

Budget Conversations

Online Survey Results

1. Please provide comments on: Limit Mayor and Council salary increases to 0% in 2013

Answer Options

Response Count

93

answered question
skipped question

93

20

Number	Response Text		
1	\$100,000 for the mayor and \$40,000 for councillors is not affordable. Other municipalities do not pay their staff nearly as much. Please don't insult us by offering a 0% increase. These salaries must be reduced.		
2	That's ok		
3	Limiting council salaries is great. How about limiting the increases in pay for the management employees as well. There are far too many people on the city payroll making more than \$100,000 per year.		
4	Sounds good. The councillor wages seem really low, and the mayor wage seems a little bit high. I agree to a cap this year as a cost-saving measure.		
5	CPI is a poor way too provide salary increases. Salary increases should be based on merit (i.e. earned). I agree that salary increases should remain at 0% for 2013 and suggest a revised remuneration bylaw be researched.		
6	The positions of mayor and council are best filled by people that do not rely on the stipend to be the main, or, only source of income. Historically salaries were much lower and many of the positions were filled by retired or semi-retired persons. These past mayors and councillors in many instances were persons that had deep business experiences and understood the necessary budgeting requirements in order to maintain an affordable live-work environment		
7	I actually really like the work that our mayor and city councillors do for the people of Victoria. I think that especially that city council might be underpaid. However, I think it's a strong statement to keep increases at 0% in the coming year. Thank you for all that you do for our city!		
8	agree		
9	stay at 0		
	Mayor's salary wrt Councillors is too high - would expect no more than double.		
10	If comparable cities have \$40,000 councillor salaries, then increases should be maintained as per bylaws.		
11	A good start.		
12	I support this.		
13	Yes. I haven't had a raise in 3 years. There needs to be a complete reevaluation of the role of mayor and council. The role of mayor and council should not be a full time job. It needs to be more like a board of directors. Cut the number of councillors to 5.		
14	Agree		
15	Yes. Not a big amount but it shows tax payers your intent to work with us!		

16	Without knowing hours WORKED I think a salary of \$80,000 for the Mayor and \$30,000 would be adequate. If the Mayor works full time, I hope any spare time would be spent learning about the local economy and studying economics.		
17	I am concerned that there is never a good time to give Mayor and Council a raise. I think the remuneration bylaw should be respected so that there is provision for small increases annually thereby avoiding the need for a large increase somewhere down the road.		
18	Agreed, limit increases to 0%.		
19	Yes, everyone should face their responsibilities, not just the bottom r.un		
20	Not worth changing.		
21	Yes. It would be hard to justify a salary increase given other budget reductions.		
22	This is clearly is a short term solution reflecting more on politics then reason. CPI is a great measuring stick for municipal salaries - but maybe consider the flat rate equivalent of the CPI % so salaries grow evenly across.		
23	Tie it to their unionized worker increase.		
24	No comment, but thank Mayor and Council.		
25	Given the current national & global economic situation, which filters down to local economies, this seems appropriate.		
26	Many public sector employees and elected officials are leading by example and adopting % increases in times of budget restraint. I support another year of zero increases by mayor and council, to be revised on an annual basis.		
27	without a doubt!		
28	Worthy but unsustainable in long term if quality governance is important.		
29	I support this proposal. Please also consider eliminating the free parking passes for Mayor and Council or at least converting the parking pass to a free bus pass. Much of the city is accessible by transit during working hours and parking is generally free in the evenings. I agree that the "residential parking only" areas should be accessible to Mayor and Council when they are performing their duties.		
30	The Mayors salary should be reduced by the 1/3rd tax saving equivalency.		
	I support, and appreciate, this decision.		
31	I feel it is important that Mayor and Council be fairly compensated so I don't feel that a 0% increase should happen too often.		
32	Nice start. Since we are now in a 3 year planning cycle, let's make it 0 for 3 years.		
33	Council salary is \$35,000? Mayor paid only \$85,000? That's absurdly low, even accounting for non-montary compensation (e.g. the 'prestige' of the position). Raise these salaries to attract more quality to city government.		
34	Agree with mayor held at \$100, 000 for this year Councillors should receive an increase to 42, 000 each for 2013 With this I would like to see clarity of goals and benchmarks via City website		
35	I disagree - for this small amount of savings I feel the people that devot their time/energy to this job deserve to be compensated for their dedication.		

36	While this type of budget reduction makes for good reading in the local press, it does little to address the issue of reducing the overall City budget by hundreds of thousands of dollars. It is little more than a token gesture. More meaningful reductions need to be adopted which, unfortunately, means service reductions. We can't have what we can't pay for.		
37	At 52.6% of city budget payroll must be significantly reduced. Good optics here, but lets reduce the number of councilors by 10% as an example to all employees and reduce salaries by 10%.		
38	Not many dollars involved by important for setting an example.		
39	The big problem is the salaries paid to the plethora of managers and directors in the City administration.		
40	I appreciate the gesture and leadership in capping salaries. The materiality of the reduction is insignificant.		
41	Good idea.		
42	I think there should be a cut to the salaries of 5%.		
43	Makes sense. Perhaps should consider extending the freeze through 2015, past the next election.		
44	We agree with this especially if other salaries are being looked at. Elected office is not intended to be a Full Time job = it is supposed to be for making decisions. We sometimes feel too much time is being spent on things that are not important to the whole community, pet Councillor projects or projects that only benefit a few loud mouths. Please stay focused on what is important- the matters that impacts the greatest number of people, place less focus on special interest groups.		
45	I'm OK with it. With thanks!		
46	Yes. Please go much further and find management positions that can be eliminated. There are WAY too many upper managers being paid well in excess of \$100,000/year for a city of our size. If we eliminated 10 of these positions that would create approx \$1.5 million for other infrastructure projects annually.		
47	I agree with this. As much as I believe the Mayor and the Councillors work hard and deserve raises, everyone is being asked to tighten their belts with little or no wage increases. It only makes sense, in this time of fiscal restraint, that elected officials do the same.		
48	If the rest of the work force is "holding the line" on expenses, mayor & council should too.		
49	This reduction is optics. \$9,000? Keep a sanding truck in service one more year instead of replacing it and you'll save three times that amount. The other option would be to reduce two council positions and save \$80,000. Is the quality of debate and governance differentially informed by having two less councillors? Doubt if the public would even notice.		
50	Good!		
51	I believe that they should get no increase at all especially the Mayor as he is already getting a fantastic wage and us in the real world do not get raises and seniors don't either. At one time a person who ran for a political position did it to improve things and not for the money.		
52	No. The Mayor and Council deserve the same increase given to unionized employees.		

53	<p>Yes, yes, yes! Do they make any real decisions other than sending to contractors or committee?</p> <p>Why not even take a 5% cut? Do we need that many council positions? And not sure if it will come up later in the survey but please review all positions and get rid of any excess union staff. There are way too many people on staff - they continue to be hired and service continues to be curtailed. As staffing is being reviewed please ensure contracting is included. Why do we have mayor, council, staff then contract out so much? I certainly appreciate they do not have expertise - then why there if not able to decide anything? Garbage pick up alone - you standardize containers to make more efficient pickup but go from weekly to every 2 weeks pickup - I don't understand how we're paying almost the same for 1/2 the service. (Altho I am happy with the compost component - why are the containers so big?) Finally shame on mayor and council for having high priced staff sit around waiting for their turn to speak at meeting - what a colossal waste of staff time and taxpayer money!</p>		
54	<p>This may be politically attractive as a "share the pain" gesture to staff and taxpayers, but the funding pressures we face are not short-term. No raise for two years is one thing, but no raise for ten years is not workable. Unless something is expected to change that will make it easier to afford a raise in 2014, it makes more sense to approve a modest raise now. The mayor and councillors are as deserving as the city staff.</p>		
55	<p>I like the idea that the mayor and council are willing to take a pay freeze in support of the City's current cost saving strategy.</p>		
56	<p>This is only symbolic and has no meaningful impact on the City of Victoria's budget. Give yourselves raises equal to the CPI and focus on more important line items.</p>		
57	<p>Civic politicians should be paid reasonably.</p>		
58	<p>For a city the size of Victoria I consider these salaries to be low and I am not opposed to annual cost of living increases.</p>		
59	<p>I agree that, while the amount saved is probably immaterial, it is a good symbol to stand behind.</p>		
60	<p>For the poor job you are all doing it makes sense. Your budget is out of control, your workers salaries and more importantly pensions are unrealistic. Trying to raise taxes 3% per year compounded is also unrealistic in an economy growing at less than 2%. People on fixed incomes are being abused so your staff can retire on million dollar pensions. You are basically bankrupting the taxpayers of Victoria. Especially small businesses.</p>		
61	<p>I think this is not really going to have much impact other than taking up space in conversations about the budget. We do not have a problem with how much we pay council</p>		
62	<p>implement 0% limit</p>		
63	<p>insignificant but perhaps perception is everything and with the other budget items probably best to raise this year</p>		
64	<p>Absolutely. Many of them receive additional remuneration from various Boards and Commissions to which they are appointed, e.g. CRD, Tourism Victoria, GVHA, etc., etc., as well as additional "perks of office", including travel allowances, etc. This is a "good politics, little savings, window dressing" item.</p>		
65	<p>Can't really criticize no increase</p>		
	<p>A symbolic move on salaries, especially one so small, does nothing to attract the best talent. The increases should continue until such time that the salaries are equal to or better than other municipalities with similar tax bases, not just population.</p>		

66	This is very nice but is not needed - immaterial. However, now that the suggestion has been presented it is unlikely that it can be avoided.		
67	Agreed.		
68	Great people come at a price. Like Great Employees, Great Politicians have competitive opportunities outside the City of Victoria. To limit Salaries simply to stand on principle, or to make a point does not serve the citizen well. \$9000 could be saved by having one less BBQ at Public Works that no one cares about. What about Public Works Day? How many thousands of dollars is that? Where are the indicators that say advertising Public Works to 8 yr olds saves the City money, or serves the children? We would be better served by Politicians that are compensated at a competitive wage.		
69	I agree that these positions should be capped given that majority of people in Victoria are receiving no increases in their salaries and given the economic downturn in Victoria, businesses are struggling to stay afloat.		
70	Cut salaries by at least 50 per cent as this council has hired a squad of PR types at a cost of half a million a year to do the job they were elected to do. If council does not know what is happening in the city, they should not be a burden on taxpayers.		
71	Tax free salaries should be implemented. this is obvious.		
72	Yes		
73	Thank you. I appreciate the optics of this decision and also respect that to attract quality candidates in the future, remuneration will need to keep pace with acceptable levels for a City of this size and particularly one that is faced with the challenges that we are faced with. Plus, this is a never-ending thankless job that you all do and you live in an expensive City so I would not want Council to continue with a salary freeze unendingly, but realize that you may be concerned with how an increase would look in an election year. Perhaps you should have a raise in 2013 and then not one in 2014.		
74	In favour.		
75	I think remuneration for mayor and council should go up with CPI.		
76	Of course they should have 0% increase for 2013 and going forward until fiscal house in order. Perhaps consideration of reductions should take place. We know that there are many who would serve the community even without compensation. Non-resident Councillors should contribute to the City's tax base somehow.		
77	Given that many residents have experienced wage freezes over the last few years, this is an appropriate strategy over the short term.		
78	Only one Mayor for all of CRD - Potential Savings:\$Millions		
79	PAY for people that work there is ok , we have to make a living ,but do or quit spending money on street people,victoria is a beautiful place ,why is it run by street people ,you safe lot;s off money there .cut welfare if there not looking for a job , life is simple ,		
80	Very commendable! Particularly since Premier C Clark raised minimum wage by 28%.		
81	no comment		
82	I agree with this proposal		

	From a leadership perspective, not only should increase be set at 0%, but rollbacks should be considered.		
83	This initiative could be forwarded by long standing Councillors who have been part of the decision-making process for many years. Accountability for poor past decisions, and absence of good fiscal performance should start with Mayor and Council.		
84	Yes		
85	Although the saving is very small, the optics of 0% for the mayor and council in 2013 are worth it and the mayor and councillors are unlikely to resign as a result of this move. Definitely 0%.		
	In addition, for long-time Councillors who sat by and let this happen, and who have wasted \$ and agreed to exorbitant expenditures and staff salary increases, there should be roll-backs.		
86	All City related income, from Board appointments etc should be declared. In fact, to show commitment to the City, Mayor and Council could donate all of these earnings beyond the annual salary to the City debt.		
87	This is expected, as far as I'm concerned. Feels like you expect a pat of the back for doing what we all do. Just do it already. Do you really think the population would say no?		
88	sounds good but dont cap for too long - need to make sure they are paid a reasonable compensation		
89	About time. Even though most of my working life was in union organizations, my wage (excluding benefits) constantly fell behind the CPI.		
90	the positions of mayor and council received excessive increases in 2008/2009. until those filling the positions are able to demonstrate competence in their positions, no increases should be considered.		
91	sounds reasonable		
92	Council salaries are a drop in the bucket. Pay cut or freeze is purely symbolic. Stop the China trips with staff. Bad optics and questionable benefit.		
93	Good idea.		
2. Please provide comments on: Change to Council Taxable Remuneration			
Answer Options		Response Count	
		87	
		answered question	87
		skipped question	26
Number	Response Text		

	I don't see this as a solution at all. It doesn't make any sense.		
	The rest of us pay all the taxes we owe. The mayor etc. would still get paid an exorbitant amount, but the provincial and federal government suffer. Just because other municipality staff have this status does not make it right.		
1	Do not revert to 1/3 tax free status.		
2	More money saved that is great.		
3	Yes, this keeps more of that tax money as City funds as opposed to going to federal and provincial taxes. Makes a bigger difference to city than to province and country, so I agree.		
4	All citizens should be required to pay taxes. In terms of PR, I believe it's better for Mayor and Council to continue paying full taxes.		
5	I have found that there is really no free ride when it comes to taxation, so who pays the taxes? If the city actually saves the \$56,000.00 as stated above then why would we not move in that direction if in fact there is no measurable income change to the officers.		
6	The money has to come from somewhere. If the City of Victoria deems salaries to be partially tax-free, it is provincial and federal government tax revenues that will be reduced. Is this a form of "uploading" to counter years of federal and provincial "downloading" ... ?!		
7	How can one-third tax free?		
	Absolutely not. Regardless of what may be commonly done, I don't see any rationale supporting 1/3 tax-free salary.		
8	It's a job. Decide what salaries are appropriate and pay taxes like the rest of us.		
9	Okay.		
10	I support this.		
11	No what reduces the cost.		
12	I FULLY AGREE THAT THIS KIND OF RESTRUCTURING AND CLAWING BACK THE MAYOR'S ANNUAL SALARY FROM 100,000.00 TO 85,000.00 AS WELL AS THE COUNCIL IS THE APPROPRIATE COURSE TO TAKE GIVEN THE BRITISH COLUMBIA AND GLOBAL ECONOMIC OUTLOOK.		
13	Agree		
14	In favour. This may not be as transparent but I can live with this. That is enough to save the job of one city employee.		
15	I stand by Mayor \$80,000 and Council \$30,000 fully taxed. These people are running a company with mountains of help that private sector (small business) can only dream of having. And if the City falls short then taxes are increased to cover so called fluffy expenses. Mayor and Council also have buckets of perks and expense coverage that the ordinary business owner does not. Perhaps if the salary was publicized then we would have more participants in the elections. The city manager does most of the work with the council okaying the bureaucrats recommendations.		
16	I am not in favour of this proposed change.		
17	Disagree. Mayor and council received increases in excess of \$15,000 and \$5,000 respectively as compensation for making their remuneration fully taxable. Leave as is.		
18	Everyone needs to contribute so normal workers dont. Have to make all the sacrificspes		
19	I support this initiative.		

20	would support the change.		
21	I agree.		
22	What is the downside to the 1/3 tax status ... It's clear you may save money but don't explain the flip side....transparency can't be the only issue here.		
23	If 1/3 tax-free salaries are re-instituted, the potential budget saving is cited as \$56,000. However, there is no statement as to whether this saving takes into consideration the budget loss from taxes no longer paid by Mayor & Councillors. Therefore, the \$56,000 may represent a false saving.		
24	I prefer transparency of salaries and reporting, over the relatively small savings that tax-free status would result in.		
25	robbing Peter to pay Paul, but if Peter isn't giving municipalities enough support, it seems like a good idea!		
26	Ok by me		
27	I oppose this proposal. The potential savings involved are minimal and will be partially offset by the additional federal taxes required to compensate for the reduced payment to CRA (Victoria residents are federal taxpayers as well). I believe the main rationale for the citizen committee recommendation to remove the tax-free allowance was equity with all other Victoria employees, 99% of whom do not receive tax-paid allowances. This is more of a "cost-shift" to another level of government than an actual reduction of expenditure in city operations.		
	as above.....		
28	reduce the salaries and go back to the 1/3rd tax free savings. How much staff time did that Committee suck out of real work for what should have been a five minute task.		
29	Yes!		
30	I do not feel I know enough to have an opinion on this issue.		
31	Nothing that has a demonstrable saving should be excluded.		
32	Same as above: Council salary is \$35,000? Mayor paid only \$85,000? That's absurdly low, even accounting for non-montary compensation (e.g. the 'prestige' of the position). Raise these salaries to attract more quality to city government.		
33	Transparency is too important - this savings does not justify the rationale in my opinion.		
34	The Mayor and members of council should be fairly paid for their time. However, this type of public service is not, or at least should not, be considered as ones "employment". All remuneration should be fully taxable and if this means each member of council takes home less money, so be it. This is how the rest of working society is treated.		
35	shuffling deck chairs on the Titanic		
36	agree with this change		
37	I'm not clear how the tax free arrangement works. Presumably, the tax that is paid by Mayor and Council goes into the Municipal coffers as revenue? So no net benefit to the financial bottom line? If so, I prefer transparency (i.e. status quo).		
38	Good idea.		
39	N/A		
40	Keep it the way it is now. Its too confusing (and kind of old-school) to explain a tax free exempt status for politicians - and besides, taxes pay for services so there shouldn't be an effort to shirk payment to the federal government to help pay for federal services. How would it seem for me to try to shirk my municipal taxes?		

41	Save taxpayer money over whatever benefit comes from this current formula. Wasn't the \$50,000 increase to the budget known when this change was made????		
42	Keep as is. Transparency is MORE important than the saving of \$56K.		
43	Yes.		
44	I agree -- less money to the federal government, but more money to Victoria.		
45	Transparency in salaries seems a good approach, but an expensive luxury if all it takes is fairly simple arithmetic to examine the fairness/otherwise of salaries.		
46	Again optics. \$56,000 is nothing in relation to \$100,000,000ish budget.		
47	Mayors' and Councillors' salaries should not be any more income-tax-free than the rest of us have.		
48	Less is always better. Why not ask for volunteers to be Mayor or Councilors the we would have no cost but still be able to get the best.		
49	Yes. Great idea.		
50	Couldn't transparency be achieved thru your website - here! It seems mayor and council (or on advise from staff) are scared of putting info on the site - why don't you put Johnson Street bridge info on the site and save all that so called freedom of info time spent? It always scares me when you keep things secret. If on website, sure pick up savings that feds willing to give. Seems a little like no brainer to me - other ways to achieve transparency!		
51	I agree that this is less transparent, but there is no downside to the city and none to the mayor and councillors. It strikes me as a no-brainer. Given that, I would support using a portion of the savings to provide mayor and councillors with a modest raise.		
52	As in number one, you are focusing on such small numbers that don't matter in the overall scheme of things. Focus on the big items.		
53	In principle I don't like the idea of any portion of the salary being tax free and I like the transparency and fairness of a fully taxable salary. However, the realities of the cost saving to tax payers is hard to argue with and so would be prepared to support reverting to the one-third tax free plan. However, will this set precedence for this strategy to be implemented for other city employees as well in the future?		
54	I think that the current system ought to be maintained. No one ought to be receiving tax-free remuneration. Why should we asking the rest of the country to be subsidizing our local operations regardless of what other municipalities are doing?		
55	This makes common sense to me and is in effect a way to get Revenvue Canada to subsidise the cost of Mayor and Council. Also I imagine that the Mayor and council do many thign s that are above adn beyond thier pay level.		
	I disagree with this for a host of reasons. The benefit of the 1/3 tax free income is much more beneficial for rich councilors than poor councilors. A current councilor with no other incomes could very likely end paying very little tax on \$40,000.		
	A councilor with two kids is likely to pay about \$4,500 on \$40,000 as their only income. On \$35,000 they would pay about \$3,450 meaning the change would benefit them about \$1,000		
56	A councilor with an additional \$80,000 a year in income beyond the council salary would save close to \$2,000 a year from this change.		
57	implement change		
58	why not? assuming exempt from federal and provincial taxes		
59	Sure, do this, but remember that less tax dollars sent to senior orders of government also impinges on taxpayers.		

60	Appears to be sensible since the taxes would be collected by the province and fed. otherwise, so paying them doesn't help the city.		
61	Please do not change. Transparency is Key to trusting government.		
62	This is immaterial in consideration of what is trying to be done but given that it has been suggested it will more than likely need to be implemented.		
63	This sounds like a clever way to circumvent the income tax systems in Canada and BC. Circumvention of the Income Tax system is one reason why Corporations continue to be subsidized by the "working" man's increased taxes. My Taxes went up again this year. I got a raise and my cheque went down compared to January 2012. I fully support transparant reporting of income to Federal and Provincial Authorities. Saving \$56,000 simply adds this to my increased responsibility as a person with a normal job. There is no saving to the "Single Tax Payer". Please set a good example.		
64	I think that any measure to save money should be taken. We have to reduce property taxes, especially for business owners.		
65	No more freeloading by a council that abbrogates all responsibilities.		
66	limit staff salaries increases to 0%		
67	This is a good idea, and keeps the city in line with other municipalities in the region.		
68	It seems like this has more dollar punch than not getting a small rate increase on your salaries. Might you implement the 1/3 tax free status and then give yourselves a small increase - example. The 85K becomes 86,700 (2%) and the \$35K becomes \$35,700. Optically, citizens still see a savings, and Mayor and Council get an increase in 2013. If you feel you need another freeze then take it in 2014 when it is politically more important.		
69	in favor of		
70	In favour.		
71	Sounds like a good idea.		
72	This is but a shifting of "who pays when". Taxpayers assume the burden, in a differ way, once the system is converted back. that Council wants to discuss this game rather than what is really needed and/or important says a lot about this survey.		
73	I believe there is enough transparency on this issue, why not take the savings and revert to the prior partial tax free solution.		
74	Eliminate every third Executive position!		
75	go easy on tax we need money to live also ,we pay too much tax in victoria ,like parking and everything you can tax people on , quit that , don;t spend so much money on street people ,		
76	Yes, except now Ottawa must find another source for their budget. How about reducing salaries, as suggested, but retain 'all taxable' status?		
77	no comment		
78	I agree with this proposal		
79	I am a taxpayer. Games to shift tax burdens from my one wallet to my change-purse are not useful. For full transparency, Mayor/Council should declare all remuneration from civic sources including the City and all boards or commissions related to appointments through the City.		
80	Yes		
81	These savings are miniscule. Transparency is more important.		

	Here you are, trying to deflect the real budget issues (inflated union salaries and poor contracts/agreements) of millions by twiddling about discussing \$56,000.		
82	This is insulting.		
83	Yes of course, this should be implemented. Why it was changed in the first place is the question you should ask? Seems like council is more interested in PR than making the right choices.		
84	This makes sense - the transparency is not real.		
85	I vote for TRANSPARENCY! The savings to the City end up coming out of my income tax, in the end...		
86	i am certain there was more than a \$56,000 increase in 2008/2009. reverting back should be an equivalent decrease.		
87	Non-issue. Symbolic.		
3. Please provide comments on: Limit Exempt Staff Salary Increases to 0% in 2013			
Answer Options		Response Count	
		94	
		answered question	94
		skipped question	19
Number	Response Text		
1	Obviously there should be no salary increases. A salary reduction is likely in order. I notice you do not include the range of salaries enjoyed by these staff members.		
2	The "must pay big salaries to attract qualified staff" is wearing thin. That is an argument put forward by the exempt staff to justify their salaries. Reduce manager payroll by reducing the number of exempt staff and nce the managerial class is pared back, hire new managers at \$60,000 starting wage.		
3	Agree, as long as this is not the case next year. Raises are a big part of job satisfaction, which contributes to better quality of work.		
4	Exempt staff should receive salary increases based on merit. Exempt staff typically receive higher wages as they are not part of the union, and thus not subject to collective agreement increases. Keep Exempt Staff Salary Increases at 0% for 2013. If City staff cannot see the "big picture" of not having a salary increase, they should be working for public service.		
5	As a businessman I can tell you that our business (in Victoria) is finding that the property taxes have us looking for a location outside of Victoria. Also I strongly feel that the number of managers and salaried people at the present pay scale are not sustainable and we may be heading down the slippery slope of failure and the resulting decay of the city. There are too many "comfortable" positions within the city staff structure. Private business could not be successful with the present "top heavy" model, how can the city justify an environment that the private sector is unable to reconcile?		
6	agree		
7	Significant saving		

8	If the collective agreement dictates zero, then zero.		
9	Sounds good.		
10	I support this.		
11	Most people in public life haven't had a raise in 4 years. Reduce the number of exempt staff by 50% in 3 years. Do not renew contracts. Look at essential services only. Do we really need a communication department?		
12	FULLY AGREE WITH THE 0% INCREASE FOR 2013		
13	Agree		
14	Yes, for one year only. Remember what is affordable may not always attract the best people for a position depending on what other municipalities are offering. A highly skilled, appropriately paid, professional can often save more in the long run, so tread carefully to keep these vital positions competitive.		
15	I agree with 0% increases. I think 53 managers is way out of hand. I would seriously look to eliminate one third to one half of these managers. Please do some serious examination of what they are doing. I think your wages are more than competitive as people would drop any job to work for the city with union wages, benefits and/or managerial salaries and benefits.		
16	I am concerned that there will be further "raiding" by other municipalities if we don't remain competitive in paying exempt staff. I don't want our city to be hamstrung by a policy that will prevent increases where they are merited.		
17	Disagree, staff salary increases should be tied to the CPI.		
18	One and all need to carry the burden, especially the people at the top who created the problems		
19	I would support limiting exempt staff salary increases. Although perhaps a re-org of current Managers could also provide some cost savings. Exempt staff of almost 10% of the overall staff numbers seems a little excessive.		
20	please see comments in #1. If increasing salary, ensure other savings are realized, e.g. limit hiring and review jobs/roles to ensure positions are in line with other public services namely the province that is not seeing increases. For example, how does the City's communication director make quite a bit more than a similar position in the provincial government.		
	I thought exempt managers also receive a wage bonus?		
	I raise concerns with this approach. Public sector compensation for senior positions is lower than the private sector. In my experience there is great difficulty in finding, and retaining quality senior staff. If Victoria is not competitive in the market, it will suffer greatly - and the taxpayers especially.		
	One lazy, useless labourer can cost taxpayers maybe thousands of dollars (I don't actually believe there lazy)		
21	One useless Manager can cost hundreds of thousands of dollars.....		
22	Exempt should get an increase roughly commensurate with unionized staff.		
23	No comment.		

24	Assuming that the GVLRA represents these employees fairly, and that salaries of exempt staff are linked to collective agreements, this seems appropriate.		
25	I support this. It is in line with federal and provincial actions. I also note that municipal staff have, if you were to compare with provincial rates, higher compensation for some equivalent positions.		
26	I think the formula linked to collective agreement increases is the best way to go. I would feel better saying yes to that than to a 0% increase.		
27	Same as #1		
28	I support this proposal ONLY for the 53 exempt managers on city staff. It is unfair to apply the 0% increase it to the 21 support staff in excluded positions, as those employees are paid much less than managers. To freeze their salaries would mean they would be making less than their counterparts in other departments who are doing the same work, and this would be unjust and inequitable to those staff members.		
	Exempt salaries should be reviewed according to market - the fundamental principle being attract the top talent to positions. A Communications person at \$140,000 is simply bad management. It cannot be justified. Increasing communications staff by 6 is madness. Reduce the number of Managers and implement market wages.		
29	Savings about \$1.2 million could be achieved.		
30	Yes!		
31	Like question one, if people are compensated fairly for the work they do, then I support this decision for a single year.		
32	Freeze should be for ALL city staff.		
33	Salary must be competitive and the city must be a best-place-to-work employer. The city sets a standard and, at a minimum, it should not lead a race to the bottom.		
34	Kind of irrelevant feedback but I would like to see an end to the unions, fair salaries for all - a 2% increase for 2013 Unions are costing employees more than the value provided		
35	This seems consistent with exempt staff working in other municipalities/provincial govt.		
36	I think that exempt staff should be treated like those who are members of a bargaining unit. More meaningful savings could be achieved by addressing the current governance model at City Hall. While the numbers reported above lead one to believe that fewer employees means lower salary costs, quite the opposite is true. For example, the current City Manager is paid more than \$100,000 per year more than her predecessors (Ballantyne and Martignago). Additionally, the managers office has been permitted to create an "assistant" position (general manager). We need good people at the top, but we don't necessarily need the best. Another example is the Department of Communications. This department has evolved from a single person, at the staff level, to a fully staffed department complete with a Director earning way over \$100,000 per year. We don't need this. We are Victoria, not Toronto! The City Manager should be the public face of City Hall in all matters relating to service delivery, not a "specialist". She is the top bureaucrat after all.		

	The area of exempt staff and high salaried staff seems to be out of control.		
	Reduce exempt staff by 10% and save \$1,150,000. million. Now we are getting somewhere. Easier said than done though. So offer a buyout to exempt staff of \$1,150,000. /7.4 = \$160,000 buy out each. I believe you would have up take. Freeze salaries for 4 years. At a 2.5% inflation rate that would generate an approximate 10% reduction in salaries. Cap the number at 70 expempts going forward to 2042..		
37	We are only looking at a population increase of 20,000. over the next 30 years (OCP 2012) That should be enough managers and other exempts.		
38	Strongly agree. "Exempt" management salaries are high enough to attract good people and don't need to increase.		
39	Not enough. There is room for consolidation and layoffs.		
	The amount of incremental increase to individual salaries that would not result in a substantial increase to the percieved "attractiveness" of working for the Municipal government. Attraction and retention, and overall corporate culture is important, and should be achieved through other engagement strategies to "refresh" the municipal public service.		
40	I'm not sure how this can be claimed as a "savings" since an increase was not planned.		
41	Good idea.		
42	There needs a longer term commitment to leave increases at 0% or only 1% per year for 5 years.		
43	Sounds good.		
	Seems reasonable. However= I believe that Victoria is dealing with problems that require solid people to lead for results. I have greater interest in seeing collective agreements managed more appropriately and changes should be made like what was proposed and publicly supported to the garbage program last year.		
44	We also have a lot of questions about the fire department budget. There is a lot of chatter about the Victoria Police but the millions spent in the fire department has to be looked at in the very same way.		
45	OK		
46	Yes, and ensure that expense accounts for these many staff members (dozens or hundreds?) are very tightly controlled and perhaps more limits placed on what can be claimed as an eligible expense. This is an area of public spending that has spiralled out of control over the years.		
47	I agree -- in this time of fiscal restraint everyone is being asked to either take a wage freeze or a cut.		
48	Considering the number of persons involved, \$200,000 does not seem a reasonable amount to hold back.		
49	Unfair. Union interests are protected while very hard working managers are penalized. Slow and incremental raises even if they are slightly less than cost of living increases are the better way to go. Zero based accounting restrictions only lead to inevitable larger controversial increases sometime down the road. You'll get the quality of staff you pay for. Another approach would be to increase management efficiency by not requiring them to sit for hours listen to council debate minutiae hour after hour.		
50	Please reduce staff! Salaries should be capped or reduced, and several positions should be eliminated as not being of benefit to the taxpayer.		
51	Cut staff and make welfare people work instead.		
52	No. Where is the fairness in this?		

53	Oh my God - 777 staff! I am so for amalgamation! First thank you for the quick facts - surprised me. Yes, no raise. Also review to see if all still required. I sent my first letter to city hall a few years ago - pathetic reply (a routine form letter sent under mayor's signature (and yes, I have consistently voted for him!) that many issues raised and I would hear from various departments. A few weeks later I got a call from a manager asking if he'd called me before? No, well he'd written letter so will send it but not very informative. Letter came with typos. Pretty shoddy - but then, I didn't hear from anyone else. Not sure I understand quick facts - staff levels remain stable over 4 yrs, total employee increase by 3 (does it include union and non-union?), exempt have decreased by 4? Does that mean 4 years ago we had 776 staff members? Less service (eg boulevard maintenance), tech advances, retirements, etc should show a bigger decrease.		
	I oppose this strategy, for the same reasons as 1) above. The funding pressures Victoria faces are not going away, taking short-term approaches to resolving them will not work.		
54	Also, it would be unfair to offer raises to represented employees and refuse raises to the exempt staff.		
55	I believe exempt staff should support the mayor and council in a pay freeze in this economic slump.		
56	Pay your staff fairly. Attract good people. Reward when earned.		
57	To properly answer this question I would need to see some specifics. Was an increase given in the past year? How do the salaries compare to the equivalent positions in surrounding areas? Most important, is the City currently experiencing difficulty in recruiting skilled and experienced staff? If not, salary increase is not at issue at this time.		
58	I think it is a good start. Then in a related action, the entire management structure ought to be reviewed from a perspective of how many layers there are and what the spans of control are, with the potential of reducing layers and increasing spans of control.		
59	You need to reduce staff and reduce staff salaries and pensions.. You are well on a course to bankrupting Victoria. Councils lack of financial and management ability is appalling. Just raising taxes every year is ridiculous and unrealistic. The economy is growing at less than 2%. The Bank of Canada has kept interest rates at 1% and you think you can raise taxes 3% a year which is inflationary. The current amounts paid to exempt staff seem to be out of sync with other comparable local governments. Many local governments like Prince George, Wood Buffalo RM, and Saskatoon need higher salaries to attract people, Victoria has no such problem.		
60	I propose that each time an exempt position comes available that the salary be offered at a lower rate than would have normally been done. This would mean over a decade there would be a significant savings in costs on exempt staff.		
61	implement 0% limit		
62	incredible amount of employees and managers for such a small town.		
63	Actually, senior salaries have increased dramatically over the past several years. They should be rolled back in many cases. A 0% increase is way too generous. Also, some of these positions should be eliminated. The whole administrative structure needs to be flattened - it has too many layers to it.		
64	Anything that results in savings is fine by me. I do think something should be done about the top level salaries. There seem to have been some very high payments to city official who have, in selected cases, given very short service and have left with huge severance packets.		

65	Assuming that having good people translates into operational efficacy, and assuming that remaining competitive in terms of remuneration generally helps attract and retain those good people, I do not understand what City Council hopes to accomplish by holding this group to 0%. Assuming that the City will want to remain efficient, then this really represents a deferral rather than a "saving". So, why place at risk the potential loss of those with the greatest talent for what is really not a tax saving.		
66	Salaries in places like Alberta can be 50% more, especially for Engineering type positions. These are locales that directly compete with Victoria for the best Employees. Staff salaries should attempt to match those of places like Calgary. With that, we will attract the best managers who are currently not tempted to come to Victoria because of low wages and the high cost of living. Cost savings will be realized over several years by bringing in the best talent.		
67	Although, this makes sense in view of reaching our goal of balancing our budget, what doesn't make sense is increasing our reserves at the same time we're taking away from our staff. Essentially, the message we're sending is that staff salaries are being cut due to economic distress today, but the money we save isn't going towards fixing today's problems it's going toward fixing the problems we possibly (a guess) could have in the future even though times might be better then. This is the wrong message to send to our valued staff members. They need to know that we're using the salary cuts to bolster the economy today through increased Economic Development projects, so that it doesn't happen again! And, that thanks to them it's going to be a good year.		
68	Agreed.		
69	Great Staff come at Great Prices. Management at the City of Victoria has a hard time controlling, motivating, and encouraging the union labour force. The union labour force controls management, rather than the other way around as it should be. Weak management is a result of low wages. Pay more. Get More. Exempt Staff should have a 5% increase, with a goal oriented bonus system worth up to 20% of their salary per year. Savings will be easily seen when good managers convince their employees to stop taking 45 minute breaks.		
70	I find the current level of exempt salaries in the city of Victoria to be out of touch with the rest of the Victoria population. I would expect these salaries to also have a pension assigned to them and we will be paying for increases a long way into the future. As for attracting skilled staff, living in one of the most beautiful places in the world should count and many qualified people outside of victoria would love to come and work here given the current salaries many exempt people receive. I believe the salaries have increased well beyond what many of those positions should be receivning and its time to stop and reflect on what other municipalities pay their employees.		
71	Exempt staff cut by 20 percent to reflect out-of-control spending of recent years.		
72	Limit staff salary increases to 0%		
73	I agree, and would suggest the same for 2014 and 2015. I think that 0% for unionized staff in 2014 and 2015 is reasonable, as well. Keeping your job is the new "raise".		

Well, in addition to being a taxpayer, I am exempt staff and here is what I think is reasonable. I would rather have a freeze on my good salary for a year or two, than lose direct service staff. That said, I also agree that we collectively have a responsibility to make this a place the best people want to work. Part of that is compensation levels. If we can help by having a freeze for a year or two, great. Aside from attracting good exempt staff, there is the potential issue of compression between management and the employees they supervise if the freeze is only on exempt staff and it is a longer term challenge. I understand that there may be some exempt staff reduction recommendations as a result of the management review and think that one senior management staff position has the same dollar value as a freeze for all, so perhaps that outcome will mean the freeze doesn't have to last more than a year or two if we can see a savings		
74 through a flattening of the organization or a marrying of departments.		
75 in favor of		
76 In favour. However, exempt staff salaries should be cut, not just frozen.		
I want Victoria to have the best workers and part of the way to achieve this is to have salaries go up with CPI. Still, I think there are too many exempt		
77 employees? How to the number (percentage) of exempt employees compare to other municipalities?		
Limit 0% for 2013 and going forward. Also limit total wage package through elimination of jobs within the unionized groups of employees. olding increases to a certain percentage is an insult. The full budget should be held to 0% increase through real reductions in programs which are far from core services of infrastructure which includes raids, sidewalks and parks. Close Crystal Gardens. I know of no one who uses it. keep the property - do not sale any public land.		
78 As fiscal situation improves, more public amenities could be created.		
This is an area where the budget has become bloated. Previously public service salaries were lower than those in private sector as it was a privilege to serve the public. This has been reversed and now public sector salaries are beyond reasonable. Victoria has other attractions for talent, salary is only one factor		
79 and a reduction here makes sense. Union salaries should also be addressed. although I understand this is a more delicate challenge.		
80 If Victoria and CRD were a business, there would be a verifiable Cost Savings Reduction Plan found that would eliminate redunancy..		
81 safe from street people , let them work like clean up , and do little , thing clean there shit when they go on the side walks ,or no welfare		
82 Good luck on this one!		
83 no comment		
84 I agree with this		
limit managerial staff salary increase to 0% for 2013 and beyond. Given the small size and narrow band of responsibilities compared to other jurisdictions, many of the positions should be red-circled for several years. The City must take a hard-line on collective bargaining. Given the deficit of the City infrastructure deficit and the operating budget challenges, affordable increase should mean no increase for any employees until the		
85 City's fiscal house is in order.		
Yes, yes, yes. Let them eat cake. Just kidding of course but the city clearly needs to get a handle on staffing and wages. It needs to provide a clear		
86 mandate to the City Manager to this effect. A hiring freeze is probably in order to bring down staff levels over the next five years.		
87 Already decided. Proceed with plan for 0% in 2013.		

	Except employees salaries should be rolled back. Many are overpaid.		
88	victoria's competitive advantage for recruitment is location, climate etc.		
89	As far as remaining competitive, this is a joke, right? You do know having a city job is sweet gig and those with them know it too, right? If someone wants to quit because they didn't get a raise, let them. There are far more qualified candidates who will appreciate the job. We all know jobs are hard to come by - people are stupid. They are as aware as you are, maybe even more so since you are asking extremely obvious questions. Just do it already. You really don't have a choice.		
90	sounds fair, lower the gap between mgt and workers		
91	The argument of "attracting skilled and experienced staff" gets the entire economy into an ever-rising --- unsustainable --- spiral. Victoria's geography and climate are enough to attract competent staff from other cities.		
92	increases for exempt employees should be calculated based on the formula linked to collective agreement increases. increases should be at least enough to equal cpi increases.		
93	it seems the real issue is the high price of union employees making over \$25/hr for picking up my garbage and sitting at parkades etc. Look for efficeincies here with 777 employees		
94	Adopt Net Zero.		
4. Please provide comments on: Limit Budget Increases for Library and Police to 2% for 2013, 2014 and 2015			
Answer Options		Response Count	
		92	
		answered question	92
		skipped question	21
Number	Response Text		
1	This is reasonable		
2	That's sounds ok for me		
3	I don't support this. Police and library are important services. If only one has to be limited, limit libraries. Don't cut budget for police.		
4	Agree		
	Policing is a big conundrum and while we all want effective policing we are finding it unafforable. We certainly don't want to replicate the USA model where we feel a need to protect ourselves by carrying weapons.		
	As staffing is the major cost area it then becomes encumbent upon the policing administrators to assess the deployment of the officers in the most effective manner. Unfortunately our society is heavily burdened with the social problems resulting from a generation of abuse of alcohol and drugs. This situation has		
5	served to put tremendous enforcement pressure on the police department.		

reduce Police		
6 increase Library		
7 Okay		
8 reasonable, but does it allow for initiatives that might require a greater increase, say in 2015? If no, then i'd see that limit on flexibility to be too tight.		
9 Good luck on this one.		
10 I support this.		
11 City staff got a raise when other government works got 0-0-0. Even this up by not giving any wage increases until the numbers are the same.		
12 I want the police budget reduced significantly!		
13 Agree		
Time to revisit the regional model of policing. Victoria tax payers should not have to shoulder the entire expense of policing large regional events around the inner harbour and legislature. Is there no way to draw extra members from adjacent municipalities to reduce the amount of extra manpower required for these		
14 events? The savings would likely allow the hiring of more members to service the needs of the population.		
Please give the police 4% and the Library 0%. Our Libraries are well funded with something like 57,000 DVD's for rent and disposal of excellent books on a		
15 regular basis. We are in tough times so we needn't be so extavagant.		
16 If it is possible to implement these limitations without cuts in service then go for it but I am sceptical.		
17 Disagree. Both are essential services and budget increases should meet their requirements.		
18 Not sufficient		
Do not cut any funding for the library. It provides a free safe haven for many marginalized people, it has many programs for toddlers, preschoolers, teens, adults, seniors. Where else can you get so much for so little. If anything support for local libraries should be increased. And with enough support for this		
19 institution ultimately police costs would go down because libraries are like a social service.		
what oversight does the City have on the police budget. With \$37 MILLION being spent, it is imperative that resources, including the taxpayer's ability to pay, is reviewed. Based on 80,000 people, we are each paying \$400+ a year and when you take residential renters out of the mix, property tax payers are on the		
20 hook for a substantial amount.		
Police services must be amalgamated. And libraries are a cornerstone of communities, don't forget about them, or the people who work there. I frequent my nearby GVPL and I know many staff who work for next to nothing. Libraries aren't sexy (insert sexy librarian joke) line items in budgets - but the value is		
21 incredible.		
I think limiting people's collective bargaining rights in advance of bargaining is bad faith...I'm not impressed with this question....seems you're taking the same tactic as christy's liberals.		
22 The focus in budget reduction is misguided frankly. I'd rather just pay more taxes.		
23 I do not think that the library should be cut at all. They are an essential service to many under-privilleged people in our community.		

	Living, as I do, in the North Park Neighbourhood, which is close to the inner city, I am witness to the need for a well-staffed and equipped police force. My understanding is that due to some recent re-deployment within the police department, there has been some loss of community/school education programs; also there seem to be fewer "beat cops" to provide an on the ground presence in neighbourhoods. These measures do not seem wise, as valuable preventative policing is lost. I would be in favour of greater increase to the police budget.		
	While library services should be available to all citizens, regardless of individual income, perhaps we need to accept some limited increase in fee-for-service.		
24	However, this should be borne by those who can afford it, and should not introduce a hardship for library users on limited incomes.		
25	I support this in principle, but I'd like to understand how this could happen without a reduction in 'outcomes' to citizens.		
26	Why not 0% like everybody else?		
27	I do not support a ceiling on the libraries; police unsure.		
	I propose to cut the police budget increase to 0% and leave the library budget untouched. The library needs to continue to expand services to meet public demand - a status quo budget means the library system falls further behind and risks losing customers and relevance going forward. The police budget has had significant and repeated increases over the last 5 years at least, and no further increases should be approved to Victoria's contribution to the police		
28	budget until the issue of CRD police amalgamation/integration is decided.		
	Police budget should be reduced. not a 2% increase.		
29	Let Saanich take over policing for the Core they are far better at managing things efficiently and do not have a Council who has the union in their back pocket.		
	The Library and Police Budgets should be discussed and budget decisions made separately. The City of Victoria is one of ten funders to the Greater Victoria Public Library. The City of Victoria's budget allocation should be reviewed on an annual usage basis and therefore, determine what the City of Victoria's share should be for the budget. This is suggested because many citizens who live in other municipalities also work in the downtown core. Many make physical visits the Victoria Library for reference materials and even DVD and other Library rental items [for family and children]. The one area not calculated [I don't necessarily know this] would be inter-Library loans.		
	As for the Police budget, we obviously face challenges and more demands for funding for crime prevention and policing. Again here we see a greater budget expense because other municipality citizens visit the downtown core where most of the entertainment [including bars] are located. The Victoria Police and its system are tasked with crime prevention, policing, incarcerations, etc. of many out-of-towners from other municipalities		
	As a suggestion, there should be a discussion on with other municipalities re: compensation by inter-municipal transfers when an out-of-towner is incarcerated. Okay... we heard that Oak Bay or Saanich might respond by saying - keep that person in jail. And yet, there should be a collaborative		
30	agreement struck in order to not overburden one municipality over another, namely City of Victoria.		
31	I support limiting the police to 2%; I do not support limiting the library.		
	My impression is this increase is primarily to cover increases as negotiated in the current contract. This should not be allowed going forward without a		
32	commitment to provide better/increased services.		
	My experience with library is top-notch. Ensure that level of service is maintained.		
	My guess is that the police budget is too big. Is there accountability such that we can identify the marginal increase in safety additional money on policing		
33	provides?		
34	Agree		

35	fully agree		
	I fully agree with this. If the remainder of City staff are facing operating and salary limitations, the Police and Library should be treated in the same fashion.		
	Suggestions. The Police Department has gone from replacing its vehicle assets every six or seven years (pre 1999) to replacing them every 2 to 4 years. These assets, regardless of age have very little residual value. Keeping each vehicle one extra year would save hundreds of thousands of dollars. Equally well, someone should look into how these vehicles are equipped. While they need to have proper emergency equipment, the current model for outfitting		
36	vehicles is extravegent to say the least. More bells and whistles does not a better police officer make.....		
	Yes, provide input to the library board, and we should be agitating the B. C. government for police force. amalgamation.		
	2% is a reasonable increase as both are probably locked into previously bargined wages, but again we should be sending a warning about a pending future		
37	fund freeze. Perhaps in 2 budget cycles to give adequate time to prepare.		
	I agree with limiting the Police increase but don't agree with limiting the Library increase. The Library is an investment that helps people get back on their feet,		
38	educate themselves, and avoid high cost entertainment services. It pays us back in multiples.		
	Why increase at all? Libraries in there current capacity are becoming redundant. And a rationale to increase budget to the police force has not been provided.		
39	Again, the logic is faulty. What is the benchmark to establish the savings. Was a higher increase planned?		
40	Good idea.		
	I believe a 2% increase for staffing for police is acceptable but I would like to see 5% for infrastructure and non staffing/administration.		
41	Library as well need more money for non staffing/administration.		
42	Absolutely. Maintain these important services, but limit their increases to a bare minimum.		
	Reasonable. Our family is strongly pro amalgamation for police, at least in Victoria, Saanich, Esquimalt and oak bay. It is ridiculous that the mayor of Saanich		
43	can determine that everyone else in the capital must pay more and get less while his residents are in the downtown and their police could be helping out		
44	serve the CRD's population who are in Victoria.		
	I'm OK with it.		
	There should be no increase for either of these departments at all.		
	Crime rates are going down, and anytime I've been near the Library, usage seems pretty light. More and more people are accessing information for research		
45	online. Each of these departments needs to find ways to reduce costs/find efficiencies to live within a non-increasing budgets for at least several years.		
46	Police staffing should be at 100%. Alot them more funds and cut down on library budget.		
47	Please limit to 2%.		
48	Agree that 2% seems a reasonable limit for an increase.		

	<p>Demands on the Victoria Police Department are beyond the bursting point caused by the dysfunctional nature of municipalities in this region. How can the caseload of one department be 50% or 60% higher than the caseload of another in the same urban area? The region must be compelled to pay for this gross disparity. Also police have less percentage of managers and supervisors than do City of Victoria and they run a far leaner organization than their counterparts in Saanich. While everyone has to live within means a 2% increase effectively puts policing more underwater than it is now.</p> <p>Another way to cut police costs is to limit the sale and distribution of alcohol. There are far too many bars and sales operations in a small city like Victoria. There should be a moratorium on extraordinary liquor sales such as beer gardens and extended bar hours. Also, liquor outlets should pay larger tariffs for the policing costs they create or their hours should be restricted ie close at midnight. A quick review of the material on the Centre for Addictions Research BC shows what the high costs of alcohol consumption is all about. There's no employment or taxation benefit that outweighs this cost.</p>		
49	<p>Increase the library and DECREASE THE POLICE. The police spend a lot of money defending themselves against complaints, and accusations in court for use of "excessive force," not understanding citizens' Charter rights, etc.</p> <p>The Province is getting away with underfunding its share of the public library (at one of the lowest levels in Canada). Council should formally pressure the Ministry to increase library funding..</p>		
50	No increase for library but yes to increase for our great police force. You can not expect to cut the police budget and keep attracting scum with high welfare payments.		
51			
52	Yes. This seems reasonable.		
53	I would hold at 0% increase for both. I love the library but right now with costs and other services more urgently required have to give up something more.		
54	Trying to contain increases to police and library costs is commendable, though both services are arguably underfunded at present. Given that we have partners in both, it may not be possible to realize these savings.		
55	Ok		
56	<p>Yes, I am in favour of limiting the increases to 2% or less but would like to see amalgamation of the police and fire departments in the CRD. To alleviate taxation for taxpayers, many provincial employees in Victoria have had a 0% increase mandated during the past few years and the provincial government is projecting an extension of the 0%. It is not unfair or unrealistic to expect municipal employees to adhere to similar fiscal restraints.</p> <p>Whatever happened to concept of zero based budgeting? Why are we not going back to all departments the police in particular to have them start from the beginning in how police services are to be delivered in this century and cost it out from there, rather than increasing it by 2% which is inflationary. What do contemporary policing models look like? This one seems like the same old model with escalating costs.....is there been an analysis done on the kind of activities a officers spend their time and is it value well spent in terms of objectives (which are what?)</p> <p>Has a very close detailed study been made on the mechanics of how overtime is used in relationship as well to taking sick days.....there have been rumours that the system is manipulatable.....</p> <p>Where is regionalization of the police programs</p>		
57	I have less concern about rising library costs as that seems to me to be move of an investment in community capacity and that if significant cuts are made, there is potential that there will be other costs that would not otherwise occur.		
58	Is there any real control over these costs? It seems illusionary to me that this could deliver cost savings		

59	only implement 2% limit if library board reports they can both maintain current service and continue to development reasonable improvements		
60	why a budget increase at all? there have been more than enough increases the last few years to last a while. when a starting police officer gets 90k a year something is wrong. perhaps looking at how policing works. for instance over time and for the most part traffic police should be remunerated approximately the same as commissionaires (seriously it is not a dangerous job relative to for instance construction).		
61	Yes, this needs to be done. But one should also act to lower policing costs that are borne by core city taxpayers. Police amalgamation is overdue. Closing the bars, taverns, and night-clubs in the down-town core at midnight rather than 2 a.m. would save on late-night policing costs (and on a transit subsidies for late night buses to UVic, etc.). After all, other parts of the CRD have sensible pub-closing rules at midnight or before. Why are we imposing these costs on local taxpayers because of our unilaterally dumb policies?		
62	I think people wouldn't mind paying a dollar for a library card renewal or something similar. Or perhaps a computer fee? It could even be a voluntary charge/donation. As for the police, I think they should get the media involved and start a public campaign for example - 10 ways we can reduce police costs. 1) don't let cell phones call 911 accidentally 2) take more interest in types of crimes on the crime alert lists and see how better manners/behaviour could reduce police involvement 3. drive more carefully and so on. if the community could make the connection between behaving better and reducing police costs/ taxes perhaps the penny would drop, but such a campaign needs leadership and publicity.		
63	The same "logic" seems to be at play here as for the exempt staff. If you will have to eventually catch up with what others (private or public) can offer, what is really being gained here? If you believe citizens really want reduced services, then reduce the service levels, not salaries.		
64	I do not have knowledge of the Victoria Library system, and reserve comment. Policing is obviously lacking in this City considering crime rates, and lack of enforcement of many drug offences occurring in the open throughout the downtown. Please increase Police Spending.		
65	This is a fantastic achievement and a great sense of community should be realized from obtaining this reduction. However, increasing the reserves for security at a future date when we need to fix our current problems isn't a consistent message. With that in mind, we're being too aggressive in reserving for our debt repayment. Looking back at 2010 the debt repayment reserve was around \$7M which jumped to \$11M in 2011 and continues to hover around that amount. In good times this makes sense but when we are cutting salaries to accommodate for tough times, increasing the reserve is too aggressive for the time. I do appreciate they may be low and needed just not now!		
66	I agree.		
67	As the Second most Dangerous City in Canada I think limiting Police budgets is pretty silly.		
68	I believe the police are well compensated with most police billing over 100k per year. Again, we can't continue to fund these kinds of pensions over the long term if we keep given increases given that this funding comes from municipal taxpayers.		
69	Library budget should be increased. Why would taxes be set at more than three per cent, well above inflation, when one of the few havens for taxpayers is restricted? Police budget is inflationary with too much for too little for a top-heavy management which is not interested in abiding by the law (licence plate recognition is just one example.)		
70	agreed. limit to 2% BUT push VERY hard to amalgamate (and consolidate) the region. This is necessary.		

	Yes to limiting for police - reductions should be considered even. The only real solution is police amalgamation. I am not as sure about limits on the library.		
71	What does this mean for them?		
72	I support this position. 2% is reasonable in both cases - to keep pace.		
73	In favour. However, why limit it to 2% instead of 0%? The police budget and police salaries should be frozen.		
	I think these are two totally separate issues. I don't want to see policing funding go up. I want to see the focus put on more holistic crime prevention. For example, funding a library systems that offers skills training for vulnerable youth and the unemployed, and a place for support for parents, kids and seniors.		
74	Therefore, I would support increased funding for the library.		
	yes to both suggestions. City must do even more to reduce police costs. policy changes are needed. the Late-night strategy should be scrapped. residents do not need to subsidise, through policing costs and outdoor loos, the nightclub/bar scene.		
75	Let others in the region carry these burdens.		
	Library funding could be capped. Police funding is a bit more delicate. The system needs a complete overhaul taking a regional approach as Victoria shoulder's far too much of the region's burden. Reduction of funding here is tough, perhaps we need to start charging other municipalities for their residents who are arrested in Victoria! Just kidding, but some kind of regional approach is needed.		
76	who are arrested in Victoria! Just kidding, but some kind of regional approach is needed.		
77	There should be one Regional Police force for the entire CRD - with cooperation from 300,000 citizens		
	street people quit spending on them ,safe lot;s ,		
78	they don;t fall under human right ,laws they don;t have laws ,work on that or noe welfare		
79	These are two areas where budget increases must be able to provide necessary service increases.		
80	The library has been short-changed forever. The library deserves more funding not less. It is the core of the city and the key to educated citizens.		
81	Reduce library hours in least busy periods,perhaps later opening times to keep staffing costs down for libraries		
	Since the City appears to be powerless to affect the library budget, then why ask the question? Regarding the police budget, the City must bring this in line with what widens can afford - and that is considerably less than what we are supporting. The City has many tools at its disposal. step one would be changing the closing hours of pubs etc in the downtown core to either 11 pm or midnight. Step 2 would be to discourage the ad hoc gatherings of large groups of people on public property for long periods of time. I know of no Neighbourhood who supported the setting up of a comfortable camping spot at City Hall for the Occupy Victoria demonstration. That cost us a lot of money. And it consumed a chunk of the Police budget. If Council thinks it is important to fund such items, then Council should take such expenditures out of their pockets, not mine. police should stop providing officers to supervise demonstrations etc. If the legislature grounds gets trashed, let the Provincial Government pay for the clean-up.		
82	up.		
83	Yes, but this seems like a short term thing - is there a longer term vision for policing and library services that can guide council?		
	Libraries are more important than police. Also, can we get rid of some of those gangster-style new police cars? Their appearance makes the police look		
84	aggressive and hostile. And they look expensive.		

	Yes, request Library to lower costs.		
85	Demand police lower costs and to assist police, alter downtown bar closing hours to midnight - as done is rest of CRD.		
	I feel this is the maximum that can be offered. I'm personally getting taxed fatigued. We are not getting cost of living increases from our employers and I'm really resenting the constant attitude that the public sector can just increase costs every year. It's time to stop and work with what you have. Does anyone		
86	even use the library any more?		
87	policing costs are getting out of hand. I support increased funding for library.		
88	from the sad state of affairs on the streets of victoria it is obvious that the city police are currently underfunded.		
89	The police budget is out of control and has been for some time. This is where the real issue is. The rest pennies compared to the police and fire dollars		
90	Adopt Net Zero.		
91	Allow budget increase for library but not police.		
	Police budgets seem like an easy place to save money, if the police board has any courage.		
	They could start by eliminating staff hours on activities already deemed illegal, such as recording license plates.		
	Overtime is traditionally used to pad salaries. This would be totally unacceptable in the Parks Dept. but in the police it is considered Business as Usual.		
	Spending less money on the Tough Guy paint jobs on Police cars and vans would also be nicer all around.		
	With the free time officers will have, now they are working less overtime, they can enjoy expanded library services with their families, as libraries should get more money.		
92	In times of fiscal constraint, the City can maintain or improve the quality of life of the residents by EXPANDING community services such as libraries. Get creative!		
5. Please provide comments on: Allocate 1.25% of 2013 Tax Increase (\$1.3 million) to Capital Work to Maintain City Infrastructure			
Answer Options		Response Count	
		88	
		answered question	88
		skipped question	25
Number	Response Text		
1	fine		
2	No tax increase please		

3	Allocate more and actually fix the potholes and roads. There has been a pattern of maintenance neglect that is going to become a large problem. Cutting the budget for Infrastructure Maintenance is only going to make this worse.		
4	Agreed.		
5	Agree		
6	Most taxpayer can only relate to the parks and playgrounds in their immediate area so it should be left up to the professionals to decide where the cost/benefit/value is for the taxpayer.		
7	I would keep the rate at 1.5%. This is a small amount and infrastructure funding is always inadequate.		
8	Apply to Prov for mor support		
9	I'd keep it at 1.5% and either put the .25% into existing and beef up faster.		
10	I support this.		
11	Capital infrastructure must be maintained. Frill projects such as the Craigflower project in Vict West must not be a priority. Work needs to be contracted out for a lot of the maintenance. Costs can be controlled easier. The speed that the road crew worked in Vic West was discusting as well as a perpetual access issue for residents. The CRD water line along Bamfield parl cost 100's of thousands more than it should have because of the desire to save a few over mature trees that will need to be replaced within 5 years. All the departments need to work together for the betterment of the tax payer. Regional governments need to work together. Remember there is only one tax payer.		
12	Agree		
13	Cheers for thinking ahead 10 years ago and not suddenly realizing that everything is getting old. I think we should still be putting funds into this direction and make sure things are going to be maintained.		
14	I say no to the tax increase of 1.25% or 1.5% Please let me understand if this 1.25% is 1.25% of the increase in total taxes or is it one third of the increase in taxes of 3.75% for example. When a budget is presented to council or the people of Victoria for a project why is this necessary maintenance not included in the yearly budget that is ongoing. Suddenly the public is faced with a building that is derelict and MUST be replaced because there was never any maintenace in the budget. The capital work budget should already be in the budget. This means you have not been living within your means and if you worked in the private sector you would be fired. You must find this money for maintenace or capital work in your budget. I am sorry, this is tough love, but we are fed up.		
15	I believe that reducing funds allocated to infrastructure is folly. I would prefer that the City maintain 1.5% for infrastructure.		
16	That is not enough.		
17	This sounds like a sound plan.		
18	Highly supportive of removing "new" items - after all if 900 Pandora Street had not been made over and Beacon Hill Park traffic management not done, would we not have quite a few more \$\$ to put towards things that need to be repaired. Please stop giving us things we are not asking for.		
19	Good idea		
20	Yes. Again, playgrounds essential.		
21	This seems appropriate.		

22	I am uncertain about supporting this proposal. I understand that there are significant backlogs in infrastructure work that must be undertaken. How would reducing the contribution to Capital Work affect the long-term plans for replacing and creating new infrastructure (new could include cross-walks on busy/unsafe streets).		
23	I feel better about the 1.5%. I don't believe that infrastructure should be shortchanged, ever.		
24	I would support higher taxes to invest in infrastructure replacement.		
25	I oppose this proposal. It essentially amounts to a tax INCREASE in future years, as the infrastructure deficit will not go away just because Council has arbitrarily decided to freeze annual tax increases at 3.25% for 3 years. It's my understanding that the 1.5% tax increase called for in the financial sustainability policy has rarely been achieved in practice. Not creating needed new playgrounds now just means they will cost more later and future taxpayers will bear an increased burden. Like proposal 2, this idea is not a cost saving but simply a deferral of costs to future taxpayers and will increase the overall tax burden to residents and businesses over the long term, as the longer we delay the needed infrastructure investments, the more expensive they will be when they are finally implemented (even more so if the infrastructure fails before the repairs are done, i.e. the sewer pipes break, the roads become undriveable, etc).		
26	All capital work should be private contracts. Eliminate union wages in the mix as a way to pay off the union and projects would reduce in cost by about half.		
27	The problem is not budget, it is the lack of control of the City union. Yes... with proviso's! What do I mean? I as one private citizen have commented on the poor maintenance I see in City infrastructure, including the 'famous' Blue Bridge. I have comment by way of the Asset Maintenance Fund. Therefore, I log in this suggestion: 1] Categorize [probably being done] each infrastructure area, such as: roads, bridges, sewers, parks, etc. and assign a dollar maintenance value; 2] Establish clear definitions for maintenance and procedures assigned to each area and also assigned to each maintenance department. Department managers and their staff must/should be held accountable to manage not only the maintenance program, schedule, etc. but must also report their efforts to ensure they are meeting their budgets/restrictions, etc. *** this aspect could be part of the City's Performance Management System whereby their maintenance program area have clearly defined outcomes and results which are reportable items. These are linked back to the City's financial sustainability policies and strategic priorities.		
28	I support this suggestion.		
29	A necessary evil. The over-all tax increase should have been pegged at no more than 1.5%		
30	Have we maximized the opportunity that low interest rates provide for borrowing? (Can the city even borrow?) Now is the most attractive time to take on new debt we've seen in a long time. Might make sense to help fund the many capital projects that, I think, are lined up waiting for funding.		
31	at least this needs to be allocated to maintain city infrastructure		
32	I don't think I understand this one - infrastructure work is important and should not be compromised at all. money should be found elsewhere.		

	Lowering contributions to Capital Projects in order to continue funding day to day operations is like ignoring a hole in your roof in order to buy that big flat screen TV. We need to continue addressing the shortfall in capital reserves in a meaning full way. A better strategy would be to address the list of potential capital projects and consider dropping those that are "nice to have". One example is the \$300,000 earmarked for a new full station in Beacon Hill Park. This is, or was, an completely		
33	unnecessary expenditure. Parks staff can, and should, make use of the fuel facility located in the Public Works yard.		
34	Yes, we have to tackle the impending infrastructure debacle.		
35	Capital maintenance needs to continue. I agree with the 1.25% increase.		
	Again, more information required. What is considered "new" items? Are they not required over the long term - and will therefore be perpetuating the deferred maintenance issue?		
36	A sustainable infrastructure fund should not be compromised.		
37	Good idea.		
38	N/A		
39	Reluctantly agree. But the city really has to get back to at least 1.5% dedicated to an infrastructure fund - we can't put off maintenance forever.		
40	We support this.		
41	Yep, I agree.		
	With above proposed changes I've suggested, these funds could be more than covered without replying on the 1.25% portion of a tax increase. Funds could		
42	be allocated for infrastructure without tax increases if the existing tax revenue was more prudently spent.		
43	Keep at 1.5% to allow for new items.		
44	Agree		
45	Infrastructure certainly needs to be maintained - deterioration escalates with time.		
46	Infrastructure is an important issue. Look at Montreal to see what happens when it's neglected. This is a reasonable demand to keep the city vibrant and modern.		


	<p>There are too many expenses designed to seem "ecological" or "sustainable". For example, we do not need any more paths, signs, drawings of cycling symbols on the roads. We know where bikes can go, and we have provincial driving related Acts.</p> <p>The big new sign at "Redfern Park" was completely unnecessary. We don't need new playground equipment; what we need is more naturalized play areas without equipment, more space set aside to be exempt from paving and building - then leave it alone.</p> <p>Please stop wasting money on changing Beacon Hill Park (please remove those poles in the roadway).</p> <p>Residential taxes are already too high. They need to be not only frozen but reduced. Put a moratorium on new work and reduce staff, especially in the areas of "Sustainability" and Arts :& Recreation (I work in the arts and am a member of self-forming arts collectives that have never been helped in any way by any municipal program, though an army of bureacrats work for those programs - and WE pay for it). Sadly, I believe the 150 Anniversary celebrations were a complete waste of money and enhanced no one's life in their city. It was just a make-work project for bureaucrats.</p>		
47	Municipalities should restrict themselves to their original functions: roads and water supply.		
48	Yes.		
49	Yes.		
50	We can see the prbolem of pushing off infrastructure costs into future years has created lots of problems for us now. What's happened to all the money previously collected? We need our infrastructure maintained! No to this one if properly managed.		
51	Ensure you,are spending enough on capex in order to maintain standards suitable to a world class city like Victoria.		
52	I would like to see it left at 1.5%. There are areas in Victoria currently receiving inadequate maintenance, such as streets and sidewalks in Fernwood.		
53	<p>What is the larger picture here, when we hear in the press that there is a \$500 million infrastructure deficit in the city? Isn't it more likely that we are in this sorry state because we have not be adequately (read sustainably) maintaining our capital infrastructure for the last 20-30 years....so this is no time to be cutting such maintenance or we will be just ending up with a deeper hole.....where is the plan to deal with the major deficit, is there a priority listing and how are we going to finance it and also maintain it into the future.....so in short I do not think that there should be any cut here at all and we ought to get on with the direct plan of dealing with the deficit and how we are going to pay for it. Shouldn't we be attempting to get at this now while interest rates are low but are unlikely to stay there for too many more budget cycles.</p> <p>Possibly a limited time special tas surcharge ought to be considered to get the ball rolling on dealing with the infrastructure deficit reduction say over a 5-10 year period.</p>		
54	It is much better to repair than get new. For instance the Cyrstal Pool is a fantastic community space that promotes neighbourhood helath and wellness. It does not need to be torn down and replaced, it is perfectly functional the way it is.		
55	I think this is folly, there are clear major costs coming for the City. The City should be setting a goal of how much money to have in capital funds. I do not know the exact number, but it strikes me that City should have a capital fund with at least \$100,000,000 ASAP and be at \$250,000,000 in the future.		
56	Keep as a permanent policy to first assure support of current infrastructure needs before creating new ones. yes to 1.25% tax increase		
57	absolutely spend on infrastructure but in this market the savings by tendering to the private sector would be significant		

58	There is a massive deferred infrastructure maintenance problem in Victoria, so cutting the budget for these costs should not occur. Find a way of charging much more for all the large highway sized buses that over-run our streets, particularly in James Bay and down-town. Put in place, or get the provincial government to put in place, a cruise ship passenger tax (as in Alaska). We are paying large social and environmental costs for being over-run by excessive numbers of poorly timed cruise ship calls, and the massive buses that are used to carry cruise ship passengers short distances. Good tourism, which generates overnight hotel stays, is one thing. Hit and run, port of call, visits by cruise ships, mostly for short evening hours, generate costs which are far in excess of the local economic impacts. The polluter pay principle says tax these activities. Get with it, and do it now.		
59	I don't think the budget for infrastructure is going to be any where near adequate for what is required, especially since most of Victoria's resources are going to be put into the ridiculous expensive and unnecessary sewage plan. According to a recent Focus article Victoria will probably be bankrupt in the not too distant future and as interest rates rise and the cost of its borrowing for bridge, sewage plan etc. rise too, as well as overruns for capital projects, I think the author is right, as well as there being no money in the future for infrastructure.		
60	I cannot really say whether or not this is the correct amount, but it seems right that maintaining existing infrastructure should take priority over creating new infrastructure—at least as a general rule. That said, strategic capital investments can reduce demands on some existing infrastructure and result in greater overall efficiency. For example: significant investment in alternate forms of transportation (transit and cycling) could serve to reduce transportation costs overall (reducing demand and resulting maintenance from traditional use by private automobiles).		
61	More effort should be spent on gearing capital work projects to those that would qualify for Federal and Provincial grants, such as gas tax. This could free up money for increasing preventative maintenance.		
62	This is a fantastic idea. Investing tax increases in revenues towards capital is a consistent message with growing our city.		
63	Augh.		
64	Much of the Capital work occurring in the City is not necessarily the best bang for the buck. Does Engineering Staff report to Council with there proposals and engineering strategies. Does Engineering have a Five Year plan for Water, Sewer, Storm and Roads. Increasing maintenance activities, and prevention methods may be more useful than simply always replacing and reconstructing, or starting from scratch. A well compensated Staff may help with that.		
65	#5 is confusing. ARe you decrease the tax to 1.25% or is it a new tax ? No more tax increases and if possible , reduce the taxes. . If you continue to increase taxes, businesses in the downtown will continue to move out and empty storefronts will attract more and more crime.		
66	Start prioritizing and managing what resources you have in a better way.		
67	There has to some coordinated strategy to maintenance, but this council and staff have never developed one beyond their own lifestyle maintenance.		
68	Agreed.		
69	Yes, I think this is neccessary. I think playgrounds should be replaced right now only when totally neccessary.		
70	Excellent plan.		
	In favour. But should be cut more.		

71	I strongly support comprehensive asset management. For capital works I would like to see a reduction in the budget for roads for cars. Instead I would like to see the money spend on facilities for walking and biking. I would also like to see more natural filtration instead of storm drains, and other creative low-impact solutions that will save us in the long term. I support a storm water utility.		
72	no, this is short-sighted thinking. city Infrastructure is in very poor shape. residents should be able to walk on sidewalks without falling on their faces or smacking into poles. The storm pipe situation, and other infrastructure issues, should be a top priority. So many other programs could be cut without losing service to the residents and businesses.		
73	This is necessary to avoid decay of infrastructure.		
74	There should be private contractors that can bid on the Capital Works projects and Infracstructure. City should move toward privitization of maintance.		
75	no more land tax increase we pay too much as it is . that it from the street people ,or no welfars		
76	New infrastructure must be considered or Victoria will become stagnant.		
77	Infrastructure must be maintained. Any time maintenance is deferred, we lose. Do not cut infrastructure or parks.		
78	Although the upgrading of the 2 cited playgrounds could, perhaps should, be delayed, the lowering of the transfer of \$ to capital should not be done. The City's capital infrastructure deficit is real.		
79	Cracked and heaving sidewalks are more important than a new playground, or a new bridge. No, please leave it at 1.5% so that we can get a handle on our aging infrastructure and create a vibrant city to live in and visit. Victoria need not become a down-on-her hills dowager. Again please think long term with an aim to create (I wish I could say maintain) a vibrant community.		
80	Maintenance is very important. If it is not carried out, the capital costs down the road will balloon. Any cost cutting in this area must be done with great care.		
81	No, do not reduce the capital transfer to infrastructure. this is small-minded thinking. The City's infrastructure is not in good shape. Cut salaries - or eliminate in non-essetial services.		
82	I think if you are going to set an increase, you must also set or commit to the elimination of it, the the same policy. You state it "can" be reduced or elimated. It MUST be elimated. We all know you won't elimated it unless its mandated. This would go along way to creating a reasonable relationship with the residence who pay this tax. Again, our wages are not going up in line with you increases. It angers me that you think I can keep paying for all this stuff. We have trouble making ends meet as it is.		
83	we need to continue to increase capital reserves - this is a good effort		

	Between road and bike infrastructure, I would support "new" bike infrastructure (as long as it is properly done.) Several studies claim that building bicycle infrastructure is more economically beneficial than road infrastructure. My take on it is that the smaller projects use local companies, meaning the dollars stay in the local economy. Check out http://www.triplepundit.com/2012/10/economic-impact-bicycling/ : "The conventional wisdom assumes that massive transportation projects are far more economically strategic than bike lanes. ...the release of two studies from two very different cities - Portland, OR and New York City - reveals that bicyclists and pedestrians may spend more than their peers who arrive at the same neighborhoods via automobile or public transportation."		
84	Victoria is drastically underfunded for capital and infrastructure. No cuts should be made to transfers to capital programs.		
85	no comments		
86	Seems reasonable. However, we need a greater percentage of public money going into recreation and public transit infrastructure. Begin reducing vehicular infrastructure investment... it is only delaying the inevitable.		
87	Great. Start by reducing new spending on the Blue Bridge and Sewage Plant.		
88			
6. Please provide comments on: Partial Automation of Some Parkades During Slow Periods			
Answer Options		Response Count	
		96	
		answered question	96
		skipped question	17
Number	Response Text		
1	good idea		
2	That's ok to implement		
3	Hate to lose jobs through automation but if the \$300,000 savings were spent on maintenance and those workers that were in parkades could be hired in another capacity then that would be good.		
4	Agreed.		
5	I think automation needs to wait until the parking services review is complete. The impact of not having staff full time in those parkades needs to be weighed against the potential savings. Employing locally tends to keep money locally.		
6	If after considering all aspects of the reduction in staffing it is then deemed to have little or no affect on service then why would we not automate?		
7	keep the services and jobs, don't automate		
8	no brainer. YES.		

9	This is a slippery slope. Once partial automated parkades come in, there will likely be a movement to further automation and people will lose their jobs. I wonder why it is always the average worker that has to lose their job when higher ups are more than well paid. I would like the city to look at the pay increases to city workers much higher up - and roll back some if not all those increases. It is always the average worker who is told to tighten their belt, who loses their job while others get pay increases. How many people at city hall are paid a six figure salary? How has this number changed over the past several years? How many of those people have seen increases that the rest of us can only dream about? I fear that cutting back on personal who are at the low end of the pole will eventually lead to further cuts - and I fear that the gap between what the typical worker is paid and what the upper management is being paid has increased. Tell me if I am wrong. Sure you can say that in order to attract the best people for management good wages are part of the package, but there comes a point where the compensation becomes ridiculous. and didn't council allow a city staffer an increase without review? Keep the workers!		
10	I support this, provided that it doesn't result in increased parking fees, or new fees for parking during periods that are now free of charge. I oppose increases in City parking fees, as it drives more businesses that we would like to keep downtown to the western communities, which is very inconvenient for people who live in Victoria.		
11	Should be monitoring the parkades and coming up with a plan to automate them all.		
12	I would prefer to keep the Humans employed this time around, rather than the computers. Please take from the equipment reserve if you're hurting that much.		
13	I AM IN TOTAL DISAGREEMENT WITH AUTOMATION IN ORDER TO CUT COSTS, IN EFFECT BY CREATING MORE UNEMPLOYMENT IN THIS CITY YOU ARE RAISING COSTS IN OTHER SERVICE AREAS.		
14	WHEN I HEAR THAT \$500,000.00 IS BEING SPENT ON "RAILINGS" FOR THE OGDEN POINT BREAKWATER, IT LEAVES ME WONDERING HOW SOMETHING LIKE THIS CAN BE JUSTIFIED, OUR PRIORITIES NEED TO BE MORE FOCUSED ON THE PEOPLE WHO LIVE HERE.		
15	Fantastic Idea.		
16	People not machines. Staff provide an extra sense of security in these off peak times.		
17	Victoria has a senior population and a viable tourist base. Automation is not an option. Seniors will stop coming to the down town core if major obstacles are put in front of them. My parents are seniors and would be afraid to shop down town if parkades became automated. Heck, they are afraid to use a cell phone! If you plan to put in automation, I hope the screens are in large font. Plus it is taking away jobs in a high unemployment market. Automation equals unemployment. You are paying Paul and sending his cheque to Peter.		
18	Good idea but make sure there is plenty of signage as to the procedure. Many get confused when the parkades switch in the evening to be prepay automated.		
19	Just saw this on the news...I think the Mayor and councillors should take a cut in pay, so the people who staff the parkades can keep their jobs.		
20	How does Johnson Street parkade work? I suppose not well or you would have automated the others soon after, or you spent the money elsewhere. Sounds like a good idea if it works okay.		
21	I am in favour of this proposal.		
22	Disagree, having visible attendants adds something of a security feature.		
23	The machines don't work people do		
	I don't support an initiative that will cost more than it saves, and also sees city workers losing their jobs. Finish the entire parking review before going any further.		

	my pet peeve is trying to find change to put in a small envelope because there is no staff on hand. Just another thing to make it easier to go to Uptown or Oak Bay or Saanich.		
24	There is also the sense of security with an attendant. As it is, I no longer use parkades at night given concern of safety and no employee on hand.		
25	significant savings, though I am very uncomfortable with the number of job losses. I recommend considering this sort of a tech change and hopefully keep jobs in Victoria.		
26	Don't like this idea at all. I prefer staff there Makes it feel safer.		
	As long as there is staffing during peak periods, and as long as the automated equipment is kept in good working order, then this seems appropriate.		
27	However, I have concern for the 27 full and/or part-time staff who would lose some or all of their income by institution of this change.		
28	I support this.		
	I don't like the idea because of the loss of 27 jobs from a union that has always served Victoria well. As a frequent visitor to Victoria (my mother and brother-and-family live there - I spent the months of November and December 2012 there) I vastly prefer live attendants in the parkade. I use them for directions,		
29	answering questions, etc.. I don't think this particular saving is worth the "cost".		
30	Support if experience suggest savings. I would also support a significant increase in rates to raise revenues.		
	<p>The Johnson St Parkade automation has resulted in people being "trapped" in the parkade. It results in fear and frustration, unless Security personell rescues them.</p> <p>As a taxpayer, I do not think the automation is tourist friendly.</p> <p>Our many seniors find new technology challenging. They do not need the city to subject them to extra walking around the parkade while they try to escape.</p> <p>We do not need more angry drivers, who are frustrated by an automated system.</p> <p>Pollution increases as drivers idle, while trying to figure out the system. Sometimes they leave their vehicle parked in the exit and walk away to look for information or help to leave the parkade. Thus, a parade of anger.</p>		
31			

	<p>The Johnson St Parkade automation has resulted in people being "trapped" in the parkade. It results in fear and frustration, unless Security personell rescues them.</p> <p>As a taxpayer, I do not think the automation is tourist friendly.</p> <p>Our many seniors find new technology challenging. They do not need the city to subject them to extra walking around the parkade while they try to escape.</p> <p>We do not need more angry drivers, who are frustrated by an automated system.</p> <p>Pollution increases as drivers idle, while trying to figure out the system. Sometimes they leave their vehicle parked in the exit and walk away to look for information or help to leave the parkade. Thus, a parade of anger.</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p>		
32			
33	<p>I support this option as long as all impacted city staff are guaranteed placement in equivalent positions at the same rate of pay as before as a minimum. I would recommend the parking services review include an analysis of whether it is more cost-effective for the city to lease or sell the parkades to a 3rd-party provider - it must be expensive to service and maintain those aging facilities and a lease arrangement might generate more revenue at a lower cost.</p>		
34	<p>parkades should be fully automated. Stop cowering to the unions and evolve into the 19th century - then the 20th Century then really push yourself to come into current standards.</p>		
35	Consider doing a Pilot Project at one or two parkades to determine if this idea will work.		
36	I agree with this suggestion.		
37	Significant saving .. why not?		
38	Yes, invest in technology that saves resources.		
39	Keep the people. They are the best deterrent to break ins and the costs incurred therein		
40	will this increase other issues/costs if parkades are not manned - will there be more vandalism? Personal risk to those parking there? I think in this day and age - yes automation makes more sense.		
41	Automation of all City parkades makes complete sense.		
42	absolutely		
43	Yes, definitely!		
44	Agreed		
45	Good idea.		
46	N/A		
47	Automate them all. As long as there is security in the parkades, this is an easy win - achieved through attrition, not through layoffs.		
48	We agree with this		

49	I'm OK with it. Keep parking areas well lit.		
50	Yes, go for it.		
51	So long as safety is preserved, partially automating makes sense.		
52	Partly depends on whether the 27 persons affected would become a social burden on the city.		
53	Agree with proposal.		
54	I never go downtown because parking is a nightmare. No space and too expensive on the street; and as for the parkades, no one I know of would go into one of those dark, wet, dirty, places.		
55	No, we need security.		
56	Yes.		
57	Works for me - easy to use and seems like easy savings.		
58	This strikes me as sensible efficiency.		
59	I would prefer to see a machine working in that environment than people exposed to that concentration of noise and pollution.		
60	This is an easy decision: automate the parkades and save the labour costs.		
61	In favour so long as consistent monitoring for safety is in place, If someone is in jeopardy, there needs to be a procedure to ensure quick response. There is clear signage when entering the parkade about payment methods required if it changes during certain hours. No surprises for people exiting.		
62	Yes this seems reasonable and where possible why not move to full automation asap and it would be likely that staff would have opportunity in other locations in the organization as attrition arises.		
63	Can parking rates be raised? When was the last increase?		
64	I think the City should consider contracting out the Parkades. There is a reasonable chance that the City will have a company bid to operate them that would return more money to the City than it currently makes.		
65	The other option would be to sell off the parkades and surface parking lots and use the money received to help with capital funding.		
66	yes to this plan		
67	if you can't run parkades as well as Robbins perhaps lease them out.		
68	Sure, do this now, and don't get side-lined by the union that represents parkade attendants.		
69	Could work.		
70	Parking downtown, though, is a problem and with the new Hillside mall I think even more traffic will be diverted to there for shoppers, which just adds to the decay of downtown. The move of Chapters to uptown will also hasten this. perhaps there should be some way to make parking downtown cheaper and if this automation does that, and is not too complicated then OK.		
71	Overall it is my belief that motor vehicle parking (storage) is considerably under charged. Though I have no problem with generating savings, I would say you might revisit the fees charged for motor vehicle storage in the downtown area.		
72	there is no need for a live person at a parking booth in a parkade. The union is obviously pushing this, in a shortsighted way.		

	This is not advised in the current year. Although, we identify a potential savings of \$300,000 annually we don't correctly identify a negative cash flow in the current year - a year when we're making salary cuts to the police force and increasing taxes. Here not only do we cut jobs but we lose money in the year we're cutting jobs. This is not the right answer in the current year.		
70	Take the money from the reserve that was going to be spent here and put it into the economic development grant fund, which should require a small business to have a residence and a business in Victoria - our two largest tax revenue sources (businesses 48.9% of our tax revenues and residences 49% of the tax revenue). This increases our revenues and keeps the parking lot jobs -win-win!		
71	I like having an attendant available to talk to when I am paying my tickets. There is often problems with the machines.		
72	Automate at all times. Retain and retrain existing staff in other work.		
73	Yes, automate the parkades.		
74	Agreed.		
75	I agree with this, but would like to see those being displaced offered the opportunity to fill other vacancies in the City, rather than losing their job outright. I support this plan even though it affects staff. This is a place where it is way past time for more automation. I would rather spend on human security		
76	increases and automate the pay for parking function if there is concern about security in automated sites.		
77	why can't they be fully automated all of the time?		
78	In favour.		
79	I support automation, but am cautious because that means less security for people who choose to park their bikes at local parkades.		
80	yes		
81	Automate. I don't want to think about how much those staffers are individually paid.		
82	With all the electronics available the entire system could be automated.		
83	close them if they don;t make the requiremant income ,		
84	Instead of having to reduce the incomes of up to 27 staff, consider attracting and encouraging more people to use the parkades at present slow periods. As a bicyclist, I want assurance that my bike will be under constant observation and survailance, at ALL times.		
85	no comment		
86	Fully automate parkades, there is no real need for attendants		
	minor change. Should proceed.		
87	Do not understand why this small item is even on this survey while major costs are not being dealt with.		
88	Yes - why even ask about this? Isn't their a well paid manager there empowered to make this obvious decision?		
89	This sort of automation is worth pursuing. We just need to be taught how to use it properly.		
90	Go ahead		
91	Are the parkades profitable? They should be be generating revenue and if not, sell them off. This is a no brained. Again, why are you asking the obvious? The question really should be, shoud you sell off the parkades.		
92	tecnology will help reduce labour costs - go for it		
93	I don't use the parkades...		
94	no automation for parkades.		

95	Yes		
96	Anything helps.		
7. Please provide comments on: Advertising in Parkades, on Parking Machines etc			
Answer Options		Response Count	
		93	
		answered question	93
		skipped question	20
Number	Response Text		
1	good idea		
2	Advertise away. Every bit of revenue is needed.		
3	Agreed, sounds like a great plan!		
4	Agree to being advertising.		
	More clutter in the lives of Victorians. Americanise the city.		
5	We continue to make decisions that will eventually destroy the unique ambiance of Victoria.		
	If someone wants to advertise on (insert item here) and we can do it in a respectful way to the community, feel free to do it. Parkades and parking spots are revenue losers (in my opinion). We do them as a convenience for the businesses and for community members. Let's making some money. Why not?		
6	Don't agree. No advertising in parking garages, on parking machines and/or on parking pay stubs. Enough commercialization!		
7	No brainer for the parkades. Do it. It also contributes to the vibrance of the parkades - more colour. Despite improvements over the years they are still dingy and colourless - scary for some.		
8	Don't want ads on the parking meters (ticket stubs ok). Let's keep the downtown as visually clean as possible		
9	This sounds like a good idea.		
10	No concern.		
11	Yes.		
	Definitely do not mind advertising on parking pay stubs or parking machines. It would help me learn about local goods and services I hope, not just national chains. I dont mind the advertising in parkades as long it doesnt affect safety or directions.		
12	NO!		
13	'Advertising' is a scourge on Society.		

14	AFTER BEING IN THE AD/PUBLIC RELATIONS FIELD FOR YEARS I SIMPLY CANNOT SEE HOW ANYONE COULD PUT TOGETHER A "POTENTIAL REVENUE" PACKAGE THAT WOULD BE BELIEVABLE. IT SIMPLY DOES NOT WORK!		
15	Yes all for it!		
16	I think advertising would be a great idea as long as it is in good taste. Local businesses could benefit with a well placed ad on a meter or in a parkade nearby, directing customers to them. It might give tourists and locals a new idea on where to go for dinner etc. I think an emphasis, at least on meters, on places within the vicinity would be brilliant.		
17	NO ADVERTISING. It is like grafitti. Not a good idea.		
18	I think this should be explored more fully.		
19	That is a stupid and horrific idea. Show a little class.		
20	Definitely worth exploring this further.		
21	thought there was already advertising on parking machines.		
22	no opinion		
23	I'd rather just pay more in taxes		
24	Why not? If it helps offset costs.		
25	I chafe at the commercialism of this idea; it seems like the thin edge of the wedge of larger and unsightly advertising all over our beautiful city. The potential revenue would need to be significant to make this worthwhile. How would "suitable" advertisers be selected?		
26	go for it but set some standards for aesthetics		
27	No. It clutters the environment and then our minds. There is enough already!!		
28	I support advertising in parkades - the grey concrete walls are an eyesore and the indoor parkade environment can sustain some advertising without impacting public spaces and the sense of civic pride. Given the number of parkades and extent of wall space in each facility, I would expect significant revenue potential from this option.		
29	For the same reason, I do not favour private advertising on parking machines. Taxpayer dollars pay for this equipment which is located on public streets. I can accept some tasteful notices of civic events or programs (i.e. new kitchen scraps pick-up) on the machines, but no private sector advertising of any kind should be permitted on them.		
30	waste of time - small return		
31	Do exploratory work, including research with other jurisdictions who have implemented advertising in similar parkades, etc., before any implementation.		
32	I agree with this suggestion.		
33	It's better than graffiti.		
34	Our city is more than a spot for billboards. The city does not need more space for ads because it would add too much to the amount of commercialism that's everywhere already.		
35	Agree with using space for advertising - particularly good opportunity for BC Transit to advertise. :-) may be a hard sell but what is the cost associated with doing a deeper dive/exploratory work?		
	I am not opposed to this though.		

36	Why not. The new parking meter dispensers have a mechanism for accepting advertising panels. Make use of this and generate some additional revenue.		
37	go ahead		
38	Agreed		
39	No. We're inundated with enough advertising.		
40	N/A		
41	Advertising inside parkades is a no brainer, and ditto for the blue parking machines. How about ads in the parkade stairwells, too? And what about other ad space inside public buildings? Inside advertising should offend no common interest, its just aimed at those consumers.		
42	We support this		
43	OK in parkades and parking pay stubbs. To me, advertising on parking machines would distract the scenery, making it less esthetically pleasing.		
44	In parkades, yes. On every blue street parking meter, no. This is a reality of our times.		
45	We could do it in good taste, Doggy bags, bleachers,downtowm infrsrtructure.		
46	Yes - good revenue source.		
47	This should be explored further -- on the surface it makes sense. How to screen and determine proper advertisers may be challenging, however.		
48	Worth pursuing.		
49	Yes.		
50	Yes.		
51	Yes.		
52	Yes - again plaster these things with ads if money comes in! Of course you have to ensure not rude etc		
	My view is that the city government exists to provide services to residents. My taxes pay for those services. I expect those tax dollars to be spent carefully and thoughtfully, and I expect to have some opportunity to influence priorities. I do *not* expect to have advertising foisted on me by City Hall. The federal government could allow private companies to put their logos on passports, but I would just as soon they did not. What's next? Police issuing motorists with tickets "sponsored" by driving schools and taxi companies?		
53	If the parkades are to be money-making ventures, they should be sold off to the private sector. If they are a city service, they should be funded by taxes.		
54	I support the City advertising for third party's. Especially advertising for business partners or those that support City initiatives.		
55	Another easy one: do it.		
56	In favour as long as it is tasteful and does not distract from parkade instructions.		
57	Certainly worth exploring. Maybe we ought to consider aside from parking meters in the streets why is the city in the parking business at all. Maybe these are assets that can be liquidated and the funds used to address more relevant infrasruture issues in the infrastructure deficit.		

	I think it would be more effective for the city to add more paid on street parking. As an example there are sites on the fringe of the current paid on street parking that have high use that could be metered.		
	The City should also consider metering on street parking in James Bay Village, Cook Street Village, Quadra and Hillside, Fernwood and Oak Bay Avenue. In the case of a number of these Urban Villages, there is a need for metered parking to cause a higher turn over of street parking.		
58	If 1,000 new spots are metered and collect income for several hours a day, this should add about \$2,000,000 to \$4,000,000 a year in revenues.		
59	do the research whether this is cost-effective		
60	why not?		
	Advertising in parkades is fine, but not on parking machines, which are both small, and visible to all who traverse our streets. The naming rights policy is a currently a farce. One talks about convention centre naming rights, etc., to generate some additional revenue, but the City gave away the name of the whole, not yet completed, harbour pathway, without any return remuneration. David Foster's Victoria home is currently up for sale, and (I am told) he is moving to		
61	Oak Bay. No public consultation occurred on the harbour pathway naming; it was just done, and done unilaterally.		
62	Yes, if there's a demand.		
63	Parkades yes. Anywhere within common areas (sidewalks, parks) no.		
64	No problems		
	Revenue Opportunities:		
	Yes, please advertise on Parkades and on parking machines.		
	Also, please sell the name space for the conference center, similar to the Edmonton, Shaw conference center or the arena etc....		
	Also, for the downtown student issues please arrange a bus company to pick the students up and drop them off back at a University of Victoria in a parking lot for a fee.		
	This program works well in Santa Barbara, California where the University of Santa Barbara is located in Isla Vista, California a neighboring city to Santa Barbara and all the students go to downtown Santa Barbara to party. The University provides a paid transportation service back and forth to the University		
65	and the University makes money!		
66	I hope that this is done tastefully and with consideration to sensitivities. Please please please no coca-cola, sexually explicit, etc...		
67	On Parkades is ok, as it is sometimes not evident that it is a City owned facility. Pay stubs and Machines is not ok.		
68	No comment.		
69	This sort of nickel-and-diming fantasy shows how bereft of ideas the multi-million dollar staff is.		
70	Agreed, and decrease the minutes from 6 to 5. or increase the cost by 5cents.		
71	Parkades - sure, why not. They are not an exactly an oasis of tranquility to begin with. As for parking machines, I would want to be sure that regulations are very stringent.		
72	Go for it!		
73	good idea		

74	Opposed. Ugly advertising is one thing worth avoiding. Also, hard to make an informed decision without knowing the potential revenue.		
75	Fine.		
76	Yes, as long as not visible from the street and as long as adverts are appropriate for all (including children) to see.		
77	This is a reasonable option, cities need to be creative.		
78	You must have the courage to save money and earn money any way there is an opportunity. Why not get paid by people who wish to advertise.		
79	cut it all out ,		
80	No advertising in parkades; no advertising on parking machines; yes advertising on parking pay stubs.		
81	no comment		
82	Please do not do advertising on parking machines for aesthetic reasons		
	of course do it. Since the David Fosetr was a give away, might as well make a few dollars with grubby adverts to make up for another poor decision made by Council? mayor?		
83	just realised that I do not recall being informed of who made that decision and how much is cost the taxpayer for this vanity decision ?		
	Yes, but the advertising should be to recognize sponsorship of the first 60 minutes of parkade parking free and the first 40 minutes of on street parking free. Increase the cost per minute for people staying longer to help recoup the cost (in conjunction with the advertising revenue). It's time to attempt to bring shoppers back downtown. People should also be able to park on the street and have lunch plus do some browsing in shops and perhaps even get their hair done without having to move their car. Most on street parking should be available for a minimum of two hours. As a former owner of a retail business downtown I can tell you that 30 and even 60 minute parking spots are simply a cause for frustration to customers - the theorized turnover in parking does nothing to make downtown a more appealing place to spend time nor does it benefit local merchants. A healthier, more vibrant downtown will benefit city revenues in the long run - please don't continue to stifle downtown with short term thinking.		
84	revenues in the long run - please don't continue to stifle downtown with short term thinking.		
85	Sure. Some factual environmental messages might be worth putting up. Commercial ads, though, are visual pollution. Victoria's image would suffer.		
86	go ahead - as long as cannot be seen from the street		
87	Seriously? Yes of course.		
88	we are in a market economy - lets get this revenue. needs to be tasteful though		
89	Wouldn't bother me...		
90	no advertising in parkades or on parking machines. victoria is sleazy and cheesy enough looking as it is.		
91	Yes but only inside the parkades		
92	Why not.		
93	Please don't. The last thing Victoria needs is to make itself uglier.		
8. Please provide comments on: Shift from Annuals to Perennials in Some Garden Beds			
Answer Options		Response Count	
		96	

		answered question	96
		skipped question	17
Number	Response Text		
1	very good idea		
2	Lots of great perennials but you are talking about jobs again. Hate to lose jobs.		
3	Agreed.		
4	Agree to shift to annuals as long as employee cuts are minimized. There is not need to continually replace plants. Why not?		
5	There are many very attractive perrenials available.		
6	Perennials can be quite nice. I think this is a great idea and a new challenge for your gardeners.		
7	don't agree. savings are too small for a city renowned for beautiful, year-round gardens. Also keeps jobs ...		
8	YYJ is about flower... tourism implications?		
9	NO		
9	brings a lot of joy to people, it's a relatively minor cost.		
10	I like the idea of using native plants over plants that are "imported."		
11	Sounds reasonable; however, as I am not a gardener, I don't know what effect this would have on Victoria's draw for tourists as "The Garden City".		
12	I don't believe there is any savings for perenials because they need a lot of pruning which will takemore time than planting new plants.		
13	Plantings are one of the reasons I moved to Victoria, please do not change this! You are a garden city! Definitely do not decrease your blooms.		
14	I AGREE THAT NATIVE PERENNIALS WOULD BE A WELCOMED BENEFIT TO OUR CITY, BUT I STRONGLY DISAGREE THAT A REDUCTION OF TWO GARDENERS WOULD REDUCE "THE NEED"! VICTORIA IS RENOWNED FOR IT'S MANY GARDENS INCLUDING OUR PARKS, KEEPING THE PLANTINGS, BEDS ETC VIBRANT CONTINUES TO BRING VISITORS FROM AFAR WHICH IS A GREAT MONETARY BENEFIT.		
15	Yes plant more native plants		
16	As long as they are tasteful and maintained, great! And maybe the crows won't be able to pull out freshly planted perennials as easily as annuals!		
17	I like the perennial idea. And cut down on the number of hanging baskets.		
18	would need more weeding and will not be as colourful as the annuals.		
19	Again a stupid idea.		
20	Wh		
21	We can still be the city of gardens with native plants. I support this.		
22	of course - use perennials - we do it in our condo building to help save dollars - why can't the City?		
23	far better for the environment, and for the pocket book. Good decision.		
24	I like annuals...we are a tourist city of gardens		
25	tourism to increase funding?		

26	Excellent idea.		
27	I support this. It seems like the costs savings could be overstated, but I think the initiative is good idea regardless.		
28	love the idea		
29	If we need to.		
30	are you kidding me. Has this is not rocket science. Why are you even asking this question for the tenth year in a row.		
31	Yes...		
32	I am not certain of the wisdom of this suggestion as it may negatively affect the appeal of the city for tourists (and residents).		
33	Without the upfront capital cost it's hard to say.		
34	Really? Isn't this the city of gardens?		
	good idea re: Perennials and have employees train school kids on best use of soil and best native plants to grow.		
35	Do not, however, agree with layoffs. Use staff better. If folks want to retire then fine but this city can not bear further unemployment.		
36	Fully support this		
	While not likely to be very popular, this strategy makes sense. However, some of the more high profile planting areas should still be maintained using		
37	existing practices.		
38	certainly		
39	Yes, this makes sense on many levels.		
	The City of Gardens should be promoted and maintained more, not less. This city needs to be beautified. Once you start cutting these services and		
40	maintenance, you will never get them back.		
	Agreed - and xeroscaping. Operations and maintenance changes should also be reduced by replacing grassed areas with indigenous plantings. Introduce		
41	an urban farming policy to bring more edible (fruit/nut/berry) plantings and invite engagement by citizenry to maintain gardens.		
42	Excellent idea.		
43	N/A		
	Some, yes, all no. We need to carefully consider how we gently change our gardens so that there is less money used for maintenance and planting, timed to		
44	coincide with attrition of the workers responsible.		
45	support this		
	Yes. Even city burms could use a bit more attractive perennials. Reduce annuals by about 30%.		
	Mahonia x media 'Charity' would provide stunning form and color for this time of year, not to mention attracting bees. Cotinus (smoke bush) with it's lovely		
	purply color is stunning in the summer time. Not much maintenance needed either. I'm sure than native plants would have its place as well. I realize that		
	they usually don't provide that WOW factor, but some beds here and there would represent responsible gardening. They don't need much water in the		
46	summertime.		
47	Yes, and especially draught tolerant varieties that do not need much water, and which grow densely together, requiring less weeding,cultivation.		
	There is no actual saving on the work load.		
	Perenial s still need to be, weeded, deadheaded, pruned in summer, cut back in the fall and watered.		
48	Unless there are employees retiring soon there will be no imidiate saving.		

49	Yes, but keep the hanging baskets.		
50	Native plants require less maintenance -- and are just as attractive, albeit not as flamboyant. I agree.		
51	Present gardens are a constant addition to Victoria's attractiveness - not worth change.		
	The CRD takes a levy from every Victoria taxpayer for parks and walkways yet there is no CRD park or walkway in Victoria. Therefore the CRD should fund at least 50% of the total cost of running and maintaining Beacon Hill Park and the Dallas Rd esplanade which are used by thousands of regional residents.		
52	These are the crown jewels of parks for the region and should not be supported solely by Victoria.		
	Please keep the NON-NATIVE plants, whether perennials or annuals. Native plants are drab and in fact need more upkeep, as many residents have found when they switched. They very soon look messy, the ground hard and dry, a source of dust when gardeners attempt to get away with less watering. There is a reason municipalities and home owners have traditionally planted lawns - they are in fact the LOWEST-maintenance landscaping option, and the most refreshing to look at (when allowed to stay GREEN).		
	Flowers R Victoria -- we can only stand so much snowberry around us. (unless it's in a truly naturalized greenspace, in which case let's put the deer there and		
53	stop talking about a cull).		
54	No.		
55	Yes.		
56	Love the gardens etc but again this option makes sense. It's certainly a loss but has to be done. Great idea.		
	Victoria draws tourists from across the country and around the world to see our "city of gardens". It seems short-sighted to make less of this natural draw; not		
57	everyone chooses (or can afford) to visit Butchart Gardens.		
58	Please bring in more plants native to this area, and plants that can survive on their own yearly.		
59	Victoria is partly branded as The Garden City. For a tiny \$150,000 saving is this really worth even thinking about?		
60	In favour for most areas but prefer a mix of perennials and annuals if needed to ensure a good floral show in a few key locations to support tourism.		
	This is definitely worth considering, certainly in all of the boulevard beds it makes sense and it would be more natural and in tune with relecting where this city		
61	is geographically.		
	yes to this plan. perhaps downtown tourist-visible areas and only a few parts of Beacon Hill Park the only place for some annuals and also add some		
62	perennials, with mostly or all perennials in areas usually only seen by locals		
63	these really are nickel and time aspects of the budget are they not?		
	Sure, do this, but hire less expensive student labour for all seasonal garden work, and don't cow-tow to the local unions. The public perceives that City		
	Council is too pro-collective-bargaining-rights, to the eventual cost of taxpayers. I presume that this reflects the close ties between NDP supporters and the		
64	trade union movement.		
65	Yes, good idea. Or more shrubs. You can get flowering shrubs.		
66	If the "layman" would not notice, and colour would be year round (revolving obviously) then this owuld be ok.		
	This is ridiculous. This amazing city was known as the city of flowers.		
67	We can either begin to look at increasing our revenues by becoming a business hub or destroy our core through disregard of our most valued beauty!		
68	Wonderful idea. It's also far more intelligent to do this from an environmental standpoint.		
69	No		

70	I think its a great idea. Does this mean that management that currently manages the eight employees will be cut to reflect the reduction of employees ?		
71	Are taxpayers supposed to take things like this seriously? Primulas instead of zinnias while managers are pulling down six-figure salaries and outrageous bonuses.		
72	Not only should we be shifting to perennials, but we need to be looking at EDIBLE berries and plants. they still look good, and the serve a purpose!		
73	I don't know enough about this comment on what that would look like, but think it could be viable.		
74	I am concerned about the effect on tourism and the City's image on this one. I am willing to pay more for the swap in seasonal plantings to support our beautiful downtown and continue to be known around the world as the city of gardens. Is there a mid-way point where we choose strategic beds to continue to use for annuals that might have half the impact.		
75	should definitely be done!		
76	In favour.		
77	This sounds like a great idea. I would also like to see more food providing plants in the City's plantings.		
78	No, do not alter parks budget. They have downsized enough already.		
79	The urban forest as well as the decorative flower beds should be kept - and enhanced.		
80	Why not? There is much to be done with creative planting.		
81	Why not request some Gardening Clubs to bid and offer their services to help beautify Victoria and surrounding areas.		
82	all bed are fine		
83	Why only "in some garden beds"?		
84	Cuttiing annuals is ridiculous. We trumpet Victoria as the City of Gardens so stupid to do this. It is micro-managing the parks department on a minor issue. Of course, we need a variety of flowers.		
85	Evaluate the cost spent on maintenance of the city owned strips fronting residential properties and shift the responsibility for these to the property owners, removing the costs for the periodic maintenance that happens on these strips of land		
86	Parks has already been stripped. Flower beds have been grassed over. The City of Gardens is losing ground each year. Nanaimo, Sidney, Parksville -all have better gardens and park spaces than Victoria. Surely students could be hired for weeding. have you asked for volunteers who could supervise stunts in pulling weeds from the flower gardens?		
87	Yes, it is time that we start not just promoting the use of native plants to homeowners but also see the city leading by example. The time has come to promote a new landscape aesthetic that is more suitable to our climate and unique to our area. (Turf the palm trees - this isn't Hawaii).		
88	Victoria is a very attractive city. To a great extent, this image is due to its care and spending on parks, planters, and flowers. The parks and flowering planters enhance public mental health. Cut back here and mental health costs to society will escalate.		
	No - we need something cheerful in the city.		
	There are few parks - over past several years the City has reduced flower beds in the residential areas.		
	Use student employment in the summer for weeding. Hire 2 students to weed - this can't be tough.		

	really? You need to ask this? Jsut do it already.		
	Why don't you make some of these community gardens or have volunteers managing them? There are so many retired gardeners in this city, why dont you		
89	ask for their help and then thank them for it.		
90	as long as n one is laid off, lets try this. a more sustainable approach anyways		
91	Thought this should be a no-brainer!		
92	no changes to the flowers, victoria has become sleay and cheesy enough looking as it is.		
	No, keep all the annuals in the beds and remove platings from the road medians. 8 gardeners sure do a good job. I would consider hiring more to raise the		
93	level of care in Beacon Hill Park		
94	Non-issue.		
	Good idea. Native plant gardens, please.		
95	Food forest, anyone?		
	This sounds great. You can help two birds by planting bee, butterfly and bird friendly perennials.		
	Also, lose the ridiculous leaf pick-up. I cannot believe the City sends huge crews out to rake, blow, scrap and vacuum my street. I would much prefer a		
96	neighbourhood compost pile, and send the staff out to patch the potholes.		
9. Please provide comments on: Reduce City-led Seasonal Programming in Centennial Square			
Answer Options		Response Count	
		89	
		answered question	89
		skipped question	24
Number	Response Text		
1	good idea		
	Hate to lose the culture aspect of this. Put this cut at the bottom of the list. Maybe have auditions for musicians that would "busk" on stage a couple of days to		
2	save fees.		
3	Agreed.		
	I agree to reduce programming - but ensure the option is out there for other local organizations to take over programming, possibly with CoV assistance be it		
4	limited grant dollars or human resources.		
	Much of this has been expensive hype and really has not contributed squat to the economy of Victoria.		
5	Council and management should not try to be "all things to all people". The feel good is certainly short lived.		
6	don't agree. small amount of money for community-building activities ...		

7	NO, livened up a dead area, brought some downtown, brings pride. Keep it.		
8	The only problem with this is that people need reasons to come to downtown Victoria. There is also the 'spin-off' affect - that is people who come to Centennial Square for events usually spend money downtown. Cut off the attraction to go downtown, you may cut off revenue to businesses in the area.		
9	I believe that the Centennial Square programming draws tourists and locals to the downtown area, which is what we want to do. If you want to tweak the lunch-time programming without reducing it, have some of the lunch hour concerts on weekends so that local working people can take in more of them.		
10	End all city sponsored lunch time Centennial Square functions. Initiate a self funded process where entertainers can set up downtown and promote their own bands/ acts etc.		
11	Please keep the lunchtime concerts! I Adored your Christmas trees. I sent various pictures and videos of these events to friends and family across Canada and the USA, which in turn may bring visitors to the city!		
12	Agree with savings		
13	Hopefully the Downtown business community can pick up because keeping Centennial Square vibrant and attracting a good cross section is important to discourage the wrong element, as was rampant years ago.		
14	Axe the programming in Centennial Square. People come from other areas and the amount of shopping downtown is not increased significantly. The problem downtown is the homeless situation which is not a problem city council can do anything about. Or has done enough and it is not working.		
15	I am not in favour of this proposed reduction to our arts community.		
16	Yet another bad idea.		
17	T		
18	I would like to think that with more partnerships with artistic groups perhaps we could see some kind of cost-sharing initiatives. Downtown Victoria events are important, but if need be reducing seasonal programming is reasonable.		
19	what is the turnout for such events? lunch time could easily move to three days a week; and if people want events such as carolling program, get sponsorships.		
20	careful about losing some of the culture value of living in Victoria. I can support a small reduction of services - but I will strongly oppose the elimination - or private sponsorship of these types of events.		
21	Happy to see it go ... Never partook myself		
22	Again I view this as community building and should not be cut.		
23	Reducing the frequency of some programs seems acceptable. I'm confused about the elimination of technical support for some events; if these are City-run events, then should not the entire cost of the event be borne by the City?		
24	I support this; three days a week would be fine.		
25	I think the reduction to three days for the lunchtime concert program is a good idea but don't like the elimination of technical support for the other two events.		
26	We would not miss Xmas elimination. Do like lunchtime stuff.		
27	I do not support this proposal until and unless there are signed agreements with DVBA or other entities to maintain the same programming levels as before. Centennial Square is a key public space downtown and the lunchtime concerts bring much-needed vitality and demographic variety to the Square. Surely, there are options to increase the revenue-generating potential of these events to make up the \$82K savings target.		

28	Cancel it - rent the square to those who wish to use it.		
29	Yes... as well, seek out 'business or other organization' sponsoring to help funding community events.		
30	I agree with the suggestion to reduce programming. Five days a week seems like more than necessary.		
31	I whole heartily support this!		
32	Because the city operates some of the best real estate in the city, it has an obligation to provide a space for the types of activities the city values (like music/holiday events) at those locations. So support cultural/entertainment activities on city sites, and open up the spaces for volunteer/public use for similar events too.		
33	Use the square for local food market and gain revenue from renting the space for stalls and performers. Also, bring back the soap box concept and allow a space for people to speak in public on public issues.		
34	disagree, sense of community is priceless. This is not worth the savings.		
35	Has anyone bothered to monitor attendance at these events? Other than those working in the immediate area, who attends? Answering these two questions might help determine the usefulness of this program.		
36	drop the entire program. we are in crisis.		
37	If this is done, community organizations should be invited to use the space and help fill the programming void.		
38	Maintaining the cultural vibrancy of the City is critical. Making it more accessible by televising/streaming would be helpful.		
39	No. Musicians need venues.		
40	These are attractions for people to visit the city center. Visitors enjoy them. Do not make cuts.		
41	As long as the programming is replaced by other events, maybe sponsored by non-profits?		
42	We think you should make sure the Christmas tree lighting happens. Please cut back in other "seasonal programming" areas to make that possible. it is very good for downtown and families. Maybe Saanich could help since there citizens are at the tree lighting.		
43	I haven't attended many of them, so I can't really comment.		
44	Yes, let the private sector/non-profits use the space to provide entertainment & cultural offerings. This would be an opportunity for revenue (privately organized concerts for example) rather than expense.		
45	Keep all of these activities. Cut somewhere else.		
46	I agree.		
47	Would keep present program, although I personally find it too difficult to attend these events.		
48	Agree with this reduction. These are nice to's and not supportable in tough economic times.		

	There should be no programming in Centennial Square. It should be de-paved and planted with big long-lived trees. If a square needs special programming other than people just spontaneously using it, then it wasn't needed at all. It could be used as a welcome shady nature-break in the downtown density.		
49	Even if left as is, the square does not need programming, energy-wasting lights etc. The best thing in it is the big tree in the middle, near Douglas Street, above the steps. That is what everyone is drawn to.		
50	Yes.		
51	Yes.		
52	Yes - again they are "nice-to-haves" but not in this economic climate. Belt tightening. Perhaps non-profits could take over some.		
	With increased retail options in the surrounding municipalities - particularly Uptown - events that bring people downtown are vital. There may be cheaper ways of holding them, mind you, with non-profits and businesses taking the lead on some of them.		
53	Cutting the Christmas Tree Light Up would garner headlines for Scroogetoria ...		
54	Keeping the City vibrante is important, but to many people depend on the City to support every initiative.		
55	Not even worth thinking about. Keep the concerts.		
	In favour of reduction and eventual elimination. Would be in favour of contracting out to interested parties who would be required to adhere to municipally defined content and conduct of the musicians to ensure appropriate content and presentation to the community while performing in our public space.		
56	I am not opposed to the city providing technical support for the Christmas tree Light Up.		
57	The only comment I have is that I think that it is this type of program that pull people including tourists into the northerly part of downtown which I think is a good thing and in fact brings people into the downtown from elsewhere which I think we want.		
58	I think this is short sighted, though maybe the City should seek more partnerships or choose to do some events on the borders with our neighbours and costs share with them		
59	approve this plan		
60	once again! does it generate income? traffic? tourists?		
61	You bet, and if Centennial Square is ever occupied again for significant periods of time, perhaps the City should give all the occupiers one-way bus tickets to Oak Bay and a meal-ticket to selected Oak Bay restaurants. The cost to local taxpayers from Occupy Victoria was substantial, in part because the occupation was allowed to go on for far too long by a Council that was pre-occupied with their own re-election. However, you will note that the councillor who was most supportive of the Occupy movement did not get re-elected.		
62	Yes, good idea. I never could understand how Victoria could afford all these shows. Why not rent the space to people who want to perform rather than pay them? They could get their own sponsors or take donations while performing.		
63	I think this would be akin to a shooting in the foot.		
64	If these are attended at numbers that exceed investment then do not cut. If attendance is low, and we put them on, just to say "we do" than cut cut cut.		

	Any program that is led by the city should be treated as a profit center and not a cost center. If we aren't managing these properly to make a profit then we should outsource them to someone that can! Just ask the Mayor of San Francisco on his beliefs of running the city as a business. As such, the savings are great but not enough. These should make money!		
65	Santa Barbara runs the Solstice Festival every year and donations pay for the festival or they have to cancel it. Ask for donations to keep the programs running before cutting them out!		
66	NO		
67	I have never seen these concerts and i would expect that most of the middle class victoria residents are too busy with kids or jobs to attend.		
68	see above		
69	Yes.		
70	I agree with this. Let some other organizations book programming in the square. It's win/win. They get some free publicity, and the City doesn't have to pick up the costs.		
71	Agreed.		
72	why have this at all?		
73	In favour. Cut it all.		
74	All subsidized programming at Centennial Square should be scrapped. More other 'make-work' projects should also be scrapped.		
75	This seems an easy target, yet we need to balance anything that makes the downtown vibrant. Could these events be run more efficiently by other groups such as the DVBA? How popular are they anyway? Could a private company manage such events more effectively?		
76	Let Street Vendors and Crafters for a small fee, fill the square.		
77	well i think it;s all good there , just keep street people out off there ,or no welfare		
78	Think for a moment of why this seasonal programming was instituted in the first place. These are the reasons why the programming must be retained.		
79	no comment		
80	cancel lunch time concerts all together. hardley anyone goes. my kids were involved in one once. Most of the people watching were parents. A true waste of public dollars. Scrap the programs all together.		
81	Perhaps a lot more reduction could be made.		
82	Please only do this as part of a larger plan to reinvigorate downtown - perhaps the money could be spent elsewhere downtown but cutting back on efforts to make the city an exiting place to be should not be cut back on at this time.		
	Poor idea. Music is food for the soul.		

	<p>Cancel - stop - all but one of the Centennial Square pretend activities. Keep Xmas tree only. Light the tree - but skip the 'celebration' and figgy event To put on concerts etc to pretend that Centennial square is a people place is a waste of money.</p>		
83	If someone - a group - market - whatever - can use it - great. Rent it out at maintenance (cleaning and repair) costs		
84	Yes		
85	do it		
86	no cuts to seasonal programs.		
87	No, the festivals are one of the reasons our family chose to live close to downtown		
88	sure.		
89	Perhaps, better facilitate third party-led programming in Centennial Square. Host a food vendor court and charge lease rates.		
10. Please provide any additional comments			
Answer Options		Response Count	
		65	
		<i>answered question</i>	65
		<i>skipped question</i>	48
Number	Response Text		
	I find it hard to reconcile the salaries paid to city staff with all the other necessary costs to the city.		
	I work for VIHA in a union environment. Despite the union's pushing, you won't find many of us (highly trained health care professionals, some at the PhD level) getting salaries anywhere close to \$100,000. That's because we are PUBLIC SERVANTS, just like you.		
1	Sorry to rant, but it's just maddening.		
	Open up streets to more vendors. Fees from food and other vendors can generate income and make the streets more vibrant. Lose the stuffy attitude towards		
2	"big city" things and cut the paperwork for small vendors who will employ people and provide much needed vibrancy to the streets.		
	Thank you for the opportunity to provide feedback on budget decision-making.		
3	Very disappointing, however, as there are very limited number of issues and limited budget dollars provided for public input ...		
4	Amalgamation anyone?		

5	<p>I feel council needs to work with other councils to direct time and energy towards the provincial and federal governments to do their part to ensure that municipalities are not forced to pick up where other legislative bodies have failed. You need to really talk with citizens and explain how, for example, our police forces are becoming social workers because of cuts from the other governments. Be honest with the public, tell us how cutbacks have affected the way in which municipalities are forced to do more with less. Make you case and stick with it. People are pissed off. You need to provide honest, no spin leadership that engages people to really consider and want to act upon what kind of Victoria/BC/Canada we want to see and ways to achieve a society that is much more balanced between those who have a great deal with those who have far less. This forum for feedback is a good start.</p> <p>The other thing I want to say is that you have to look at how to make Victoria "different." What can bring life to this city and attract people? A festival of sorts (film, music..) that entices people. We used to have all kinds of festivals that have gone under - but have also taken away reasons for people to come to the downtown area. Can the city work with groups such as the ICA to bring about a festival of sorts that will bring people into downtown? What festivals work in other cities and why? Can we bring some of that here? Why not? How about turning some fallow land into crop producing land that can supply a downtown market with local, organic food? Corner of Hillside and Blanshard - a huge field that is never used. Can the city find and work with partners to use this kind of</p> <p>wasted space for something that can make Victoria "different," exciting - a place where people want to go?</p>		
6	<p>Go after the provincial government for fair taxes to government owned buildings. Stop funding social housing- this is a provincial and federal government issue. Look at reducing tax free property for a number of non- profits/ churches etc. This could be a gradual process. Forecasting a 3.5% budget increase is not sustainable. Over a 20 year period this will result in a 70% increase to property taxes. Couple this with large increases in user fees for water,sewage, storm water and garbage and we are becoming unaffordable to the normal resident. If 70% of the residents of Victoria rent these costs need to be passed on to renters if the owners of rental property are to survive. Go back to the basics for city services- if it is something the private sector supplies then get out of the</p> <p>business. Frills need to go.</p>		
7	<p>The proposed cuts amount to < 1% of the total budget. Hardly what I would call aggressive nor meaningful.</p> <p>If the City was really interested in cutting costs, start by implementing an immediate hiring freeze for position now open and those that come open thru attrition. The Mayor says the City wants to be 'a good employer' which means no courage to downsize, at least a freeze would give the tax payer a break because I'll bet the freeze could end up paying for the 2% wage increase for non exempt city employees.</p> <p>The mayor can wear his 'proud to pay taxes tee shirt' butl resent paying one cent extra until it is proven that what we currently pay is being prudently spent</p> <p>and all the waste trimmed. If the Blue Bridge fiasco is any indication, we are a long way from efficiency and value for money.</p>		
8	<p>I want to see the police budget reduced in the order of 20% as there is more bullying done BY police than by any other group in Victoria. Their ethos is not 'to serve and protect'. It is instead to autocratically 'muscle & muzzle' Victoria's citizenry. I want a fact finding investigation of the police,</p>		
9	<p>The tax situation is deplorable for the businesses of Victoria. It must be cut. If homes were taxed at the same rate then something would be done. It is unbearable. I am serious about cutting every second manager. If they were paid half as much as they are maybe there could be some discussion. But right now it is out of hand. The city should be decreasing taxes and for some time to come. The idea of all this development that is making our city lose its glamour is too get more tax revenue. Everyone working for the public should know that increased population never reduces taxes for those of us already here. It is a total myth!! Please stop any future development. Carpet bagger developpers eventually get their development proposals approved no matter how much the neighbourhood rejects the developments. Is this fair? We have to live with these developments everyday. Highrises take the sun away, make</p> <p>wind canyons and deprive us of views of the horizon. If everyone in the neighbourhood is in favour of a development then go ahead but not until.</p>		

10	<p>Would it be possible to greatly reduce the street cleaning budget. Obviously drains still need to be cleared on a regular basis but the zamboni-like machines that brush the streets appear to have little effect. Coming from the prairies I understand their utility there, particularly in the Spring, however here they really appear to accomplish very little. What does it cost to maintain the small fleet of them and send staff out to drive in circles up and down our streets? Is there any means to objectively appraise their utility? Would they be missed?</p>		
11	<p>No one seems to want to pursue amalgamation, but have we looked at sharing services? Do ten municipalities do their own purchasing, or could we have a smaller group, for example. Could one municipality do garbage pickup, and another do recycling? Shared staff, shared resources.</p>		
12	<p>I did not see any reference to private, contracted services. I know of two service reviews in BC municipalities who determined better quality, and financial savings by eliminating the contracts and doing the work in house. Was there any review of the private contracts the city holds?</p> <p>Oh and if Crystal pool is ever eliminated I'll be the first one protesting. I heard a rumour of the "Y" taking it over, or just closing the door and the public having to go to Oak Bay, Esquimalt or Gordon Head. I strongly oppose either of those rumoured solutions.</p>		
13	<p>and get on with amalgamation already,</p> <p>I thought I had helped elect a labour friendly mayor and council but between the service reduction with garbage pickup and the tone of this survey...I'm not so sure now.</p>		
14	<p>I think our tax rates are low compared to what we get and also to other cities.</p> <p>I think the city and region do a great job.</p>		
15	<p>I find this exercise positive and I thank the city for allowing this mode of public comment on the 2013 budget. On the substance, however, I think these 9 options demonstrate the fundamental flaw in the 3.25% tax cap decision by Council. Short-sighted and irresponsible options like reducing infrastructure reserve set-asides, and cuts to core services like libraries with little or no analysis of impacts, and gimmicks like "up-loading" part of Mayor/Council compensation to federal taxpayers would have little or no merit as individual proposals. Yet because of the 3.25% tax increase cap, they are seen as "lown-hanging fruit" towards the pre-ordained objective of cutting \$3M from city spending over the next 2 years...and there was NO public consultation about whether citizens want the city to cut that much spending! A true engagement process would lay out a range of tax increase and spending cut options, with the relevant context (i.e. cutting infrastructure reserves now means higher taxes and more expensive projects later, the average impact on residential taxpayers of a 5% vs a 3.25% increase is likely no more than a dollar a day, etc.). That would allow residents to provide direction on those fundamental strategic choices, as opposed to simply saying we have to cut \$3M and asking residents where to cut.</p>		

<p>Here are a few other comments, including those referenced by Councillor Lisa Helps budget sessions...</p> <p>1] City Facilities - sell off or ???, including parks, Crystal Pool and maybe even the Conference Centre [different issues here]. The City should keep the land but consider a P-3 partnership and lease out the facilities. As an example, all parks and the Crystal Pool could be run by the University of Victoria and Camosun College sports programs. Private organizations could make up the 3rd leg of the P-3 partnership. The City staff could be managers/liaisons between the other two partners.</p> <p>2] Mirror the USA Main Street Program with the goal of assisting small to mid-sized businesses in the down town core. In the USA [not sure if the program still exists] the Main Street Program had grant and loan programs designed for small businesses to get up and running within a specified time frame [say one to two year horizon]. It included training programs in marketing, finances, customer service, etc.</p> <p>3] Victoria as a 'beta test' site as Singapore. Invite Fortune 100 or 500 corporations to Victoria to 'test out' their products and services. Singapore as a community reaps many benefits beyond the financial aspects. Their citizens become employees and the city benefited from advanced technological inventions, etc. - fiber options throughout Singapore; advances in bio-medical, etc.</p> <p>4] Victoria as a Learning City. Host national and international initiatives in the areas of learning and education and other disciplines. Consider hosting events such as IdeaCity, Ted, etc.</p>		
<p>I have attended two budget consultation processes, one conducted by Lisa Helps and the other by Dean Fortin. I very much appreciate the process and the opportunity to learn more about the complexity of the issues. As someone that tries to be informed, I would appreciate if the city would respond to the concerns raised in the January issue of Focus Magazine. At the session I attended, a question was asked about the solvency of the city. I do not feel it was adequately addressed.</p> <p>I appreciate that Council seems very reluctant to cut funds to recreation centres and other services that support resident's quality of life. I would not be in favour of cuts in this area.</p> <p>17 Thank you.</p>		
<p>18 City needs to rethink the idea of the super expensive blue bridge replacement project as all the above pale in comparison to this cost. Also, if the city cannot demonstrate that they adequately maintain infrastructure such as the blue bridge, why should the city be allowed to just get a new one built and charge it to the taxpayers. Go back and maintain the blue bridge and put sensors on it to identify if/when it becomes dangerous to have traffic on it.</p>		

19	<p>Having attended on of the budget consultation meetings I would like to comment as follows:</p> <p>1) There was insufficient detail outlining just how/why the 3.25% increase was arrived at. Unfortunately it was far from aggressive enough.</p> <p>2) The priorities as presented need to be rearranged giving emphasis to growing the revenue; all that is doable comes from that. Putting Community Well-being number one automatically drives a higher tax burden vs affordability given the revenue. It is disappointing to read in 'Connect' that we are now in the Mayor's 2nd term and is only now bringing in an Economic Development Strategy (whatever it may be).</p> <p>3) Government needs to be an enabler vs a doer. Setting direction and providing incentives to get there vs trying to do it.</p> <p>4) Annual salary increases without increased productivity should be a non starter. COLA increases, in this environment of benign inflation and above the desired unemployment rate, should not be considered.</p> <p>5) Commit to transparently publish the consultant's report and commit to acting upon the recommendations.</p> <p>6) In future when publishing objectives provide benchmarks so results can be objectively evaluated.</p> <p>7) Provide feedback on just which items provided by the public consultation process will see the light of day.</p>		
20	<p>Protected bike lanes are absolutely crucial. An investment in safety, health, transportation, youth and reputation of the city! Other cities are leading the way (Montreal, Vancouver, Ottawa, American cities) and Victoria is falling behind. Protected, seperated, elevated, and car-free bike paths with appropriate signals are so important. They also get harder each year to put in, as car traffic gets worse. Now is the time to set aside North-South and East-West routes for bikes in a way that protects the bike, not just a white line. Increases ridership. Improves safety. More riders, more healthy, happy citizens.</p> <p>True, cyclists are a minority. But they don't deserve 0% of the roads to be dedicated to protected bike lanes in the city.</p>		
21	<p>thank you for increasing engagement through the best city council we've had in years.</p>		
22	<p>Legal budget for Police - ridiculous that millions or dollars are spent on legal for bad/poorly trained/deceitful police. They act as though they have bottomless funding. ANY case that is proven LEGALLY to be contrary to the findings of internal police investigations should be paid back in FULL by the police agency as a deterrent for abusing public funds in this fashion.</p>		

	<p>We must address city payroll. At 52.6 % of the budget it is the only area where we can generate significant saving. We are locked into bargined increases. But now is the time to be setting the stage for future bargaining. I would suggest that you let the unions know that in future you will have to be looking to reduce workforc costs.</p> <p>As a starting point let them know that in the next round of bargaining you will look at employee benefits to yield savings. Employees could be paying 50% of their benefits package, as is usually done in the private sector. Look at the components of the benefits package. If group benefits are 5% of payroll, \$5,128,500., a 50-50 split would generate a \$2,564,000. saving. How do their benefits compare to the private sector. Start benchmarking wages and benefits to the private sector here on the island.</p> <p>The OCP 2012 projects growth of only 20,000 over the next 30 years. Surely we can service that with technological change and efficiencies coming. So zero growth in employees going forward.</p> <p>We should be looking to future developments and developers to raise the funds for for new amenities. The city and the taxpayers have enough on their plate to just pay for infrastructure renewal and upgrade.</p> <p>The city should be benchmarking itself to other cities through North America, not just in B.C.. We need creative, innovative thinking. Not the same old, same old.</p>		
23	<p>1. When the City legalized secondary suites, I argued that the very slight increase in taxes would not cover costs for infrastructure, etc. People who are reaping the financial benefits of renting out suites should have to pay sufficient taxes to pay for the increased demand on the system.</p> <p>2. If the City were less inclined to spot rezone to the incredible extent that it does (upwards of 800 sites), less money would be spent pandering to the demands of developers who wish to profit to a greater extent than current zoning regulations allow. Planners and councillors spend a great deal of unnecessary time facilitating developers rather than rely upon the zoning regulations to do their job.</p>		
24	<p>unnecessary time facilitating developers rather than rely upon the zoning regulations to do their job.</p>		
25	<p>I do not believe the city is making decisions which will attract new investment and tax revenue to the city.</p> <p>Although we appreciate the opportunity to give feedback, I think the city council could make more decisions and let us know what and why it was done. We are very tired of the loud complainers in this city and feel there is more to celebrate than to nit pick about, which is where some councillors and citizens would like to spend their time. We appreciate the hard work of the elected mayor and councillors and city workers but sometimes feel the loud complainers are getting the grease.</p>		
26	<p>Thank You.</p>		
27	<p>Please improve maintenance of bicycle lanes. Cycling (and other physical activities) has an important role in Victoria being a great city to live in. The presence of rocks/gravel on those lanes makes me ride closer to the traffic than I want to.</p>		

28	<p>You need to get serious about cutting costs across the board and reducing staffing levels. There should be at least a few years of nil tax increases so that Victoria taxpayers can catch their breath after successive years of significant tax increases. Forget about limiting it to 3.25% increase. By having a 3 to 5 year holiday from future property tax increases, you would do more to stimulate the Victoria economy than anything else you could do. new investment would surge in. I am not a raving anti-taxation person - no, I am in favour of taxation in order to provide all the benefits of civil society, However I really hate to see my tax dollars being wasted on unnecessary expenditures. A perfect example is the new green bin program. It would have been far less expensive in the long run to create a campaign to encourage home composting and when requested, provide a simple backyard composter bin (free or at reduced cost) to those not already composting, than to implement a blanket distribution of green bins. The costs in personnel, deisel, etc to collect all this organic waste could have been completely avoided and still get the sought after reduction in solid waste. We own 2 houses in Victoria, (therefore pay a handsome share of property taxes!!) and both our own home and our rental property have backyard compost bins that are used by all members of each building. Yet both of these properties got new green bins which will not be used.</p>		
29	<p>Hello...I provided some written feedback on the above noted topics at an open house but have since thought of additional measures for your consideration. sale of compost - I am guessing we have an abundance of leaves taken from parks and boulevards and while some is used to mulch beds around town, could the balance be mixed with lawn clippings from city parks to create a saleable compost? Lawn clippings cut from every 2nd cut of parks would reduce the mess and mulch found around town, and create a revenue stream</p> <p>lobbying for a change to prov. legislation to allow cityies to be more aggressive and successful in tracking down parking fines. Millions of \$ sit outstanding and would go a long way to helping keep services and/or balance the books</p> <p>street sweepers make the rounds regularly. Outfitting them with camera / IT technology to support the above noted change would aid in finding delinquent offenders and their vehicles</p> <p>neighbourhood parks adoption to assist in quarterly clean up of neighbourhood parks supports the city, assists staff and creates a stronger sense of civic pride and community</p> <p>similarly, initiating an "Out to the Curb" program whereby owners and renters take the initiative to keep boulevards, sidewalks and gutters clean of debris. This includes the watching of illegal debris dumping on boulevards, particularly old furniture. Cleaning gutters of weeds and the like to avoid costly road repairs. Cutting of boulevard lawns to maintain pride of neighbourhood. Raking of leaves for appropriate disposal. Could begin as a test in one of many neighbourhood community associations</p> <p>eliminate branch chipping service. Saturdays at Garbally are already a wonderful city service which could add a branch program to its collections</p> <p>Thanks for hearing me out.</p>		

<p>30.</p>	<p>Does the city of Victoria have a Depreciation Report and do we have a fund that will allow for replacement of capital expenditures? We should have a fund that will allow citizens to donate to or leave in their Will to donate to a program in perpetuity.</p> <p>Why don't fire departments solicit in their own community for a new fire truck, etc. like they do in the States? Citizens are allowed to donate to these funds there. Also, why does the fire department go on so many medical calls when they are not needed - this adds a huge cost to their budget. Is not emergency health care the responsibility of the provincial government? Doesn't the BC Ambulance Service attend these emergency situations with qualified paramedics? It makes sense to use fire department personnel and equipment at a fire scene or motor vehicle incident, but not as a normal response to a call for help to the BC Ambulance.</p>		
<p>31.</p>	<p>Victoria has to become much less diplomatic about carrying the costs for the region. I advocate withdrawal from regional initiatives such as sewage treatment and transportation until such time as other municipalities come to the table with a more equitable resource sharing mindset. Victoria should refuse to cooperate with other municipalities until there are sharing agreements around policing, parks and other municipal costs in which Victoria bears too much of the share.</p> <p>Victoria council has become anything but strategic since the last election. There is far too much debate about things that don't matter and too much time spent posturing for public exposure. Ninety per cent of council's strategic time should be spent pressuring other municipalities to pay their fair share. A break through on equitable funding from the region would deliver more savings to Victoria than all of these proposed cuts combined.</p>		
<p>32.</p>	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to contribute to this survey.</p>		
<p>33.</p>	<p>You must make hard decisions. No more fence sitting.</p> <p>Why not tax the boats in Bamfield park waters. They use our garbage etc. I want them gone - what about councilor Gudgeon and her stand on getting rid of them?</p> <p>Yesterday I talked to staff about garbage collection and why my 104 year old neighbour had to jump thru hoops to get her garbage picked up and returned to where they are. Happily the fellow who called me back concurred and will change policy - kudos to him and Victoria for giving him the authority to make a sensible decision like that. More common sense things like that have to be enacted.</p>		
<p>34.</p>	<p>Victoria has remarkably low property taxes. No one likes tax increases, especially above inflation, but we pay far less than residents of similarly sized municipalities in Ontario, Quebec or the Maritimes (places where I have friends and family, so I'm familiar with their rates).</p> <p>That would be fine - and even a selling feature for Victoria - but for the consequences: underfunded, deteriorating infrastructure; fewer police per capita than many eastern cities despite a higher crime rate;</p> <p>Rather than going through painful exercises like this one each year, nibbling around the edges of city spending, we need to work towards a sustainable model where taxes are sufficient to provide a decent level of current services and maintain infrastructure for the future. That is bound to mean a higher rate of taxes than we presently have and I, for one, would welcome a mature discussion on the subject.</p>		

35	<p>You are asking about such minuscule budget matters. These are tiny refinements on a much larger statement of revenues and expenses. Don't waste taxpayers time with these silly questions. Go and govern and do so in a fiscally responsible way. If you do so you'll keep getting elected. If you don't then eventually you'll lose.</p>		
36	<p>I request that the city take a survey on the success or any issues that may arise from the proposed new garbage collection after 2 years of implementation. Reducing the frequency of pickups may cause unforeseen problems, such as smell during the summer or an increase in the rat population, and the schedule may need to be revised. Thank you for the opportunity to participate.</p>		
	<p>Although I do not have all the details as the budgeting process that the city engages in, it always seems surprising to me that it all seems to be completed back to front. By that I mean that council (and maybe senior management) states that taxes can only go up by x amount rather than going back to basics every budget cycle and reviewing every program and service that is being delivered and possibly others that are not and determining in the context of the constitutional mandate of the city what should be supplied or delivered and then cost it out and that is what we pay and definitely including the maintenance of our infrastructure. For the last number of decades there seems to be this rush to the bottom of on the one hand rising costs but on the other hand not wanting to raise taxes.....and of course the old adage applies you get what you pay for, as the streets and everything else crumble down on top of us.....and while I cannot cite actual numbers I would not be surprised to learn that for a municipality with the small population of less than 100,000 our city management is very top heavy and likely overpaid compared to other jurisdictions in Canada.....I am sure there are cities in Canada that have the population of the CRD that have no more managers and are paid no more than those here in Victoriasomeone has got to take up the ball and it rolling on some form of amalgamation or at very least to start by regionalizing some critical services like police and fire.....also the longer that we don't we also are going to have to rebalance the business/residential tax burden more in favour of business because otherwise the downtown core will continue to be hollowed out with businesses both old and new moving or setting up in the outlying communities, I say this even though it means my taxes will necessarily go up, but that is the cost of maintaining a vibrant thriving urban community.</p> <p>Has it been considered to have a higher tax rate on property that is not developed such as surface parking lots so that owners may be encouraged to invest in development rather than sitting on vacant unproductive property. This developemnt would increase building density as well as the taxable base.</p>		
38	<p>You just don't get it. You are bankrupting Victoria. Your existing salary and pension commitments are unrealistic for service that is not as good as the private sector. It is not about flowers. Your payroll can not be sustained. Privatize a lot of your service and reduce your costs.</p>		
39	<p>Leaves piclup</p> <p>I am a renter and walk most of the James Bay streets weekly and notice with the recent leaves pickup some residential grass boulevards were poorly cleaned in James Bay, South Turner street being one. During the pickup process some of the leaf debris was transferred from the boulevards to the streets and not cleaned up in the street so there is now quite a bit of leaf debris on many of the streets along the curbs. If I was doing this work I would take pride in doing a thorough job even with what is perhaps a tight work schedule.</p> <p>I also noticed that on the east side of the block of Government street south of Michigan there are tracks on the grass boulevard from what I assume was a machine that scooped up leave piles. These tracks damaged the grass boulevards and I question whether any time or other saving of using this machine balances the damage done.</p>		
40	<p>those reductions are penny ante and constructed to look like city hall is trying.the real issues are staffing levels and management of them. overtime,pensions etc.victoria is not a very big city and yet we continue to want to act like we are not.police and fire budgets are the ones that must be addressed.</p>		

41	<p>There can be no question that Victoria is suffering from core city problems, and the burdens that are imposed on the core city. Amalgamation is seriously overdue. The waste associated with 13 colonies existing side-by-side is enormous. Most of the waste shows up in excessive administrative costs, almost everywhere in the CRD. Victoria has the lowest average household income in the CRD, the highest level of per capita municipal expenditures and, in conjunction, the highest municipal tax burden on its residents and other property owners. Limiting taxation increases to 3.25% will nevertheless lower the disposable income of many people who live in the City, many of whom are certainly not rich. The City needs to cut deeper than this, and to petition the provincial government to press forward with amalgamation before the City (writ small) collapses under the weight that it bears for its adjacent, and somewhat parasitic, neighbours. In the meantime, do not spend any city money subsidising transit fares and infrastructure for those living elsewhere. Although I love our regional parks, and hike in them often, none of these parks are in the City of Victoria, so why should the City be contributing through the CRD towards their upkeep? After all, the other municipalities are not helping to cover core city costs.</p>		
42	<p>increase taxes with our long-term capital improvements needs. Additionally, the mayor and team have demonstrated a willingness to cut their own salaries to demonstrate their resolve to stick by the people of the city.</p> <p>However, these salary decreases essentially only offset an increase in the reserves, which are being used to pay down debt at an over taxing rate during a short-term time of difficulty.</p> <p>Moreover, the 2011 grant structure is not in line with revenue generating and economic needs of the city. The 2011 grant structure is overly generous to the Heritage Foundation (reduce it by 50%), the Arts and Culture Foundation (reduce it by 20%) the Victoria Housing Foundation (reduce it by 20%) instead of in line with the Economic Development needs of the city. Use the decreases in the other foundations to bolster the Economic Development grants, which directly generates revenues in the form of business taxes and residential taxes from new businesses moving in and new employees moving in too!</p> <p>This leaves the City of Victoria in a position of telling everyone that we're hurting. This is not true! Change the message as soon as possible.</p> <p>Suggestion:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Find \$1,000,000 in the reserves by reducing the amount of debt we're paying back and trimming some fat until the Economic Development programs are in place.2. Increase advertising by using signs and selling the name of the Conference Center.3. Treat all city led programs as profit centers.4. Create a program with UVIC that uses a charter bus to drive students back to UVIC after late nights (and charge them enough to make money or outsource it to someone else). This also reduces policy costs.5. Add more EV quick charge stations to downtown Victoria and sell electricity.6. Restructure the grant programs to place a focus on the Economic Development of the City of Victoria by reducing the amount of the Heritage Fund, the Arts Fund and the Victoria Housing Fund. <p>Finally, let Canada and the world know that Victoria, BC, Canada is now offering Economic Development Grants to technology startups, green technology and green energy (solar and EV energy) and is open for business!</p>		

43	<p>With inflation in Victoria averaging 1.25% annually since 2007 (Statscan) and City revenue increasing approximately 6% annually over the same period, the issue facing Council (read Victoria taxpayers) isn't the need to find additional revenue sources but the need to control and reduce spending especially when the average salary at City Hall is \$91K. The attempt to hold property tax increases to 3.25% for the next 3 years, a rate 2.5 times the average rate of inflation clearly illustrates a lack of willingness by Council to address the real issue facing the City which is excessive spending. Perhaps Council needs to revisit the various initiatives underway (i.e. Sustainability, Travelodge purchases, Crystal Pool renovations, Johnson Street bridge, Sewage treatment) if a serious reduction in spending is going to occur. The number one priority as identified by Council is "Quality of Life". However, increasing taxes in excess of the rate of inflation reduces the quality of life of every taxpayer in Victoria.</p>		
44	<p>I find a lot of these savings your talking about are small given the total budget of the City of Victoria.</p> <p>I understand that every little savings count but the City of Victoria really needs to cutback given the future taxes that the Bridge, Sewer, and renovation projects are going to create. I am generally understanding of budgets and annual increases that occur thru tax increases but breaking the back of businesses can't be in the best interest of the city.</p> <p>I also find that no discussions take place on reducing staff levels at the City. The Police increase comes up in discussion but no one discusses the need for so many fire halls and fire personnel. With the addition of 21st century fire prevention in many new buildings and homes, why is there no decrease in this area of the city ? Can we not share resources in this area with Saanich ?</p> <p>Even ICBC has just gone thru a round of staff reductions in Victoria, why is Victoria so apposed to this type of action ? Are labour costs not one of the biggest expenditures in the city ?</p> <p>How much tax do you think small building owners can pass on to tenants or themselves (owner occupied) before they succumb to the financial burden ? Does City council and the Mayor care if the city becomes a Vacant shell ?</p> <p>As a business owner and resident and normally not active in Municipal politics, I now find myself discussing the poor management at the City of Victoria to other residents and the need to elect a mayor and council that better represents the city of victoria home and business owners.</p>		
45	<p>This council is doing less with more. Year after year, taxpayers are gouged for more taxes and fees, while management staff get more bonuses and hire their buddies while council sits on its hands never questioning process. Well, there is no sin in saying the emperor has no clothes. The repeated addition of staff and secrecy of council makes a mockery of democracy. Council refuses to be accountable and is led around by the nose by managers.</p> <p>It is appropriate that this process is called SurveyMonkey since that is how staff and council consider taxpayers.</p>		

<p>Property Tax increases are to cover existing services at existing services levels. NO. There is TOO much bureaucracy and TOO many employees, we need to make this leaner!</p> <p>Only apply for grant funding for items already in the 5-year Financial Plan and 20-year Capital Plan. This is just stupid. TAKE THE MONEY THAT YOU CAN GET for the NEW projects that funding agents WANT to support. We need to revolutionize how we do business. downtown will be VACANT if you continue on these paths</p> <p>We need more talk about revenue GENERATION. In the City Council Budget Presentations last year (slides on the website) it shows that currently there is NO funding source? What!!??? And then the uses are limited to: Capital projects such as downtown revitalization projects, tourism related projects, construction projects. There was just a Green Economy stakeholder meeting with 200 participants. Where's the talk about GREEN ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT. This was my introduction and what they were saying is true, this IS where we need to be going.</p>		
<p>46 Where is the long-term strategy? Continually being in the red?</p>		
<p>47 Thanks for the opportunity to comment.</p> <p>Thanks for asking. I appreciate the formal process undertaken by the Mayor and guided by accurate information in this matter and hope that all of Council</p>		
<p>48 will come to appreciate the value in this strategy for citizen participation. I appreciate the professionalism inherent in this style.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - stop doing unnecessary projects such as the Beacon Hill Park traffic calming project - plant perennials rather than annuals - have less hanging baskets - freeze council and management salaries - stop unnecessary taxes such as the new stormwater tax.....really taxing people for when it rains is ridiculous - blue bridge design - could have gone with just a basic bridge rather than trying to make it a focal point of the inner harbour - stop doing unnecessary road updates.....ie putting islands and plants in the middle of roads.... has anyone thought about when these trees/shrubs get larger...what a hinderance to drivers 		
<p>49 To realize real savings the city must either reduce its unionized workforce or cut CUPE salaries and benefits.</p> <p>This survey seems rigged. Why does it include only piecemeal reductions when what's really needed is a 10 or 15 per cent cut in money spent on unionized employees?</p> <p>Property taxes should be reduced, not increased. That means means focusing on core services with no frills, and either pay cuts or firings of unionized staff.</p>		
<p>50 I really can't afford ever-increasing property taxes!</p> <p>I want to see a much larger budget for cycling infrastructure. I strongly support my tax dollars being spend on making the city easier, safer and more fun to get around on a bike. Separated facilities will attract families, get more people shopping locally, increase health, and attract the creative class of workers that Victoria is trying to attract to "Techoria" (See Richard Florida).</p>		
<p>51 I would like to see more fee for use of city utilities and services (thus my support for a storm water utility).</p>		

	<p>the City needs to really evaluate programs - with cutting them in mind.</p> <p>If not essential, then see if could be offered in other ways or if it could be cut.</p> <p>For example, the City financially supports groups/organizations from other municipalities - this needs to end.</p> <p>The City provides funding and or subsidy to private sector companies, sometimes in significant ways - this needs to stop. (E.g. RalMax and GVHA)</p> <p>The City is showing favouritism to some companies over others, thereby giving subsidies. on tracts, leases, agreements should be open and transparent so that the best deal is made for the City.</p> <p>Do other businesses have alternate uses for the RalMax leased properties - if so, should be considered.</p> <p>Why would City Waterloo or property be given to Harbour Air without open competition.</p> <p>last year, the Maid of the Mist lost its monopoly to tour under Niagara Falls - the City decided to open the process to get the best deal for the City/taxpayers.</p>		
52	We need City Council, and staff, to be independent of particular favoured businesses.		
53	Thanks for asking - I hope you take views into consideration		
	<p>!; Run a free Trolley Bus up and down the length of Douglas Steet. It will reduce traffic congestion, stimulate shopping and free up parking spaces on the street.</p> <p>There should be a study done on Amalgamation of the 13 Municipalities to show where taxpayers would save money over time.</p> <p>Victoria has too much Blue Collar Management.</p> <p>City offices should be moved to the north end of Douglas steet to ease traffic congestion downtown.</p> <p>Make several downtown core shopping area - Pedestrian only area. Shuttle buses should be available at a nominal fee.</p> <p>The City should consider and press the provincial government to regulate and tax the sale of Cannabis.</p> <p>Have the courage and forward thinking of how you can make Victoria more tax affordable through buying and sharing (in bulk) for all equipment, supplies and</p>		
54	employment with the cooperation of all 13 Municipalities and the CRD		
55	well same as the above		
	<p>Hugely increase public transit to and within Greater Victoria. Change parking fee structure so that the first hour is \$0.25; the next and each subsequent hour is double the previous hour; e.g. three hours = \$1.75 (0.25 + 0.50 + 1.00) - payable upon exiting parking space or parkade. Consider modest toll for all motor</p>		
56	vehicles (except public service) on new Johnson Street Bridge.		
	<p>Cut what is not essential and that means the Communication Dept. Each department can speak for itself. The Communications Dept has too many staff, costs</p>		
57	a lot and is unnecessary.		
	<p>Push for amalgamation with neighbouring municipalities, not just of police services but complete amalgamation to increase property tax base with minimal</p>		
58	changes in staffing. Make this an issue in municipal elections so that the people can decide.		
	<p>this survey is deficient.</p> <p>it is dealing with items whereas whole programs could be scrapped. zero-based budget considerations should take place.</p>		
59	Scrap most non-essential programs until infrastructure deficit is conquered.		

60	The downtown YMCA pool is greatly outdated as are some of their other facilities. Please work with the YMCA to integrate their services at a new recreational facility - why provide the same services when you could work together. Victoria could do the aquatic and family oriented programs and facilities while the Y focuses on adult fitness programs - or some similar arrangement. Perhaps the new facility could be placed on School Board property in Fernwood and be also utilized for Vic High programming. That would free up the Crystal Pool and Y sites for redevelopment and provide funding for the new facility. Best wishes on this,		
61	While good budgeting and transparent financial accountability are important, reducing taxes is usually counterproductive as an end in itself. Cutbacks to spending on maintenance, parks, city beautification, and public events will very likely not yield a long-term benefit. Rather, such action is more likely to degrade the city of Victoria.		
62	The City needs to head to zero-budegtting. Focus on core programs, get rid of others. Staff can be re-assigned to any c=vacancy that arises. When I worked for the deferral government and their were serious cut-backs, people changed careers totally - and for our department is worked. Consumer liaison (speeches etc) became vegetable graders - and loved it. Those who didn't like new assingments found other employment - ALL WITHOPUT SUBSIDY or SEVERANCE packages.		
63	the decay in downtown victoria is growing at a fast rate under this mayor/council. clean up the downtown/harris green areas from drug/criminal use. make the city attractive. businesses will move back. tax base will increase. stop supporting/promoting illegal drug use.		
64	This is the city of gardens and our parks are great and are getting better these days with new features such as the bike park and zip line.		
65	The 9 questions total a fraction of savings needed in YYJ. How come? Is that all council and staff could come up with to fill in the shortfall? The sewer, bridge and current infrastructure funding shortfall are serious problems & I see nothing being done to address them. Asking the public what type of flower they want on a boulevard is insulting. Get on with it. Allow rapid development of the Douglas Street corridor to increase our tax base. Speed up zoning approvals. Stop being an obstacle in the way of development. We need the increased tax base, especially by commercial owners. This survey does not include any vision for future revenue growth or real tax savings. We are running out of time.		

11. Are you a Victoria taxpayer?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes - Residential	75.0%	81
Yes - Business	3.7%	4
Yes - Residential and Business	9.3%	10
No	12.0%	13
	<i>answered question</i>	108
	<i>skipped question</i>	5

12. Which neighbourhood do you live in?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Burnside Gorge	3.2%	3
Downtown	8.4%	8
Fairfield Gonzales	16.8%	16
Fernwood	8.4%	8
Harris Green	2.1%	2
Hillside Quadra	5.3%	5
James Bay	16.8%	16
North Jubilee	3.2%	3
North Park	4.2%	4
Oaklands	8.4%	8
Rockland	8.4%	8
South Jubilee	2.1%	2
Vic West	10.5%	10
I don't know	2.1%	2
Other (please specify)		11
answered question		95
skipped question		18

- | Number | Other (please specify) |
|--------|---|
| 1 | Oak Bay but right on Fairfield border! |
| 2 | Saanich |
| 3 | Strawberr y vale |
| 4 | Langford and Sidney |
| 5 | currently saanich but plan to move to the downtown core within the next year |
| 6 | Camosun |
| 7 | Langford |
| 8 | Saanich |
| 9 | I own a condo downtown that I currently rent, but have lived in myself and intend to keep for the future. |
| 10 | North Douglas |
| 11 | Cordova Bay; Saanich |

13. How did you learn about the budget process and how did you learn about the budget consultation?

Answer Options		Response Count	
		96	
		<i>answered question</i>	96
		<i>skipped question</i>	17
Number	Response Text		
1	facebook		
2	facebook		
3	Facebook		
4	I pay attention to the news		
5	Lisa Helps		
6	local newspaper; councillor info		
7	twitter		
8	I heard about the process on the news.		
9	E-mail.		
10	Community Association		
11	Newspaper		
12	Ctv news, and the victoria website		
13	LOCAL NEWS CHANNEL		
14	CTV-VI		
15	frient		
16	Ads plus encouragement from Councillor Shelley Gudgeon		
17	radio		
18	Through the media and online (Facebook)		
19	Vicnews		
20	Cupe bc		
21	Newspapers		
22	newspaper		
23	councilor		
24	Cupe local 50 email		
25	CUPE		
26	City invitation to budget consultation, sent to North Park Neighbourhood Association		
27	Received a city email.		
28	e-mail from a relative		
29	CBC		
30	Facebook/social media		
31	on the website..... looking at how to pay a parking ticket but just decided forget it - I won't go downtown anymore - better solution		
32	Times Colonist		
33	from New Horizons in James Bay		

34	Newspaper		
35	tweet		
36	Twitter		
37	work colleague - too late to participate in the conversations		
38	City web site		
39	newspaper		
40	from a Councillor		
41	Media.		
42	Emails/bulletins		
43	I received an email.		
44	CTV Vancouver Island		
45	Media and facebook		
46	the Times Colonist newspaper and your website		
47	victoria.ca website		
48	city newsletter and media		
49	Times Colonist		
50	Through my neighbourhood association and in the Victoria Time Colonist.		
51	City of Victoria website and Mayor's Facebook page.		
52	from Director at James Bay New Horizons Centre		
53	Media reporting.		
54	Councillors Helps and Coleman on CBC		
55	North Park Neighbourhood Association		
56	Newspaper		
57	Through the North Park Neighbourhood Association		
58	City employee		
59	On the mailing list		
	Neighbourhood association email as well as reading about the process in the paper		
60	I have not yet been to a session but will try to get to one		
61	The Chamber of Commerce		
62	Lisa Helps		
63	Times-Colonist newspaper		
64	newspaper		
65	Facebook and news-media		
	web		
66	I didn't attend an info session but I plan to go to one on 28th		
67	Open Victoria		
68	Friend		
	I've lived and worked in California as a CPA for the past nine years and just returned to this beautiful city. I was looking for information on the City when I		
69	came across the meetings. Seeing similarities between San Francisco and Victoria, and Santa Barbara and Victoria, I thought I'd help.		
70	SHAW Cable		

71	Twitter		
72	Radio		
73	NewsPaper		
74	Focus magazine		
75	website		
76	Through my job initially. But I learned about the survey on CFAX.		
77	newspaper		
78	Print newspapers and Facebook.		
79	Newspaper and twitter (Lisa Helps).		
80	Heard about it from a Councillor		
81	Facebook posting		
82	CFAX radio and Times Colonist		
83	time colonist		
84	Victoria Times Colonist, Saturday, January 19, 2013.		
85	Newspapers, attending city functions, workshops		
86	Times Colonist		
	Any intelligent resident has "learned about the budget process". Weird question.		
	The 'consultation was committed' about a year ago.		
	But, I would sincerely hope that the consultation process is more than this survey and the Mayor's 6 sessions.		
	If the City wants resident opinion, then program information should be provided.		
	Let's do a zero-budget analysis of the non-core activities at City Hall.		
	Significantl savings might occur.		
87	Question 14: none of the information sessions are conveniently timed and situated for me, hence cannot attend.		
88	Articles about Lisa Helps. Thanks Lisa for your fine example of leadership!		
89	Victoria Times Colonist article on Saturday, Jan 19, 2013.		
	VicNews		
	Regarding questions 14 and 15, I have been independently reading/following City's budget issues (and infrastructure deficit) for years.		
	I would rather that the City repair the sidewalks so I can walk on them then have a staff someone subsidize free dinners for prairie snow-birds or to create		
90	programs for a few people.		
91	facebook		
92	Through the Greater Victoria Cycling Coalition		
93	advertisement		
94	email		
95	Twitter		
96	friend on facebook.		

14. Did you attend an information session?			
Answer Options		Response Percent	Response Count
Yes		22.9%	24
No		77.1%	81
		answered question	105
		skipped question	8
15. Did you use the website for information?			
Answer Options		Response Percent	Response Count
Yes		77.6%	83
No		22.4%	24
		answered question	107
		skipped question	6