

Scott Anderson answers to my email are in blue.

From: Floyd P <floydpinto84@gmail.com>

Sent: Monday, January 29, 2024 8:23 PM

To: Scott Anderson <sanderson@adjtos.ca>; Adam Cox <acox@adjtos.ca>; Miklos Borsos <mborsos@adjtos.ca>; Ronald O'Leary <roleary@adjtos.ca>; Bob Meadows <bmeadows@adjtos.ca>; Julius Lachs <jlachs@adjtos.ca>; Anub Simson <asimson@adjtos.ca>

Subject: Budget questions

Dear members of Council,

I heard the township budget deliberations and was rather surprised to see council debating over a few thousand dollars for fixing an existing sidewalk infrastructure in Colgan since the last budget and a pilot programme in Lisle and Glencarin for removable speed reduction infrastructure both of which are good projects requested by the respective ward councillors when close to \$900,000 of taxpayer dollars due to tax payers are not being collected.

To update the new councillors. As Mayor Scott Anderson is fully aware during his last term on council as a councillor he, Councillor Scott Anderson along with Councillor Jonathan Pita, Councillor Annette Bays, Councillor Deborah Hall Chancey petitioned two council meetings as I would not call the meetings due to concerns of lack of transparency and matters being discussed contrary to the law and the Municipal Act.

The Provincial Ombudsman already gave his decision that the March 1 petitioned meeting was contrary to the Municipal Act. The November 9, 2021 council meeting to discuss the Tribute Communities subdivision agreement was again petitioned by the same 4 councillors although they were fully aware that all documents were not available as per the councillors emails. The Land Tribunal has now stated in writing that Township Council and Township Engineers John Thompson had no authority to change the draft plan conditions without the Tribunal Approval. This concern was brought to council's attention by residents along with other financial concerns for the Tribute Communities development at the subdivision approval meeting. Fully aware of the problems all on council approved the subdivision agreement in a recorded vote with the exception of then Deputy Mayor Bob Meadows and myself as I was absent and at another meeting, Councillor Annette Bays signed the subdivision agreement. On my last day at the Township I was informed by staff that the Township would not be collecting any money from Tribute Communities for the water hookups which would amount to approximately \$600,000+ and that council would be responsible as they approved the Tribute Communities Sub-division agreement.

My questions below are to the Mayor and I would like him to answer as he was one of the four councillors who petitioned the meeting and voted in favour of the subdivision agreement that has now left Taxpayers to pay for the developers infrastructure approximately \$600,000+.

1. As per the subdivision agreement the Township was to collect water hookup fees from Tribute Communities for each home built. Is Tribute communities paying the hookup fees as per the water and wastewater bylaw approved by council?

Assuming the enquiries regarding “hookup fees” for potable water & wastewater services should more properly be referencing “connection fees”, it should be clarified that the intent of such fees are to reimburse the Township, for works required to accommodate the connections, which are in existence and/or constructed at the Township’s cost to provide, supply, treatment, and conveyance in the case of Water, and conveyance, treatment, and disposal in the case of Wastewater.

In the case of the Colgan development, the Township was not required to construct or fund these works, but rather the works were designed, and constructed by the developer at their cost – which means that no connection charges would be required – or if paid would be required to be credited to the developer against other fees – as the developer actually shouldered the costs for which the fees are intended.

It may be interesting to note that during Subdivision Agreement negotiations, in an effort to provide some short term capital to the Township, the developer agreed to upfront some of those fees (for water - 315 residential units in Colgan 1 and for 210 residential units in Colgan 2) – of course these funds, if received, would have to be returned to the developer by either cash or appropriate credit – for the reasons explained above.

The provincial tribunal (bearing several acronyms over the last few decades: OMB, LPAT, now OLT) dictated that the Township would be financially responsible for all costs of increased Wastewater treatment facility capacity to enable it to accommodate the pre-existing Colgan community historically being served with municipal drinking water (the facility has been appropriately sized). Given the current estimated cost of Wastewater Treatment Construction, this equates to an obligation by the Township of approximately \$5,000,000.

Early negotiation between Township Staff and the Developer representative provided for a mutually documented and agreed trade off. The agreement relieved the Township of their obligation to provide some \$5,000,000 to the developer for the Township’s share in the Wastewater treatment facility capital construction and not requiring the up-front payment of some 525 residential water connection fees (which would have had to be returned in any event.) **The net result Adjala-Tosorontio avoids a payment of some \$5,000,000.**

2. If Tribute communities are paying the water hookup fees why is it not showing in the budget as Income? Every other resident who has hooked up to municipal water in the last terms of council shows as income in the budget.

The answer is contained in the response above – “connection fees” were not charged to the developer as per the agreement.

Other Township residents which were required to pay connection fees due to the fact that they were benefiting from existing infrastructure constructed by the Township that provided accommodation for their connection (i.e. supply, treatment, and conveyance in the case of Water, and conveyance, treatment, and disposal in the case of Wastewater) have been accounted for in Township accounts.

3. If Tribute Communities was given an exemption from paying the hookup fees. When was this exemption given? Please provide me with the Staff Report, the Resolution Number and the Council meeting when this exemption was given.

As explained above, the Colgan developer was not given an exemption – as the Subdivision Agreement required the developer to fund and construct the necessary facilities for which connection fees are intended to cover.

The beneficial negotiations to allow a **saving of some \$5,000,000 for Adjala-Tosorontio** was effected in accordance with the Subdivision Agreement provisions.

4. I was informed by staff, Tribute Communities was putting in the water pipes therefore they were given an exemption. However, nowhere in the subdivision Agreement does it make any such mention. Please direct me to the section and paragraph where it states if Tribute Communities puts in the water infrastructure pipes they will be exempt from water hookup fees?

It must be noted – that there was **no exemption**. Staff informed you of the works Tribute was undertaking including the installation of Water and Wastewater (i.e. supply, treatment, and conveyance in the case of Water, and conveyance, treatment, and disposal in the case of Wastewater) If the word exemption was used it unfortunately was in error. Construction of services including water infrastructure has been undertaken in accordance with the Subdivision Agreement Provisions.

5. If Tribute Communities was given an exemption as they put the water pipes infrastructure to the homes, will the Township be refunding the water hookup charges to all the other municipal water users (Total around 1021 users in Lisle, Everette, Hockley, Loretto and Colgan) who were charged water hook up fees as those developers also put in the pipes to the homes?

Recalling the fact that there was **no exemption** – In many cases the various developers installed the municipal water systems in these communities or had to provide capital works to upgrade the systems without the need for individual residents to pay connection fees.

A future organization, funding and constructing the necessary infrastructure would likewise not be required to pay connection fees, or if paid would have them paid back or credited, for all the reasons previously stated.

6. This water hook up fee was to cover the costs for the well that was expanded at 5th sideroad and Concession 7 especially to accommodate the development. The township took a loan to pay for this well. If no hook up fees are being collected from Tribute communities have the township residents been left to pay up the loan of over \$300,000 of which around \$200,000 was for the Colgan well? Are the township residents subsidizing Tribute communities water hookup fees?

The Subdivision Agreement and the necessary external works required to be designed, funded, and constructed by the developer includes considerable costly obligations to be undertaken by the developer related to the existing water supply. These obligations include those that accrue to the benefit of both the developer and the pre-existing water customers. Further, all municipal rate payers benefit from the considerable saving of some **\$5,000,000**, as previously described.

7. During our term of council 2018-2022 a specified audit was done. This audit identified around \$300,000 that could not be accounted for. Council passed a resolution that the report be sent to the O.P.P as they had recommended a forensic audit. I have been informed by the O.P.P that staff never followed the direction of council and the specified audit report was never sent to the O.P.P so no money could be recovered. Councillor Scott Anderson, Councillor Ron O’Leary and Councillor Jonathan Pita were the councillors who voted against sending the specified report to the O.P.P.. Why are you raising residents taxes when around \$300,000 cannot be accounted for and you did not want to recover this money?

The specified audit noted some deficiencies in Township accounting practices and made recommendations to correct these deficiencies. I can’t speak to if the OPP was provided a copy of the specified audit as per Council direction. However, at no time was there any direction from Council to the OPP or Township Staff to further investigate or recover funds. Direction was given to Staff to update policies and procedures on the items of concern, (i.e. mileage and lieu time). Recalling the meeting conversation, the forensic auditor at the meeting which the report was presented, informed Council that some funds were unaccounted for in the transactions but this did not imply the funds were missing from the accounts or of any fraudulent activities. Further, they made no recommendations to investigate these funds. The year-end audited financial statements provided no further evidence the funds were missing. Your claim of “...around \$300,000...you did not want to recover...” is unsubstantiated.

8. During the 2018-2022 term of council Tribute communities made numerous freedom of information requests and was billed little to nothing. Yet residents make a small freedom of information request and are made to pay for every page and staff time as per our fees bylaw.

Will council be amending the fees bylaw to give residents the same benefit as was given to Tribute communities?

The Township can only charge/recover for FOI requests as per the Provincial legalisation. FOI requests and subsequent information provided to the requestor is billed correctly, Tribute or otherwise.

Tribute filed multiple FOI requests as a direct result to unnecessary delays and manipulations of Council during the last Council term. These requests resulted in a significant lawsuit on the Township by Tribute, costing thousands of dollars to the ratepayer.

The Township benefitted greatly by Tribute's position of not advancing their significant lawsuit providing the development process proceeded at a reasonable pace – which it has.

9. In 2022 the township contributed approximately \$110,000 to the Stevenson Memorial Hospital in addition to the fracture equipment that was purchased by the council in the 2011-2014 term. Can the Mayor provide me with how much the neighbouring township of Essa and New Tecumseth donated to the hospital? The County of Simcoe donates to all hospitals as the Mayor and Deputy Mayor sit on the County Council. Have you made any effort to get funding from the County for the hospital? I think all 3 municipalities need to fund the hospital equally or based on population.

The Town of New Tecumseth is working with Stevenson Memorial Hospital and are providing some in-kind support as well as contributing to their Hospital Contribution Reserve Fund. The Township of Essa recently donated some of their annual golf Tournament proceeds to the Hospital Foundation. The County of Simcoe has committed 10 million to the redevelopment. There is a great need to see this redevelopment of the hospital succeed and funding is a necessary component. I believe our Township should be leaders in the community and provide for additional investment in our community.

10. The Mayor stated he wants to pledge \$500,000 to the hospital. How does the Mayor plan to raise \$500,000 in the balance term of council?

Starting in the 2024 Budget, a \$20,000 contribution will be made to the Hospital Reserve Fund. Further contributions/reserve strategy and commitments to Stevenson Memorial Hospital will be discussed by Council. A commitment of \$500,000 could be achieved over a period of 6 to 8 years.

This email reply below is a continuation of the above email, with Scott Answers in blue, Red is my response followed by Scott answers in green and my answers in purple and Scott Anderson answer in orange.

From: Floyd P <floydpinto84@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 1, 2024 9:59 AM
To: Scott Anderson <sanderson@adjtos.ca>
Cc: Adam Cox <acox@adjtos.ca>; Miklos Borsos <mborsos@adjtos.ca>; Ronald O'Leary <roleary@adjtos.ca>; Bob Meadows <bmeadows@adjtos.ca>; Julius Lachs <jlachs@adjtos.ca>; Anub Simson <asimson@adjtos.ca>
Subject: Re: Budget questions

Good Evening Mayor Anderson,

Thank you for your reply. Would appreciate it if you can reply and provide further clarity on my questions below in red.

1. Based on your answer to my first question, you state "In the case of the Colgan development, the Township was not required to construct or fund these works, but rather the works were designed, and constructed by the developer at their cost – which means that no connection charges would be required – or if paid would be required to be credited to the developer against other fees – as the developer actually shouldered the costs for which the fees are intended.

My response

To stick with the Terms of the Ontario Municipal Board now OLT the works were defined as "Hook ups fees" hence referenced. Could you clarify when you say the hook up fees if paid would have to be credited against other fees. What other fees are you referring to? Could you please provide details of these other fees and amounts?

Scott response

The "other fees" would be in relation to the capital water infrastructure and the Wastewater Treatment Facility had the Township not negotiated a favorable result.

My response

The OLT makes no mention of the Township having to pay for any upgrade of the water system. Please direct me to the section of the OLT decision where the OLT has stated that the Township shall share costs associated with water upgrades. Why is the cost of water upgrades put on taxpayers when the OLT has not made any such order. The township had not delegated authority to staff so any negotiations should have come to council for approval. Please provide me with these staff reports and negotiations approved by the council through resolution.

Scott response

The OLT Decision does not cover all aspects of a possible development agreement. Both the Township and Tribute negotiated in “good faith” on several matters resulting in a comprehensive Subdivision Agreement. Contrary to your belief, Staff had the responsibility to negotiate the Subdivision Agreement and provisions of the Agreement.

Scott response

The provincial tribunal (bearing several acronyms over the last few decades: OMB, LPAT, now OLT) dictated that the Township would be financially responsible for all costs of increased Wastewater treatment facility capacity to enable it to accommodate the pre-existing Colgan community historically being served with municipal drinking water (the facility has been appropriately sized). Given the current estimated cost of Wastewater Treatment Construction, this equates to an obligation by the Township of approximately \$5,000,000.

My response

Could you provide me with the final cost of the wastewater system to include the new homes, the existing homes and the retirement home? Will the existing residents of Colgan be asked to connect to the new wastewater system to recover this \$5,000,000 in future?

Scott response

The Wastewater Treatment Facility as noted before was correctly sized to accommodate the pre-existing community and new development. With increased construction and material costs the Wastewater Treatment Facility costs also increased. Had an agreement not been negotiated the Township obligation of the costs would be considerably higher. To be clear, the Township does not need to recover \$5,000,00 as the Township negotiated relief of this obligation.

My response

Was this negotiation in the best interest of the township? if we would be responsible for raising costs of material etc. Should the negotiations not have been that the township fixes its costs based on the day the subdivision agreement is signed. The way it stands now is the developer could build the plant 2-3 years from now and the costs will be substantially higher. Although we do not have to pay, it would again be misleading to the residents that we obtained substantial savings when in fact we would have got a better deal had the costs been fixed to a certain date like signing of the subdivision agreement and would not be determined when the developer builds the plant. How can you say we do not need to recover the \$5,000,000 and call it a relief of this obligation? This relief as you call it was given by the developer not paying the water hook up fees.

The township lost revenue on the water hook up fees, hence this lost revenue should be recovered from the residents who will benefit from future connections to the wastewater system? Will the school be given a free hook up to the waste water system?

Scott response

As part of the OLT decision the Township was responsible for a share of the Wastewater Treatment Facility to accommodate the pre-existing community of Colgan. Tribute agreed to cover costs of the Treatment Facility and therefore the Township did not need to commit dollars of some \$5,000,000 to the project. This agreement was negotiated parallel to the Subdivision Agreement. Had Tribute not relieved the obligation, alternative options as you suggest could have been included in the Subdivision Agreement. Charging Water connection fees to recover some of the Township's capital infrastructure while also contributing to the capital project of the Wastewater Treatment Facility would not have saved the Township the considerable amount as noted.

Should any of the pre-existing community (including the school) wish to connect to the Wastewater Treatment Facility a connection charge and/or capital works would apply.

Scott response

Early negotiation between Township Staff and the Developer representative provided for a mutually documented and agreed trade off. The agreement relieved the Township of their obligation to provide some \$5,000,000 to the developer for the Township's share in the Wastewater treatment facility capital construction and not requiring the up-front payment of some 525 residential water connection fees (which would have had to be returned in any event.) **The net result Adjala-Tosorontio avoids a payment of some \$5,000,000.**

My response

With regards to these negotiations between Township staff and the Developer representative that resulted in a mutually documented and agreed trade off. Could you provide me with the staff report and the resolution of the council that approved this trade off? The last O.P.P investigation into the township found lack of proper resolutions and records. I would like to ensure that there were proper resolutions to approve this trade off just in case I have forgotten this trade off was approved by the council as a whole. You will surely agree that staff take direction from the council as a whole though bylaw or resolution.

Scott response

As noted in my original response the negotiations and agreement are covered under the Subdivision Agreement Provisions. The Subdivision Agreement was endorsed by Council.

My response

As noted in my previous question in Red, as you have stated these negotiations were mutually documented and agreed to a trade off. I am again asking you to provide me with the staff report where these mutually documented negotiations and trade off were brought to council attention and approved by resolution of council. If as you say, it is in the subdivision agreement approved by council, you petitioned the meeting for and voted in favor of the subdivision agreement knowing all documents were not available as per your email. As you voted on this subdivision agreement you should be able to direct me to which section of the subdivision agreement identified these negotiations and trade off. Please provide me with the required sections.

Scott response

Contrary to your comments and belief, Township Staff were responsible to negotiate a Subdivision Agreement and any provision of this agreement. Personally, I was well informed prior to these decisions, having talked with both Township Staff and the developer. It was understood the developer was to shoulder the cost of the Wastewater Treatment Facility and discontinue the lawsuit. This agreement provided direct relief to the Township and ratepayers on both construction and legal costs. Having spent some \$450,000 in development litigation to that point.

My response

I may have additional questions on point 2, 3, 4, 5 based on your response to the above question.

Point 6 : The Subdivision Agreement and the necessary external works required to be designed, funded, and constructed by the developer includes considerable costly obligations to be undertaken by the developer related to the existing water supply.

Can you provide me with the total cost of these costly obligations you have stated to be undertaken by the developer? You should have details of these costs as it was mutually documented as you stated in point 1. Staff and council should have these numbers in the staff report if any that came to council for approving this trade off.

Scott response

As noted in my original response, the obligation of the Township was a proportionate share of the construction of the Wastewater Treatment Facility. The developer is shouldering all construction costs of this Facility. The Facility is not under direct

ownership or control of the Township since the subdivision is being developed by Tribute Communities.

My response

You have not answered my question on the total costs? If you and the council do not know the total costs how can you claim that we as a township are saving money? My question was in relation to your comment in blue that the developer is undertaking costly obligations related to the existing water supply. Why are we trading costs for water upgrades when we were never required to pay for any water upgrades by the OLT decision?

Scott response

The developer, as noted previously, has made significant investment in the Water System including new equipment, water tower, waterlines etc. These improvements also provide improvement to the pre-existing community of Colgan and have been expensed by the developer.

Scott response

These obligations include those that accrue to the benefit of both the developer and the pre-existing water customers.

My response

Can you direct me to the section of the OMB now OLT decision that required the township to pay for any upgrades to the water system that benefits the pe-existing water customers?

Scott response

Considerable upgrades to the water system have occurred with this development. These upgrades provide benefit to both pre-existing community and the new development. A reasonable share of these works could have been attributed to the Township outside of the OMB decision and within the Subdivision Agreement.

My response

Why were negotiations done outside the requirements of the OLT decision? Where is the council resolution to direct staff to negotiate outside the OLT decision? If the developer needed to upgrade the water system to benefit their development it was their need. Our water system was working fine with the existing infrastructure to accommodate the existing residents. **Please provide me with a resolution from the council permitting all these upgrades and the costs associated with these upgrades. Council as a whole has not delegated authority to staff to make any**

decisions for council prior to the subdivision agreement being signed. Hence any costs or changes to the OLT decision and any negotiations or trade off would have to come to council for approval.

Scott response

Please see comments above as to the authority of staff negotiations with the developer. Water System improvements were necessary for the new development. As noted above, the developer has made significant improvements to the Water System. Part of the OLT decision was for the developer to provide appropriate servicing to the development to the satisfaction of the Township.

My response

Point 7. As per the FOI from the O.P.P they recommended a forensic audit before they could proceed. Council did not do a forensic audit but a specified audit. The audit found approximately \$300,000 unaccounted for which you have agreed to, as there were no receipts to justify these expenses. The Council resolution was for staff to send the report to the O.P.P as they recommended an audit. The auditor doing the specified audit was never asked to give a recommendation, her mandate was to only investigate. As these were tax dollars not accounted for, your voting against sending the report to the O.P.P who recommended providing this audit to them to proceed would imply that you did not want to recover the unaccounted tax dollars. In fact you even voted against doing a specified audit. As a councillor and now Mayor you have a fiduciary duty to ensure tax dollars are spent responsibly. Will you provide the leadership and ask the current council to direct staff to ensure the audit report is sent to the O.P.P as directed by the previous council to enable recovery of any funds or are you making the taxpayers pay this unaccounted \$300,000 by raising our taxes?

Scott response

As explained in my original response, Froese Forensic provided a specified audit. In their report to Council, they provided recommendations on both lieu time and mileage but did not make a recommendation to the Infrastructure and Development Funds. The auditor provided a forensic review of mileage, lieu time and corporate credit card purchases. To confirm – there was no statement of fraudulent activity nor was there a request to further investigate the Infrastructure and Development Funds. I am cognizant of my duties as a Member of Council. I also confirm the specified audit cost over **\$65,000** to the ratepaye.

My response

I am aware the audit costs \$65,000 to the ratepayers, at the same time the ratepayers lost \$300,000 that cannot be accounted for, hence the net loss to the ratepayers is \$235,000. I am surprised you show no interest in recovering money unaccounted for. But at the same time talk of making trade off to benefit taxpayers. Based on your

answer you will be making no effort to recover any money. I do hope the council as a whole keeps this in mind when voting to increase taxes.

Scott response

The comment has been answered several times, and I have no new information to share.

Scott response

The year-end audited financial statements provided no further evidence the funds were missing.

My response

I am surprised with your above statement. You have sat on the audit committee and have approved year end financial statements for the 13 years you are on council. You should know that the township auditor does not audit amounts below the materlization amount. Are residents to understand that you have been approving year end audited statements for 13 years not knowing what amounts are being audited?

Scott response

My comment remains the same – the year-end audited financial statements provided no further evidence the funds were missing.

My response

Thank you for your comment. You have made you stand clear that you will make no effort to recover unaccounted tax dollars. This speaks volumes of your accountability and transparency to taxpayers.

Scott response

Point 8. The Township can only charge/recover for FOI requests as per the Provincial legalisation. FOI requests and subsequent information provided to the requestor is billed correctly, Tribute or otherwise.

My response

The township fees bylaw for FOI fees is in accordance with the provincial legislation. Hundreds if not thousands of documents and emails were requested by Tribute. You have indicated Tribute Communities FOI requests were billed correctly, if so can you explain why the budget documents do not show income for the hundred if not thousands of documents provided to Tribute communities for their FOI request. Then Deputy Mayor Bob Meadows and myself raised this concern during the budget meeting

and staff Rhonda Bunn replied staff will commence billing Tribute Communities going forward. The ex CAO Rhonda Bunn statement and the budget documents contradict your statement Tribute was billed correctly? Could you provide me with the budget document showing income from FOI requests to match the large amount of FOI requests from Tribute?

Scott response

My comment remains the same. If you would like to receive this information please contact the Clerk's Department and you may need to complete an FOI request.

My response

The documents that I relied on for information are past budget documents. Are you asking me to do an FOI request to get a budget document that by law is required to be made public? Please direct me to which section of the Municipal Freedom of information and protection of privacy act where it states I need to make a FOI request to obtain a budget document. Based on your comments the township violated the FOI by posting the budget on the internet and discussing it at a public meeting. Your direction to me to contact the clerk and do a FOI is a direct violation of the act and the Municipal act that states budgets have to be discussed in public with public input. Please note as Head of council you should be providing me with accurate information and not asking me to do things not required by law. I again ask you to provide me with the budget document showing income from FOI requests in the budget document to match the large amount of FOI requests from Tribute. If you cannot provide this document will the council as a whole be refunding all costs paid by residents for FOI requests made by residents. The fees and charges bylaw gives no exemption to developers and all are required to be treated equally under the law. Look forward to receiving the documents.

Scott response

Please contact the Clerk's Department if you are seeking specific information. As you are aware, Council delegated their authority of the Head of MFIPPA to the Clerk and information pertaining to the FOI's should be directed to the Clerk's Office.

Scott response

Tribute filed multiple FOI requests as a direct result to unnecessary delays and manipulations of Council during the last Council term.

My response

You correctly state Tribute filed multiple FOI requests. Please provide the details of the manipulations that you state took place during the last term of council? By manipulations, are you referring to the meeting you petitioned to approve the Tribute subdivision agreement knowing that not all documents were available to council, and at this same

meeting that you petitioned you along with Councillor O'Leary, Bays, Pita and Hall Chancey approved the subdivision agreement with changes that the Ontario Land Tribunal has now confirmed was not approved by them and council nor John Thompson had any authority to change? Your emails on this subdivision agreement meeting indicate you had initial concerns with the meeting proceeding until all documents were made available. You then later petitioned the meeting knowing the documents were not attached to the subdivision agreement. Please provide the Ontario Land Tribunal decision, the date when the hearing took place and the notice of the hearing to justify the changes that you and the other councillors approved are in compliance with the Draft plan conditions approved by all parties to the case as the Tribunal is unable to locate any such decisions or hearing taking place? Or are you referring to the Municipal drain that you again approved and the CAO Rhonda Bunn then put out an email stating no approvals were obtained and the work was paused. Please provide details of the manipulations that you have stated took place during the last term of council when I was Mayor.

Scott response

I again understand your strong opposition to the Colgan development and particularly to Tribute Communities. The Township benefited greatly by Tribute's position of not advancing their significant lawsuit providing the development process proceed at a reasonable pace. Unfortunately, this happened after the Township spent over **\$450,000 of ratepayers dollars on development litigation** in large part due to Council's unwillingness to work with all parties.

My response

[You have not answered my question, Please provide the details of the manipulations that you have stated took place during the last term of council?](#)

Scott response

Staying on topic to your 'budget questions' I suggest you read the discontinued litigation by Tribute Communities against the Township. This should provide the relevant information you are seeking.

My response

[Point 9. The Township of Essa recently donated some of their annual golf Tournament proceeds to the Hospital Foundation.](#)

My response

The township of Essa and our Township are approximately same in size although Essa takes in more in taxes and slightly higher population. Would it not be a better solution to fund the Hospital foundation through a similar golf tournament or other forms of indirect

funding that has no direct implications on taxpayers rather than make it a direct charge on taxpayers.

Scott response

Thank you for your suggestion. These decisions are in the hands of the current Members of Council.

Look forward to your reply to further clarify your answers and where required please provide the staff reports, resolutions of council or Ontario land tribunal decisions to back up your answers.

Thanks

Floyd Pinto