the May 10 Open House, up to and including May 30 (Refer to Comments for Details)**

| Comment Number | Thanks to the WG                           | General Agreement (Yes/No) | Make Service Common in WG Approach | Make More Services Special in the WG Approach   | Concerns about the Process  | Questions and Observations   | Other Comments and Suggestions   | Service Levels <u>Not</u> Same in Both Wards                 |
|----------------|--|----------------------------|------------------------------------|---|---|--|--|--|
| 1              | Yes  | Yes                        |                                    |   |   |  | WG has applied sound principles  |  |
| 2              | Appreciate the hard work & time            | No                         |                                    | Add Sidewalks, Streetlights, Physical Parks   | Rationale that these are provided to all does not seem fair   |  | Services are available to all Hamilton Twp. ratepayers   |  |
| 3              | Thanks for hard work ...                   | ?                          |                                    |   |   | What you have done is amazing!   |  |  |
| 4              | Balanced presentation; reasonably thorough | Yes                        |                                    |   |   | I am good with the suggested splits  | # of Fire Stations per Ward; Plan 173; OP protects Rural environment   |  |
| 5              |  | No                         |                                    | Add Sidewalks, Streetlights, Harbour, Crossing Guards, Marina, Paid Parking, PRC Admin, Facilities & Programs, Parks; Library | WG structure was not in balance by ward; composition of the group was too Ward-1-centric [see text] | Proposed approach not fair to Ward 2 citizens [see two-page chart included with the comment sheet]                         | I do not agree that it is as easy as saying "Ward 2 citizens have access and should pay" [see text]          |  |
| 6              |  | No                         |                                    | Add Streetlights, Sidewalks, Physical Parks, Roads  |   | Urban pre-amalgamation debt load is unfair to be charged to Rural. Reference to Yacht Club [marina], and harbour dredging. | Except for admin., track the budget by ward for all of the services and make every service a Special service |  |
| 7              |  | No                         |                                    | Add Streetlights, Sidewalks, Fire Services [see text], Roads  |   |  |  | Fire Services and Roads are not at same levels in both wards |

**Appendix E – Summary of Comments Received since the May 10 Open House, up to and including May 30 (Refer to Comments for Details)**

| Comment Number | Thanks to the WG | General Agreement (Yes/No) | Make Service Common in WG Approach | Make More Services Special in the WG Approach  | Concerns about the Process | Questions and Observations  | Other Comments and Suggestions  | Service Levels <u>Not</u> Same in Both Wards  |
|----------------|------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------------|--|----------------------------|---|---|---|
| 8              |                  | No                         |                                    | Add Marketing & Tourism, Planning and Dev't, Animal Services, Community Grants, Paid Parking, [Police Service Bd.?], Crossing Guards, Street-lights, Sidewalks, Physical Parks, [Library?] |                            | Not fair, not equitable, not appropriate  |   | Marketing & Tourism, Animal Services, Planning and Development, Virtual Library 24/7  |
| 9              |                  | No                         |                                    | Add Library, Street-lights [see text; also more services, not specified, see text]   |                            | Excessive financial burden is being imposed on Ward 2 with little or no perceived value or common good  | Increase user fees. Comments include references to guardrails and flail mower.  | Rural parks, roads and library do not receive same level of care & attention as Urban |
| 10             |                  | No                         |                                    | Add Paid Parking, Police Service Board, Crossing Guards, Street-lights, Sidewalks  |                            | No rational reason for a change [from the special services list in 2014 by-law]   |   |   |
| 11             |                  | No                         |                                    | Add Paid Parking, Police Services Board, Crossing Guards, Street-lights, Sidewalks, PRC Programs & Facilities, Physical Parks, Marina, Harbour [see text]                                  |                            | Municipal Act relates to providing service <b>"in an area"</b> , not <b>"to residents or ratepayers"</b> [see text, with emphasis added by the commenter] | Consider a surcharge on the area that receives the additional benefit. Reference to slide 35 (Marketing) and question about the CFFM. | Roads might be considered as common or special, depending on ... [see text]           |
| 12             |                  | No                         |                                    | Keep the 10 special services where they are [in the 2014 by-law]   |                            | Disproportionate tax burden has been piling up on Rural, not sustainable for many.  |   |   |

**Appendix E – Summary of Comments Received since the May 10 Open House, up to and including May 30 (Refer to Comments for Details)**

| Comment Number | Thanks to the WG                                       | General Agreement (Yes/No) | Make Service Common in WG Approach | Make More Services Special in the WG Approach   | Concerns about the Process  | Questions and Observations   | Other Comments and Suggestions   | Service Levels <u>Not</u> Same in Both Wards   |
|----------------|--|----------------------------|------------------------------------|---|---|--|--|--|
| 13             |  | No                         |                                    | Add Physical Parks, Sidewalks [see text]  | WG structure was not in balance by ward, with only one person from Ward 2 Rural, no council rep from Ward 2 Rural | List in by-law from 2014 was not acceptable [too much shift of levy onto Rural], and the WG proposal is worse                                    | Consider increasing user fees. Couldn't find your "fillable" comment sheet on your website.  |  |
| 14             |  | No                         |                                    | Remain at 10 items from 2014 special list. Add Fire Services as Special. [see text for explanations]  |   | Reduction of special list cannot be justified as fair to Ward 2  | Includes a comment about visitors from one political area or territory visiting another [see text]   |  |
| 15             | Thanks to all for time and effort put into the process | No                         |                                    | Add Police Service Board, Crossing Guards, Streetlights, Sidewalks, Physical Parks  | Saying everyone uses sidewalks is a very weak argument to justify calling it "Common"                             |  | [Storm] sewer maintenance should be a Special service [Urban] if it is not already.  |  |
| 16             |  | No                         |                                    | Add Planning and Development, Paid Parking, Crossing Guards, Roads [maybe? see text], Streetlights, Sidewalks, Library, Parks & Rec [likely includes facilities, programs, parks] |   | Unwarranted and unsupported shift of taxation burden from receivers of benefit to other parties. Significant inequity will ... lead to tensions. | This is clearly an unevenly prepared document, showing significant bias [to the advantage of Ward 1]. Appears to be philosophical bias of the group and/or the author. | Planning and Development, Crossing Guards, Streetlights, Sidewalks [more]. Police Service (OPP) should remain Special [see text] |
| 17             |  | ?                          |                                    |   |   | "We are one municipality!" [see text]  | Far too many to list [two pages of text]   |  |
| 18             |  | No                         |                                    | Add Paid Parking, Crossing Guards, Streetlights, Sidewalks  |   | "Well, you [WG] still want another 8% [increase]. You have got to be kidding!!"  |  |  |

**Appendix E – Summary of Comments Received since the May 10 Open House, up to and including May 30 (Refer to Comments for Details)**

| Comment Number           | Thanks to the WG | General Agreement (Yes/No) | Make Service Common in WG Approach | Make More Services Special in the WG Approach                                | Concerns about the Process   | Questions and Observations   | Other Comments and Suggestions  | Service Levels <u>Not</u> Same in Both Wards |
|--------------------------|------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------------|--|--|--|---|--|
| 19                       |                  | No                         |                                    |  | "It would seem by now that Ward 2 has no hope of influencing the municipal council and the mayor" [see text]   |  | "If the municipality won't ... adjust taxes accordingly ... I would propose a spending boycott of Ward 1 by Ward 2." [see text]   |  |
| 20                       |                  | No                         |                                    | Add Crossing Guards [Urban], Street Lights, and Police Service Board [Urban] |  | "We cannot fathom why the tax rate for the rural community is to be increased by +-8% in addition to the 37% increase for ten years." [see text]                               | Tax rate for streets, sidewalks, physical parks & programs should be less, not more for occasional and nominal users.   |  |
| 21 part 1 (of six parts) |                  | No                         |                                    |  | Rejecting [11 of 14] of the legitimate candidates for Special Services is "cherry-picking"; no rational reason has been provided for the rejecting.                  |  | Identifying services on their own individual merits is all that should count.   |  |
| 21 part 2                |                  | No                         |                                    |  | From May 29 WG meeting: the report to the Finance Committee had apparently been drafted in advance of the group's review of public comments [see text, first bullet] | From May 29 WG meeting: from one WG member in particular, heard several references to "them" and "they" as if some sort of opposition to be defeated [see text, second bullet] | From May 29 WG meeting: refers to filling the identified gap of not having an overarching ... rationale .... In the vacuum of a rational, believable rationale ... [see text, third bullet] |  |

**Appendix E – Summary of Comments Received since the May 10 Open House, up to and including May 30 (Refer to Comments for Details)**

| Comment Number | Thanks to the WG | General Agreement (Yes/No) | Make Service Common in WG Approach | Make More Services Special in the WG Approach | Concerns about the Process  | Questions and Observations   | Other Comments and Suggestions   | Service Levels <u>Not</u> Same in Both Wards |
|----------------|------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------------|---|---|--|--|--|
| 21 part 3      |                  | No                         |                                    |   | WG mandate only partially completed [see text for details]; still need an acceptable rationale that is both fair and in compliance with the Municipal Act for many of the decisions.          | Where some services are eligible to be Special but recommendation was Common, the reason offered was strange and seemingly disconnected from definitions in the Act. [see text]                  | Act talks about services being provided in an identifiable area. It does not talk about availability to residents of one area if they must travel to another area to obtain service.                   |  |
| 21 part 4      |                  | No                         |                                    |   | Municipal Act seemed to cause difficulty for the WG ... did the WG seek professional advice? Reference to slide #12 with its definition for word "undertaken". [see text for both, bullet A]. | At May 10 Open House, I asked the WG to explain their process in determining fairness: how is fair defined in context of assigning more levy to one ward vs. another? [more, see text, bullet B] | From May 29 WG meeting, heard a possible definition of overall fairness as: on the basis of what benefited the most people or the majority. This is an unacceptable concept [more, see text, bullet B] |  |
| 21 part 5      | Yes              | No                         |                                    |   |   | I wish to congratulate the Working Group on aspiring to a process ... for leading to logical, rational conclusions ... [more, see text]  | That is a tall order, but politicians when performing at their best must bring constituents together rather than sow discord and disunity... [more, see text]  |  |

**Appendix E – Summary of Comments Received since the May 10 Open House, up to and including May 30 (Refer to Comments for Details)**

| Comment Number  | Thanks to the WG  | General Agreement (Yes/No) | Make Service Common in WG Approach | Make More Services Special in the WG Approach                                | Concerns about the Process  | Questions and Observations  | Other Comments and Suggestions   | Service Levels <u>Not</u> Same in Both Wards |
|---|---|----------------------------|------------------------------------|--|---|---|--|--|
| 21 part 6 (e-mail cover page for the other five sheets) | While I thank you for all your work wrestling with this stuff on our behalf, ... [see text] | ?                          |                                    |  | This feedback is offered in the spirit of frank and open discussion with a view to helping WG ... to produce a quality final product [see text] | Rural taxpayers are looking at a double or triple whammy this year on their tax bills: continued phase-in of 10% of the 2014 levy shift, an additional levy shift [next column] | [continued from previous column] ... of 1.5% if WG recommendations are followed, plus MPAC's huge increases this year especially for agricultural lands. |  |
| 22  |   | No                         |                                    | Add Crossing Guards, Street-lights, Sidewalks, Physical Parks, PRC Programs. |   | Numerous services once deemed special to Ward 1 are now being considered for listing as "common"  | Consider user fees for Parks, Rec & Culture Programs.  |  |
| 23  |   | No                         |                                    | Add Streetlights, Sidewalks, Crossing Guards, PRC Programs                   |   | "How can you ask ward 2 tax payers to cover ... street-lights, sidewalks, crossing guard, programs, parks & rec when we don't have them to use?"                                | "Please don't raise my taxes anymore they are already unaffordable!!"  |  |
| <i>Totals</i>   | <b>7</b>  | <b>Y=2, N=23</b>           | <i>none</i>                        | <i>many</i>  | <b>10</b>   | <b>22</b>   | <b>22</b>  | <b>5</b>                                     |

**Note: this is a summary, with selected clips that have been paraphrased. Please refer to the actual Comment Sheets for the full text.**