. 22 May 1975

#### RE: MONEY BY-LAWS - NOVEMBER 1975

At a special meeting of Council on 14 May 1975 the following motion was passed:

"That the staff come forward to Council with a report on the three money by-law presentations namely, Library, Parks and Recreation, and Roads with their effect individually and collectively on the mill rate."

First, a look at trends of the past.

Inclusive of water and schools, the gross debt of this community rose from \$44,092,000 or \$384 per capita in 1967 to \$65,449,000 or \$487 per capita in 1974. Net debt after application of sinking funds, the B.C. Government responsibility for school debt and a portion of the water system debt, rose from \$31,218,000 or \$271 per capita to \$46,292,000 or \$345 per capita in 1974. In other words, in seven years gross debt has grown by 48.4% and net debt by 48.3%, almost in parity.

Table 1 attached shows the patterns of expenditures in the years 1967 to 1975. It shows that general government services, transportation services, environmental health services and environmental development services, have taken relatively constant portions of the total revenues year by year. Protective services have grown from 10.84% in 1967 to a peak of 12.9% in 1973, dropping slightly to 12.4% in 1975. Public health and welfare costs have grown from 8.6% in 1967 to 15.6% in 1971, dropping back to 14.6% in 1975; recreation and cultural services from 5.2% to 8% in 1971, staying at about this level up to and including 1975.

Debt charges have declined from 9.3% to 8.1%; transfers to reserves from 14.6% to 3.7%; transfers of water utility collections from 3.1% to 2%. Transfers to the capital improvement program rose from 3.5% in 1967 to 7.6% in 1970 and dropped back to 3.2% by 1975. Collections for other Boards have risen steadily from 32.1% in 1967 to 37.1% in 1975.

- 2 -

From this it can be concluded that while some services retained a steady proportion of total expenditures, others such as protective services, public health and welfare (mostly welfare), recreation and cultural services, and collections for other Boards, have grown whereas debt charges, transfers to reserves and transfers to capital improvements have declined. This decline has been deliberate, particularly in the last several years, in an attempt to keep mill rates within limits prescribed by Council.

Table 2 shows the trends of revenues over the years. It shows that tax collections (which includes frontage and business taxes) have comprised a varying proportion of total revenues over the years - yet, as will be seen from Table 5 attached to this report, the actual effect on a homeowner has been a constant rise in taxes. The heading "Transfers, collections for other governments" excludes collections for the Greater Vancouver Sewerage & Drainage District which, by statute, form part of the general tax levy (also the Greater Vancouver Regional District until 1974).

The debt charges shown in Table 1 are gross charges. The next step in this exercise is to determine the proportions of the debt charges payable by direct tax levy and by special charges or other revenue. Table 3 makes this analysis. In the process it breaks down a portion of the tax supported debt applicable to parks and recreation operations so that the latter figure may be lumped together with parks and recreation operation costs in the manner shown in Table 4.

Table 3 shows that while the gross debt charges grew from \$2,452,435 in 1967 to \$5,347,126 in 1975 or 118%, the portion, excluding the portion for parks purposes borne by the tax levy, grew from \$1,589,902 in 1967 to \$2,613,295 in 1973 but because of Sewerage Facilities Assistance Fund grants, dropped to \$2,257,113 in 1975, a net growth of only 42%.

Table 4 combines all mill rate tax levies into one total. It then breaks the total down into its component parts into a somewhat different fashion than the original mill rates would indicate. In compiling tax levies, total revenues receivable are subtracted from gross expenditures to arrive at the sums to be raised as taxes. In making the calculations for Parks and Recreation and Library levies, only the revenues receivable by these Boards are included. All other Municipal revenues were applied in the calculation termed as "General purposes levy excluding items marked \* ".

This table shows that the portion of the debt charges excluding debt for parks purposes raised by taxes has declined over the years from 10.17% to 5.64%; that the general tax levy has fluctuated year by year; that the Parks levy, including debt charges, has grown from 9.19% to 12.10%; the Library levy from 2.23% to 3.03%; the school levy from 47.31% to 53.51%; and that the Greater Vancouver Sewerage & Drainage District portion has declined from 3.92% to 2.29%, despite the enormous expenditures made by this Board in the past five years. This may be accounted for in part by the fact that the Provincial Government, through the Sewerage Facilities Assistance Fund Act, has given grants to alleviate a portion of the debt charges forming part of this cost.

Regional Hospital District rates entered this picture in 1968 as did the Greater Vancouver Regional District, and subsequently came the Municipal Finance Authority and Assessment Authority rates.

Table 5 shows the tax growth picture of a median property between 1961 and 1975, a period selected to coincide with the Coat of Living Index. It shows that in the period under study, 1967 to 1975, gross taxes, inclusive of the addition of a local improvement street project in 1968 and a lane project in 1971, increased by 98.5% and that after application of the Provincial Home-Owner grant, the net taxes increased by 92.2%.

- 3 -

It is of interest to note that the Consumer Price Index in 1967 was 111 whereas in 1974 it was 157.4 in comparison with an index on the growth in net taxes on this property of 127.31 in 1967 to 244.78 in 1975. The actual growth of net taxes in this period was 92.27% as compared with a growth in the Consumer Price Index of 41.8%.

Attached also is Table 6 which shows that wages paid by the Municipality to its labourers grew from \$2.705 (average) to \$4.740 or 75.6% as compared with the growth in the Consumer Price Index of 41.8%.

This material is voluminous but it is necessary to show that the annual tax bill of a median property has accelerated at a greater rate than the increase in the Consumer Price Index and that the proportions of the total revenues of the Municipality devoted to the creation of reserves, transfers to capital funds and debt charges have declined in order to keep tax increases to a reasonable level and at the same time allow the costs of protective services, welfare, recreation and cultural services to increase to meet the demands of the day. They indicate that if these trends continue the Municipality will have to continue restricting the creation of debt, the setting up of reserves and the use of revenue for capital purposes, unless there is to be a substantial increase in property tax rates or alternative sources of revenue are found.

The following outlines the borrowing programs currently before Council as extracted from the Capital Improvement Program 1975-1980 which will be before Council shortly. Some of this information was not available for inclusion in Item 21, Manager's Report No. 33, of 5 May 1975.

#### Sanitary Sewers

Projected expenditures are \$3,584,092, of which \$1,341,474 is on hand, requiring further borrowing of \$2,242,618. The annual charges for repaying this debt will be absorbed by the Sanitary Sewer Utility by means of an increase in rates.

#### Local Improvements

During the past several years, on advice of the Manager, Council has restricted the amount of local improvement work undertaken. In 1975, the program, including ornamental lighting, totalled \$1,946,270. Indications are that demand from the public and the capability of staff to provide same is at least in the \$2,500,000 range annually. 50% of the annual carrying charges would be payable from the general tax levy and the balance by way of frontage taxes.

#### Storm Sewers

The Capital Improvement Program shows a need of \$4,842,000 to be apent 1976-1981.

#### Parks

The program as produced by the Parks and Recreation Commission shows:

Referendum - construction period 1977-1981	\$ 11,333,431
Referendum - land acquisitions 1977-1981	5,798,704
Annual budget - construction 1976	153,720
Annual budget - land acquisitions 1976-1981	1,800,000
	\$ 19,085,855

- 4 -

The Commission has asked for a referendum of only \$17,132,135, assuming that the balance will be forthcoming from the annual budget. It is respectfully suggested that this assumption should not have been made. They cannot expect to borrow for part of their program and to obtain the balance from the annual tax levy, although it is a fact that we have been through this exercise twice before. On two occasions borrowing by-laws have been brought down but before long demands by the public for facilities not in the by-law soon made themselves known and the annual budget had to be tapped for funds. In particular, the 1971 by-law was supposed to provide sufficient funds for the land acquisition program but it soon became evident that this was not the case and large sums had to be found from the tax levy. This indicates that the Commission in the past has not been successful in accurately forecasting capital needs over a five year period. It suggests that five years is too long a period over which to have a by-law. In this respect, a great deal has been said about the principle of getting approval of the ratepayers for specific parks and recreation projects but the facts are that in the past approval has been sought for only a partial list of facilities - funds being taken out of revenue for the rest.

During the discussions on their presentation, the Commissioners pointed out that some of the proposed facilities have been reduced in size, to scale down the costs. It is suggested that this may not have been a good decision because past experience has shown that public demand tends to cause the deletions to be restored or, in some instances, the original concept changed completely. Luckily, unexpected Government grants became available and took care of these added facilities and unexpected inflation in costs.

Further, no provision has been made in the proposed Parks by-law for development of Oakalla lands and obviously this is going to be needed during the next five years. Also, one major land acquisition has been deleted which has been in our previous Capital Improvement Programs and on which considerable time and effort has been expended in negotiating with the owners. There may be other points of this nature to be considered, but time has not permitted a detailed examination of the program to determine what they may be.

In other words, the by-law probably should be greater than \$19,085,855 (as adjusted above). The sum shown makes no allowance for Provincial recreation grants which could amount to as much as \$3,807,000 if the grant program remains in Victoria for the term of the by-law. It is our recommendation that a by-law being put before the rate-payers should be for the estimated gross amount of the projects. Grants subsequently received can be used to make up deficiencies in estimates and/or inadequate provision for inflation; reduce the amount of borrowing actually necessary; or with the permission of the Inspector of Municipalities, applied to new works.

For the purposes of this report, the sum of \$19,085,855 will be used in the calculations.

#### Roads

The Planner brought down a report covering \$18,397,467 (at 1976 costs) in road works. This total is subject to alteration when the changes to the program suggested by members of Council are analysed. This analysis has been made but cost figures are not available. Nor does the above figure include provision for inflation. Therefore \$20,000,000 is arbitrarily chosen as the figure for 1976-78 and a further \$20,000,000 for the period 1979-81.

As with the Parks program of works, the Roads program has not been refined to the point where one can feel confident about all of the estimates. Without adequate plans and specifications, it is doubtful that these cost estimates could be improved in time for presentation of the by-law to Council in early September of this year.

#### Library

The Capital Improvement Program indicates an expenditure of \$5,825,000. To this has been added \$200,000 for land acquisition, which may or may not be sufficient. The land for the headquarters Library is already in the possession of the Municipality and it is customary to charge a project with the cost of the land being used. The two branch Library sites have yet to be acquired.

Table 7 shows accumulated new borrowing, exclusive of sanitary sewers and 50% of local improvements, of \$78,425,990.

Table 8 shows the annual debt levies required to retire this debt if a 10% coupon is required on the debentures.

Table 9 shows the mill rates that may be required to pay these sums and Table 10 shows the effect thereof on the median residential property in the Municipality. When relating Table 10 to Table 5 one can see that there would be an increase in taxes over seven years, due to debt charges only, of 30%.

This contrasts with the fact that taxes on the median property increased between 1967 and 1975 by 92.2% whereas the proportion of the tax levy relative to debt charges was 10.17% in 1967 and only 5.56% in 1975. Projections of this nature can be most unreliable. They assume that the existing rate of growth in construction will continue at present levels and that the inflation of the past will continue. If the growth doesn't occur, the cost of supporting this debt will rise faster than projected.

Table 11 shows the operating costs projected by Parks staff for their program. It contains a rate for inflation compounded at 15% per annum. It shows that by 1982 the operating costs are likely to require .33 mills and cost the sample homeowner \$15.00 on his tax bill.

All of this looks very rosy, but it is not. It simply shows that one phase of our economy will cost X number of dollars. However, it ignores the balance of our economy which is most difficult to project.

On the one hand we have expenditures, the growth patterns of which are not constant and on the other, revenues which do not grow at a constant rate. As will be noted from an earlier section of this report, the proportions of the total revenues of the Municipality devoted to the creation of reserves, transfers to capital funds and the payment of debt charges, have steadily been reduced to pay for increases in services such as protection to persons and property, welfare, recreation and cultural services, among other things. There is no justification whatever for saying that the Municipality can assume the cost of repaying large scale new borrowings unless at the same time we can be assured additional revenues sufficient to cover.

- 6.-

One other matter that should be considered by Council is whether or not to adopt the recommendation put forward by the Capital Improvement Committee in that "Council adopt the principle of submitting to the ratepayers annually as circumstances may indicate, a money by-law to include those projects of of ratepayers, and which projects are capable of funding within a three year period."

The reasoning of staff was as follows:

- 1. Projects should be considered in relation to priority one with the other.
- 2. The capital needs of the community are continuous.
- 3. It is most difficult to accurately forecast capital needs in priority one with the other over a period longer than three years, and it is almost impossible to calculate costs even over three years, especially if no design work has been done.
- 4. When possible, basic designs should be on hand before a by-law is put.

In summary, staff feel that only those projects which are of immediate concern should be put to the electorate at any one time.

This, of course, ignores political considerations. The usual argument against a composite by-law is that electors are being asked to vote for a range of projects, some of which they may not agree with. As a consequence, a voter may vote against the by-law because he is opposed to one project or he may find himself having to vote in favour of a by-law because he very much desires one project but has little interest in, or has opposition to, some others in the by-law.

It is suggested that this can apply to a parks, roads or library by-law, put separately. Some of the electors will be opposed to some of the projects, especially the location of roads and other facilities.

The principal problem with putting by-laws separately at the same election is that electors may vote on an either/or basis and favour one by-law against the other. When this happens, what does Council do for funds if the projects in the defeated by-law are of prime importance to the community?

Composite by-laws are not new. Vancouver City has used them for more than twenty years. In the past several years, Richmond and Victoria have employed them with success.

As has been demonstrated in the past, especially in correction with sanitary sewers, Council is in a much better position to assess the capital needs of the community than is an uninformed public.

Conclusions:

In reviewing this whole subject, your Manager and your Treasurer have concluded that because:

(a) It is always desirable to minimize borrowings, especially at times of high interest rates;

- (b) The Parks and Recreation Commission has over \$1 million to spend remaining in the 1971 Parks by-law;
- (c) The Parks and Recreation Commission does not plan to do any by-law construction work until 1977;
- (d) The Library Board will not be ready for a by-law before November 1976;
- (e) The Parks and Recreation Commission are proposing to spend an additional \$1.8 million in land acquisitions in the C.I.P. over and above the \$5.8 million included in the proposed by-law;
- (f) Planning, estimating of costs and scope of works are not really as definitive as they should be to be thoroughly reliable for a major road by-law and/or a parks by-law this Fall, be they in composite or separate by-laws;
- (g) It is possible to interim finance any advance planning and design costs required for parks and roads without resorting to a money by-law for this purpose;
- (h) It is desirable to pursue an aggressive land acquisition program for parks and roads purposes;
- (i) It is becoming very obvious that we cannot maintain and operate the parks and recreation facilities we have now and hold operating costs in check without building additional facilities at this time;

the parks by-law, with the exception of the land acquisition portion, should be deferred until next year and that one by-law go forward to the electorate in November this year to include the Kensington and Boundary, and Gilley (if desired by Council) projects, together with funds for acquisition of parks sites and road rights-of-way lands. We would be talking of a money by-law amounting to approximately \$18 million inclusive of Gilley Avenue Alternate if one included the \$1.8 million for additional park land acquisitions proposed in the C.I.P. So that no time will be lost in making ready for a by-law for parks and libraries next year, and further roads at a later date, we may borrow temporary sums in accordance with Section 260 of the Municipal Act, to a maximum of \$500,000 and proceed with the engagement of necessary consultants and the preparation of plans and specifications.

It is our belief that unless we are confident in knowing exactly what we are going to do in parks and road work, we should not put a by-law or by-laws at this time.

We do know that the Boundary Road and Kensington projects are pressing problems as are the acquisitions of parks lands and road rights-of-way and the preparation of plans and specifications for future projects. We know also that every member of Council believes the Gilley Avenue Alternate to be a top priority project.

We know also that municipalities ready to go with plans and specifications on hand are given top priority by Provincial authorities in the event of a Federal winter works program, and that the Province will authorize money by-laws for such projects without a vote of the electorate.

\$14,500,000

- 8 -

#### RECOMMENDATIONS

1. THAT Council consider putting a composite by-law to the electorate in November, the by-law to make provision for the following:

Kensington Avenue, Hastings to Sprott

Boundary Road, 29th Ave. to Dubois

Land acquisitions for balance of road
projects

Land acquisitions for parks as proposed in the Parks &
Recreation presentation

Additional as shown in the C.I.P.

Contingency

\$ 5,400,000

3,043,600

\$ 967,800

\$ 1,800,000

4,988,000

100,600

and

- 2. THAT staff be instructed to bring forth a complete report on the Gilley Avenue Alternate for consideration of Council for possible inclusion in the by-law; and
- 3. THAT staff be instructed to prepare the plans and specifications of the several roads and parks projects and that from time to time, as required, temporary loan by-laws be passed to finance the cost of engaging consultants to do the necessary work.

MUNICIPAL THEASURER

BM:gw Attach.

cc: Director of Planning
Planner II (CRL)
Municipal Engineer
Parks & Recreation Administrator

# She Computation of the The Euler sing Computation of the single statement of Person editation for the year of 21 becomes I entrai Municipal Funds (# 5! outsain)

TABLE 1

100   100	<b>=</b> -:-	3 - 4	<del></del> 5 -	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	<del></del> 6	5 <del></del>			<del></del>		:	<del></del>	:	:===	-	: <del></del>	<del></del> .			3 <del></del>		
1. 7 ° 6. 5 ° 6 ° 6 ° 6 ° 6 ° 6 ° 6 ° 6 ° 6 ° 6 °			18%	7	19	68	10	,0	107	<u>'o                                     </u>	19	7/	10-	<u> </u>	<i>- 0</i>	ツ ローニー	<i> 0</i>	<u>で</u> イーニー	10	<u> </u>	<del></del>	<del></del> -
1 7 16		Le Mai governant services	7	1226		1248		1366		145		1591		172/9		£ 154		259		240	- 1	
10 8 11 1 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 1			14	10%	3.	9 %	4.	0.0/0	14	0 %	14	0 0/2	4	1 %	4	3 %	4	. Wolg	3	. K etg .		
10 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1		Prototive circus		163		3 415		3 614		3 943		4 159		5 372		£ 330		7 021		8158		
100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100			10.8	8 0%	4	1 00	10.	700	10.	2 %	11	6 %	12.	6 0/0	12	.90%	12	. 200	12	1210		
Fille halts and what some 249 300 300 300 300 300 300 300 300 300 30		- Validate The Winds	1:11	1024	_;_	026		1 163	14	1208	<del> </del>	1600	<u> </u>	1342		1731		1852	$\bot$	2274	1 1	
Fillie is acte and with source 2 249, 3 20 222 540 602 602 602 602 602 602 602 602 602 60			4.	100	7	9 0/0	2.	5 %	2	3 %	14	o de	3.	1 %	2	する	ئ	-240	3	ه کین به .		
Public is act and white source 2249 3 500 3 500 1500 1500 1500 1500 1500 15		Is wonner of his the cervices		618		696		761		958		1055		1026		1 277		1441		1521		
The state of a state of the sta			7.	4010	4	2 00	7.	8 %	7	640	2	600	13	Hido	2	66	-	.5 %	7	ي ما ديا .		
According to the property of t		Butilie de acte and intake sources		2249		3 030		2828		540		6 284		6078		6789				1		
Lond 196 197 197 196 196 196 196 196 196 196 196 196 196			8.	b of 0.	9.	50/0	14.		14	9%	15	6 %	14.	2 0/2	13	-	14		14	16 of	+++	
Accreation & dentity of stringer 1858 1777 2024 2374 5 182 1928 1466 538 1466 538 1566 5 296 5 2		- Involonmental divergement streetes .		168		209		244		217		300		312	1.	3.33		29		· I .		
S. 276 5.696 4.0% 6.5 % 8.040 7.44 1.64 1.64 5.2% 1.64 5.2% 1.64 5.2% 1.64 5.2% 1.64 5.2% 1.64 5.2% 1.64 5.2% 1.64 5.2% 1.64 5.2% 1.64 5.2% 1.64 5.2% 1.64 5.2% 1.64 5.6% 1.66 5.6% 1.66 5				600		700	.	7 %		1 %		70%	1	8 0%		. 8 %		.9%	14	-0%		
254 254 254 2554 3152 322 36577 4017 42667 4962 5754 66 37 10		Reception and enteres review -		1359		1777		2024		2374	.	312		3 148		4028		4.68		21/2		
Dranefel To Newtone 19.3% 5.5% 2.4% 2.6% 2.4% 2.5% 2.5% 2.4% 2.473  Dranefel To Newtone 19.3% 5.5% 2.4% 2.4% 2.5% 2.4% 2.473  Dranefel To Newtone 19.4% 4.286 3.117 1503 1366 1.736 1.424 2.066 2.473  MANAGER'S REPORT NO. 3. 40% 2.4% 2.2% 2.9% 2.7% 2.4% 2.2% 2.9% 2.7% 2.4% 2.2% 2.9% 2.7% 2.4% 2.2% 2.2% 2.2% 2.2% 2.2% 2.2% 2.2			3.	2%	\$	600	4.	00%	6	E 0/-	8	.0%	17.	1100	7	. 2 %	7	. 8 %c	٤	بالته جاد		
Dranefil to hearine  3444 1/286 3117 1508 1366 1036 1424 5066 2475  14.6 of 13.4 of 9.3 of 4.1 of 3.4 of 2.5 of 2.7 of 5.5 of 5.7 of 6.00 managers to 0.1.1.1.  Annefit to 0.1.1.1.  14.6 of 13.4 of 9.3 of 7.3 of 1.2 of 2.205 1608 2916 1726 2.06 council MERTING 12.00 managers to 1.2 of 3.2		hold chalge	1:11	2.52	!	2675	1-1-	2824	1-1	3155		3322		3485_		4092	╂-╂	W876	1-1	5308	+ +	
Dranger to rescribe 10 1/24 1/36 1/36 1/36 1/36 1/24 2066 2473  14.6 do 13.4 do 9.3 do 1.06 3.4 do 2.9 do 2.9 do 3.7 do COUNCIL MEETING MAY STORED TO STORE TO STORE THE STREET NO. 30 1/24 1/36 1/36 1/36 1/36 1/36 1/36 1/36 1/36			9.	37.	क्र	E 7.	2	4%	8	6%	4	2 %	8.	×7.	8	. 3 %	Ę	5%	8	1.90		
The market to C.1.P. 916 2014 2413 2790 2205 1608 2976 1726 2106 COUNCIL MEETING 18 414 890 888 903 910 1078 1208 1300 MEETING 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18		Trappel to hererve				4286		3 117		1503		136		1 036		1424		3066		2473		
And titling rollection thefd.  31. 1 do 2. 4 d			14.	6 %	13.	4 %	9.	3 %	14	10/0	3.	4 00	4.	E %	2	9 %	=	3 %	3			
And titling rollection thefd.  31. 1 do 2. 4 d		Transfer to C.I.P.		916		2014		2413		2790		2205		1608		2916		1726		2/06	NAW NAW	<b>5</b>
And the state of the year of the state of th	_		3.	5 %	_6.	3 0/0	<u> </u> 4.	2%	14	642	5	50/	13	840	£	· 1 do	13	0 %	3	2 %	AGE	-
32. 10/0 32. 60/0 31. 70/0 34. 30/0 22. 90% 32. 60/0 37. 10/0 38. 20/0 32. 10/0 32.		Notes utility rollection to sfd.		97		814		890		888		903		910		1078		122		1300	L ME	8
22. 1 of 32. 6 of 31. 1 of 34. 3 of 22. 9 of 32. 6 of 37. 1 of 30. 30. 30. 30. 30. 30. 30. 30. 30. 30.			3.	40	2.	8 %	1 2.	6 %	7	4%	1	2 40	7	1 %	2	. 2 de	2	2 %	1 =	.090	REP	
Surface for the year 32.10% 32.60% 31.10% 34.30% 23.90% 34.50% 35.00% 37.10% 38.80% 32.60% 37.10% 38.80% 37.10% 38.80% 37.10% 32.60% 32.60% 32		Collections trad to stud boards		8 436		0 368		0675	,	2511		3 622		4600		1 59		= 164		24552	NG PRI	
Surface for the year   256 291 169 75 85 1104 245 263 226 3 50 1006 900 2.300 125 25 2.601 506 6 20 3 10 30 125 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 2			32.	100	32	6010	31.	7 %	34	3 %	23	9 0%	34	2.0%	33	. K %	35	.0 %	37	140	M NO	
# 16.258 31839 53 682 36.517 WO 187 4 2667 19.262 57.574; 19.257 36		Surfles for the year	1 11	258				40.00		75		i -									~	I
			111		$\vdash \downarrow$		<del>1 1 1 .</del>			<del> </del>	+-+	1	+++	<del></del>	+	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			-	7	6/7	}-
100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100			112	6258	الم	31/839	<u>1 1</u> 2	15 682	<u> </u>	16 <i>517</i>	<u>I</u>	10/7	-								S	F

long votus 2 to the set of Twent of the west of Burning Somboth Lindal Municipal Sund (4 Show and)

	Lor	and you	need of any	endi	1 three and	eb	TABLE 2	
2	3 <del></del> 1967	, 968	1969	3 <del></del> 1970	9		1975	
72/22-	10 5%	10400	1/ 637	12513	14836 13820	18165 2017		
	38.407	33.00%	34.5 %	34.3 %	36.8 42 37.2 d2 535 658	37.000 35.10		
Thanks in hear of taken	1.195	1.00%	1.1%	1 8 %	1.3 % 1.5 %	1.50/0 1.20		
(ogress)		1.8 0/2			350			-
Line i corone	508		2.0%	2.1%	347 932	2 3 0 2 2 0		
Bent revenue from our southers	1211	1461	1 635	1539	1426 1450	2 216 275	6 3510	
	4. 9 %	4.6%	4.9%	4.2%	3.5% 3.4%	4. 10/2 4. 8 0/2		
Shipile from other power minto	13.7%	16.900	16-1 %	18.3 %	18.6 0 19.2 7	19. 700 19. 7 4		
I and the stander from so gives	181	172	180	70	88 69	11 10		
Can hand sold the fol offer	. 7%	.5%	1.5 %	.200	2% 2%	195 .196	. 1 %	
- Chi Band rate for other	10321	13 438	13752	14311_	14701 15 626	18:300 21 23		
- Joseph mente 1	39.3%	42.2 %	40.9%	39.1%	34.6% 34.6%	37.3% 36.9%	43.100	7
<u> </u>	26258	3/ 839	33 682	36577	40 197 42 687	49062 5757	MANA COUN	
	00.0%	100.0%	100.0%	00.0%	100.0% 100.0%	00.0% 100.0%	MANAGER'S REPOR	:
								NATIONAL PROPERTY.
							May 2	
							39 26/75	16
						<del>                                     </del>		<u> </u>
		1 1 1			<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	

The Corporation of the District of Burnaly Cinalypis showing the composition of the unnual delt charges for the years shown

TABLES

paradonario (marino armara) adamente en juli marte del marte e del marte e del marte e del marte e del marte d	en just maganiar i maana	<del>3</del>	:: :: <del></del>	<u>== :2 ==== :3 ===== :2 =====</u>
	1967 1968	17:0 1970	1971 1972	1973 1974 1975
Dry Delit & Parque	2452 === 2695 701	2534-55 3155 189	3331 178 3428 420	4035 310 485 3576 5347 126
Lewy metile i fati	540 047 544 161 175 560 189 330	548721 551391 225025 260425	556 322 563 812 282 354 289 265	681511 826874 1097650 358047 428945 564500
Lour and Jack to Asst Suport				358 047 438 945 364500
Carte Book forgive Part.	14/6 926 14/2 8 m	11/984 70452	130 425 143 135	3/8227 584229 914522
net Debt George	1589 972 1755 056	1850 050 2138 121	2204529 2364 707	2613295 2465002 2257113
				COUN
				TEM 18 MANAGEN'S REPORT NO. COUNCIL MEETING May
				REP
				May
168				26/75
St	+		+++	<del>                                      </del>
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	<u>. L., . L</u>	<del>الليانية والبادية .</del>		

·	Analysis showing in comparition of annue tax levice is yes		ggi
e ·	went it was the level of the	TABLE 4	e∵ •
	-3	======================================	en e
Lord of Person hery  Andrew Say  Library havy  Lord of Lay  Regional Hopen Line  1	* 1 = 2 = 2 = 2	7.113 564; 7.121 764; 7.102 7.0%, 7.210 7.34; 7.201 7.201	
Marke pai Fin is Autor	1. 18 do 1.	?7.10 CIL MEETING May	R'S REPORT

Analysis showing the composition of annual tax issues follows up the down seprend in indice

TABLE 4(CONT)

1 2 3 3	4 5	67 <i>-</i>	8	=9 === 10 ===	12	
	1967 1069	1969 197	2 (27) /	972 1973	ے۔و، ہے۔	<del></del>
Send Later Cing	100,00 110.3 100.00 93.5	106.87 98.	61 129.35 1	48.73 164.37 56.16 158.90 38.84 195.27	155.05 141.97 188.12 189.98 5=1.42 342.47	
Lindy - in	100,00 104,9	1 121.63 134.	40 169.20 1 30 120.19 1	30.36 752.54	881.20 353.85 180.81 151.65	
By R. Van Park Marting		7 140.42 221.	00 /53.38 / 6 885.13 3	77.15 198.22 152.82 152.82 152.82 152.82 191.40 Wb1.22 85.58 97.16	245.17 294.07 165.13 275.39 107.14 555.64 125,45 .131.90	
muricipal tennes Authorit					10 . 90	
	112.4	1 /23.6/ /39.	10 155, 78 1	167.56 188.50	222.58 260.99	
						ITEM 18 MANAGER'S REPORT NO. COUNCIL MEETING May
167						REPORT NO. 39 ETING May 26/75

1961   1962   1967   1968   1969   1970   1971   1972   1973   1974   1975   1976	•	Summary	of taxes or			이 남자들은 학교 하다 보다 나는 것이다.	OF BURNABY		Drice Inde	<u>,</u> 1	Page 1	48LE 5
Ceneral   139, 13		Jummar y	or taxes or	i median pro	per 0y 1901-	1914 WIGH C	Omparison co	J Consumer	Frice Inde	<u>.</u>		
School 99.69 105.17 152.65 170.44 190.76 219.78 233.31 242.48 255.56 293.32 32.30 471.74 506.19 544.04 603.91 612.31 654.67 742.12 7572 Net taxes 235.12 259.53 299.33 341.74 356.19 334.04 333.91 427.31 454.67 512.12 575. Net taxes 235.12 259.53 299.33 341.74 356.19 334.04 333.91 427.31 454.67 512.12 575. Net total 105.50 153.12 196.50 153.49 155.56 226.15 224.24 228.35 256.76 229.71 251.00 256.03 35.00 35.00 36		1961 \$	1962 \$	<u>1967</u>	<u>1968</u>	<u>1969</u>	<u>1970</u>	1971 \$	<u>1972</u>	<u>1973</u> <b>\$</b>	197 <sup>1</sup> 4	1975
			142.36				219.22	251.57				338-23
Nater   25.00   25.00   30.00   30.00   30.00   30.00   30.00   36.00   \$2.0	School	<b>99.</b> 69	105.17			190.76	219.78	233.31	242.48	255.56	293.32	347.53
Sever   21.00   21.00   21.00   21.00   21.00   21.00   21.00   21.00   21.00   21.00   21.00   25.00   32.25   25.00   32.25   25.00   32.25   25.00   32.25   25.00   32.25   25.00   32.25   25.00   32.25   25.00   32.25   25.00   32.25   25.00   32.25   25.00   32.25   25.00   32.25   25.00   32.25   25.00   32.25   25.20   32.25   25.20   32.25   25.20   32.25   25.20   32.25   25.20   32.25   25.20   32.25   25.20   32.25   25.20   32.25   25.20   32.25   25.20   25.2		-			4.58	3.70	<b>5.</b> 59*	<b>6.73</b> .	<b>6.</b> 46			24.30
Total improvement=0.8.L.   13.00   1	Water					30.00	30.00	30.00	30.00	36.00	42.00	\$2.00
Local improvement—O.S.L.E.   3.00	Sewer	21.00	21.00	<b>21.</b> 00	21.00	21.00	21.00	21.00	21.00	25.00	32.25	45.00
Docal improvement-paving   Si.00   S	Local improvement-0.S.L.		13.00			13.00	13.00	13.00		-		
Local improvement-Xing   Local improvement-lane   Local improvement-l			3.00	3.00		3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00		
Total 285.12 309.53 419.33 471.74 506.19 544.04 603.91 612.31 654.67 742.12 4732 856.001 99.69 105.17 152.65 170.44 190.76 219.78 233.31 242.48 255.56 293.32 247.53 347.75 367.71 403.04 439.00 484.88 506.55 539.21 610.27 473. All others 46.00 62.00 71.58 104.03 103.15 105.04 119.03 105.76 115.46 131.85 275. Total 285.12 259.53 299.33 341.74 356.19 544.04 603.91 612.31 654.67 742.12 732 875. Net taxes 235.12 259.53 299.33 341.74 356.19 384.04 433.91 427.31 454.67 512.12 575. All other 102.10 139.93 141.48 152.25 157.23 180.43 189.39 203.44 227.32 266.85 294.23 34.04 263.25 255.25 294.23 294.23 295.35 258.76 229.71 251.00 286.63 35.25 294.24 228.35 258.76 229.71 251.00 286.63 35.25 294.24 228.35 258.76 229.71 251.00 286.63 35.25 294.24 228.35 258.76 229.71 251.00 286.63 35.25 294.24 228.35 258.76 229.71 251.00 286.63 35.25 294.24 228.35 258.76 229.71 251.00 286.63 35.25 294.24 228.35 258.76 229.71 251.00 286.63 35.25 294.24 228.35 258.76 229.71 251.00 286.63 35.25 294.24 228.35 258.76 229.71 251.00 286.63 35.25 294.24 228.35 258.76 229.71 251.00 286.63 35.25 2								31.00				31.00
Total 285.12 309.53 419.33 471.74 506.19 544.04 603.91 612.31 654.67 742.12 92.22				,	1.45	1.45	1.45					1.45
General 139.43 142.36 195.10 197.27 212.28 219.22 251.57 264.07 283.65 316.95 323 251.001 99.69 105.17 152.65 170.44 190.76 219.78 233.31 242.48 255.56 293.32 242.48 239.12 247.53 347.75 367.71 403.04 493.00 484.88 506.55 539.21 610.27 427 427 450.04 493.00 494.88 506.55 539.21 610.27 427 427 450.04 493.00 493.00 105.76 115.46 131.85 427 427 427 427 427 427 427 427 427 427	Local improvement-lane		***************************************	<del></del>			-	12.85	12.85	12.85	12.85	12.85
School 99.69 105.17 152.65 170.44 190.76 219.78 233.31 242.48 255.56 293.32 342.75  All others 46.00 62.00 71.58 104.03 103.15 105.04 119.03 105.76 1151.46 131.85 593.  Total 285.12 309.53 419.33 471.74 506.19 544.04 603.91 612.31 654.67 742.12 93.2  Prov. Home-Owner Grant 50.00 50.00 120.00 130.00 150.00 160.00 170.00 185.00 200.00 230.00 257.  Net taxes 235.12 259.53 299.33 341.74 356.19 384.04 433.91 427.31 454.67 512.12 575  INDEX INDICATORS - 1961 BASE  General 105.50 153.12 170.97 191.35 220.46 234.04 243.23 256.35 294.23 34.04 103.52 145.43 153.78 168.55 183.59 202.78 211.84 225.50 255.21 29.81 104.10 134.78 155.61 226.15 224.24 228.35 258.76 229.71 251.00 286.63 32.  Total 108.56 147.07 165.43 177.54 190.81 211.81 214.76 229.61 260.28 19.84 100.00 240.00 240.00 260.00 300.00 320.00 340.00 370.00 400.00 460.00 50.20 50.00	Total	<b>2</b> 85.12	309.53	419.33	471.74	506.19	544.04	603.91	612.31	654.67	742.12	832.66
School 99.69 105.17 152.65 170.44 190.76 219.78 233.31 242.48 255.56 293.32 342.54 233.12 247.53 347.75 367.71 403.04 439.00 448.88 565.55 539.21 610.27 427.54 1403.04 439.00 448.88 565.55 539.21 610.27 427.54 1403.04 1491.03 105.76 1154.46 131.85 427.57 1541 285.12 309.53 149.33 141.74 506.19 544.04 603.91 612.31 654.67 742.12 73 127.00 120.00 120.00 120.00 150.00 160.00 170.00 185.00 200.00 230.00 257.58 140.48 140.5	Ceneral	130 lia	1112 36	105 10	107 27	212 28	210 22.	251 57	261: 07	283 65	316 05	332.23
All others	_											347.83
All others 46.00 62.00 71.58 104.03 103.15 105.04 119.03 105.76 115.46 131.85 27.  Total 285.12 309.53 419.33 471.74 506.19 544.04 603.91 612.31 654.67 742.12 93 27.  Prov. Home-Owner Grant 50.00 50.00 120.00 130.00 150.00 160.00 170.00 185.00 200.00 230.00 257.  Net taxes 235.12 259.53 299.33 341.74 356.19 384.04 433.91 427.31 454.67 512.12 575  INDEX INDICATORS - 1961 BASE  General 102.10 139.93 141.48 152.25 157.23 180.43 189.39 203.44 227.32 22.86.001 103.50 153.12 170.97 191.35 220.46 234.04 243.23 256.35 294.23 32.86.001 103.52 145.43 153.78 168.55 183.59 202.78 211.84 225.50 255.21 29.  All other 134.78 155.61 226.15 224.24 228.35 258.76 229.71 251.00 286.63 32.  Total 108.56 147.07 165.43 177.54 190.81 211.81 214.76 229.61 260.28 19.  Net total 110.38 127.31 145.35 151.49 163.34 184.55 181.74 193.38 217.81 244.  P.H.O.G. 100.00 240.00 260.00 300.00 320.00 340.00 370.00 400.00 460.00 574.	· ·											681.06
Total 285.12 309.53 419.33 471.74 506.19 544.04 603.91 612.31 654.67 742.12 79.22 79.23 79.00 50.00 120.00 130.00 150.00 160.00 170.00 185.00 200.00 230.00 257.  Net taxes 235.12 259.53 299.33 341.74 356.19 384.04 433.91 427.31 454.67 512.12 575  INDEX INDICATORS - 1961 BASE  General 102.10 139.93 141.48 152.25 157.23 180.43 189.39 203.44 227.32 24.25 105.50 153.12 170.97 191.35 220.46 234.04 243.23 256.35 294.23 34.25 103.52 145.43 153.78 168.55 183.59 202.78 211.84 225.50 255.21 29.25 11.00 126.65 32.20 126.15 224.24 228.35 258.76 229.71 251.00 286.63 32.25 126.15 224.24 228.35 258.76 229.71 251.00 286.63 32.25 126.15 126.15 106.56 147.07 165.43 177.54 190.81 211.81 214.76 229.61 260.28 19.25 100.00 240.00 240.00 260.00 300.00 320.00 340.00 370.00 400.00 460.00 564.25 145.05 100.00 240.00 260.00 300.00 320.00 340.00 370.00 400.00 460.00 564.25 145.05 126.15 100.00 240.00 260.00 300.00 320.00 340.00 370.00 400.00 460.00 564.25 145.05 126.1	All others											151.60
Prov. Home-Owner Grant 50.00 50.00 120.00 130.00 150.00 160.00 170.00 185.00 200.00 230.00 257.  Net taxes 235.12 259.53 299.33 341.74 356.19 384.04 433.91 427.31 454.67 512.12 575    INDEX INDICATORS - 1961 BASE												932.66
Net taxes 235.12 259.53 299.33 341.74 356.19 384.04 433.91 427.31 454.67 512.12 575    INDEX INDICATORS - 1961 BASE	<del></del>								612.31			
### INDEX INDICATORS - 1961 BASE    General   102.10   139.93   141.48   152.25   157.23   180.43   189.39   203.44   227.32   228.50   220.46   234.04   243.23   256.35   294.23   324.04   243.23   256.35   294.23   256.35   294.23   256.35   294.23   256.35   294.23   256.35   294.23   256.35   294.23   256.35   294.23   256.35   255.21   256.35   25	Prov. Home-Owner Grant	50.00	50.00	120.00	130.00	150.00	160.00	170.00	185.00	200.00	230.00	257.73
General 102.10 139.93 141.48 152.25 157.23 180.43 189.39 203.44 227.32 24.5001 105.50 153.12 170.97 191.35 220.46 234.04 243.23 256.35 294.23 34.6001 103.52 145.43 153.78 168.55 183.59 202.78 211.84 225.50 255.21 29.41 other 134.78 155.61 226.15 224.24 228.35 258.76 229.71 251.00 286.63 32.41 other 108.56 147.07 165.43 177.54 190.81 211.81 214.76 229.61 260.28 190.40 100.00 240.00 260.00 300.00 320.00 340.00 370.00 400.00 460.00 654.	Net taxes	235.12	259.53	299.33	341.74	356.19	384.04	<u>433.91</u>	427.31	454.67	512.12	575.53
General 102.10 139.93 141.48 152.25 157.23 180.43 189.39 203.44 227.32 24.5001 105.50 153.12 170.97 191.35 220.46 234.04 243.23 256.35 294.23 34.6001 103.52 145.43 153.78 168.55 183.59 202.78 211.84 225.50 255.21 29.41 other 134.78 155.61 226.15 224.24 228.35 258.76 229.71 251.00 286.63 32.41 other 108.56 147.07 165.43 177.54 190.81 211.81 214.76 229.61 260.28 190.40 100.00 240.00 260.00 300.00 320.00 340.00 370.00 400.00 460.00 654.			•						·			
School       105.50       153.12       170.97       191.35       220.46       234.04       243.23       256.35       294.23       34.64         General and school       103.52       145.43       153.78       168.55       183.59       202.78       211.84       225.50       255.21       29         All other       134.78       155.61       226.15       224.24       228.35       258.76       229.71       251.00       286.63       32         Total       108.56       147.07       165.43       177.54       190.81       211.81       214.76       229.61       260.28       29         Net total       110.38       127.31       145.35       151.49       163.34       184.55       181.74       193.38       217.81       244.64         P.H.O.G.       100.00       240.00       260.00       300.00       320.00       340.00       370.00       400.00       460.00       674					INDEX INDIC	ATORS - 196	1 BASE			•		
School       105.50       153.12       170.97       191.35       220.46       234.04       243.23       256.35       294.23       34.64         General and school       103.52       145.43       153.78       168.55       183.59       202.78       211.84       225.50       255.21       29         All other       134.78       155.61       226.15       224.24       228.35       258.76       229.71       251.00       286.63       32         Total       108.56       147.07       165.43       177.54       190.81       211.81       214.76       229.61       260.28       29         Net total       110.38       127.31       145.35       151.49       163.34       184.55       181.74       193.38       217.81       244.64         P.H.O.G.       100.00       240.00       260.00       300.00       320.00       340.00       370.00       400.00       460.00       674	General		102-10	139,93	141.48	152.25	157.23	180-43	189,39	203.44	227,32	242.58
General and school 103.52 145.43 153.78 168.55 183.59 202.78 211.84 225.50 255.21 29 All other 134.78 155.61 226.15 224.24 228.35 258.76 229.71 251.00 286.63 32  Total 108.56 147.07 165.43 177.54 190.81 211.81 214.76 229.61 260.28 190.81 110.38 127.31 145.35 151.49 163.34 184.55 181.74 193.38 217.81 244.  P.H.O.G. 100.00 240.00 260.00 300.00 320.00 340.00 370.00 400.00 460.00 574												343.90
All other 134.78 155.61 226.15 224.24 228.35 258.76 229.71 251.00 286.63 32  Total 108.56 147.07 165.43 177.54 190.81 211.81 214.76 229.61 260.28 192.  Net total 110.38 127.31 145.35 151.49 163.34 184.55 181.74 193.38 217.81 244.  P.H.O.G. 100.00 240.00 260.00 300.00 320.00 340.00 370.00 400.00 460.00 574.						168.55						284.82
Net total 110.38 127.31 145.35 151.49 163.34 184.55 181.74 193.38 217.81 244.  P.H.O.G. 100.00 240.00 260.00 300.00 320.00 340.00 370.00 400.00 460.00 574	All other					224.24	228.35					329.57
P.H.O.G. 100,00 240.00 260.00 300.00 320.00 340.00 370.00 400.00 460.00 574	Total	•	108.56	147.07	165.43	177.54	190.81	211.81	214.76	229.61	260.28	192.04
	Net total	•	110.38	127.31	145.35	151.49	163.34	184.55	181.74	193.38	217.81	244.18
Consumer Price Index 100.2 111.0 115.1 110.0 122.0 127.0 122.1 1/1.0 157/k	P.H.O.G.		100,00	240.00	260.00	300.00	320.00	340.00	370,00	400.00	460.00	514.26
	Consumer Price Index		100.3	111.0	115.1	119.0	123.0	127.0	132.1	141.0	157.4	

<sup>\*</sup> M.F.A. commenced this year

\*\* G.V.R.D. commenced this year

+++ Assessment Authority commenced the )=AR

1961 712 1977 1978 1972 1972 1972 1972 1972 1972 1972 1972	Wage	) at inclose 1961-	1974 with sompalison	to Concumb. Bice	TABLE 6	9,1, ref <sup>=175</sup> .
LINE 3 LAW 2130 2.170 2.670 2.905 2.055 3.575 3.940 4.330 4.770  LINE 3 LAW 400 412 508 532 589 673  LINE 3 LAW 400 412 508 532 589 673  LINE 3 LAW 400 412 508 532 589 673  LINE 3 LAW 400 412 508 532 589 673  LINE 3 LAW 400 412 508 532 589 673  LINE 3 LAW 400 412 508 532 589 673  LINE 3 LAW 400 412 508 532 589 673  LINE 3 LAW 400 412 508 59 673  LINE 4 LAW 400 412 508 59 673  LINE 3 LAW 400 412 508 59 673  LINE 4 LAW 400 412 508 59 673  LINE 5 LAW 400 412 508 5		1961 /962	1967 1768 1969	910 <i></i> 1972197/19	11 <del></del>	14
Blub 3 IAN. 1.0.98 125.14 133-17 140.84 155.69 163.37 181.68 195.05 218.56 NAMA	elec =	JAN 2130 2.170 LULY JAN 404 412 JULY JAN MAR 475 482	2.470 2,905 3.055 2.445 532 569 508 532 588 587 623 660 676	3.375 3.545 3 629 660 710 812 724 849	24 788 883	
	blub 3	Tan. Tury Tan Mar	8 (25.74 133-17 140.84 145.50 7 123.58 131.16 138.95	149.47 170.95 15	11.68 195.05 218.56	

### THE CORPORATION OF THE DISTRICT OF BURNABY

e:

£.			TIM COM	OTTAL TON OF THE	DIDIRLOI OF DOING	101			
PROJECTED BORROWING									TABLE 7
		<u>1975</u>	<u>1976</u>	1977 \$	<u>1978</u> \$	<u>1979</u>	<u>1980</u> \$	<u>1981</u> \$	Total S
Local improvements (50% of total cost	:)	973 <b>,</b> 135	1,250,000	1,250,000	1,250,000	1,250, <b>0</b> 00	1 <b>,250,0</b> 00	. 1,250,000	8 <b>,</b> 473 <b>,</b> 135
Storm sewers		1,542,000	1,250,000	1,250,000	200,000	200,000	200,000	200,000	4,842,000
Parks			453,720	3,763,217	2,118,677	4,401,992	5,099,648	3,248,601	<b>19,0</b> 85,855
Libraries			600,000	4,590,000	835,000				<b>6,025,0</b> 00
abso:			6,700,000	6,700,000	6,600,000	6,700,000	6,700,000	6,600,000	40,000,000
		2,515,135	10,253,720	17,553,217	11,003,677	12,551,992	13,249,648	11,298,601	78,425,990
		•						-	
						•	•		
	_					•			
REPAYMENT TABLE @ 10	% ACCUMUL	ATIVE \$	\$	<b>\$</b>	<b>. .</b>	\$	\$	\$	TABLE 8
Local improvements		•				•		·	
10 - 15 years		139,979	312,138	484,297	656,456	828,615	1,000,774	1,172,933	
Storm sewers ( 20 years		181,123	327,947	474,771	498,262	521,681	545,100	<b>5</b> 68 <b>,</b> 519	
Parks 20 years			<b>53,29</b> 3	495,319	744,178	1,261,234	1,860,237	2,241,816	
Libraries				600 615	<b>707 600</b>	707 600	<b>507</b> 602	707 600	MAN.
20 years Roads				609,615	<b>7</b> 07 <b>,</b> 693	707,693	707,693	<b>707,</b> 693	NCI A
20 years			786,980	1,573,960	2,349,193	3,136,173	3,923,153	4,698,386	ITEM 18 Manager's Report No. Council Meeting May
		321,102	1,480,358	3,637,962	4,955,782	6,455,396	<u>8,036,957</u>	<u>9,389,347</u>	EPOI
		grade in the second					-		NT N
									39 26/75
		•							
						•			

## THE CORPORATION OF THE DISTRICT OF BURNABY

Local improvements									T
Storm sewers   1.14   2.23   3.30   2.28   2.26   2.25     Parks   0.33   3.31   4.43   6.63   8.44     Storm sewers   3.84   4.00   4.00   3.66     Storm sewers   3.85   4.00   4.00   3.66     Storm sewers   3.86   4.00   4.00   3.66     Storm sewers   4.00   4.00   3.66     Storm sewers   4.00   4.00   3.66     Storm sewers   4.00   4.00   4.00     Storm sewers   4.		1976	<u>1977</u>	<u> 1978</u>	<u>1979</u>	1980	<u>1981</u>	1982	
Farks .03 .31 .43 .63 .84  Libraries .38 .40 .40 .36  Roads .55 .98 .1.31 .1.57 .1.77  .25 .1.03 .2.27 .2.79 .3.28 .3.67   EXAMPLE OF EFFECT OF ABOVE LEVIES ON MEDIAN RESIDENTIAL PROPERTY  Heneral purposes assessment \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$  market value of \$50,000  In 1974 .25,805 .28,385 .31,224 .34,346 .37,780 .41,600  Local improvements .2.84 .6.25 .9.37 .12.71 .15.87 .18.72  Storm sewers .3.61 .6.53 .9.37 .9.62 .9.82 .10.40  Parks .85 .9.68 .14.77 .23.80 .34.94  Libraries .11.87 .13.74 .15.11 .14.98  Roads .15.61 .30.60 .13.74 .59.31 .73.63	local improvements	.11	•22	•30	•37	.42	<b>.</b> 45	-47	
Libraries  .38 .40 .40 .40 .36  Roads  .55 .98 .1.31 .1.57 .1.77  .25 .1.03 .2.27 .2.79 .3.28 .3.67   EXAMPLE OF EFFECT OF ABOVE LEVIES ON MEDIAN RESIDENTIAL PROPERTY  Heneral purposes assessment \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$  market value of \$50,000 \\ \text{lin 1974} 25,805 .28,385 .31,224 .34,346 .37,780 .41,600  Local improvements .2.84 .6.25 .9.37 .12.71 .15.87 .18.72  Storm sewers .3.61 .6.53 .9.37 .9.62 .9.82 .10.40  Parks .85 .9.68 .14.77 .23.80 .34.94  Libraries .11.87 .13.74 .15.11 .14.98  Roads .15.61 .30.60 .13.74 .59.31 .73.63	Storm sewers	.14	•23	•30	.28	.26	.25	•23	
1.57   1.77   1.77   1.25   1.03   2.27   2.79   3.28   3.67	Parks	•	.03	-31	•43	.63	.84	•91	
.25 1.03 2.27 2.79 3.28 3.67  EXAMPLE OF EFFECT OF ABOVE LEVIES ON MEDIAN RESIDENTIAL PROPERTY  General purposes assessment \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$  In residential property of a market value of \$50,000 an 1974 25,805 28,385 31,224 34,346 37,780 41,600  Local improvements 2.84 6.25 9.37 12.71 15.87 18.72  Storm sewers 3.61 6.53 9.37 9.62 9.82 10.40  Parks	libraries			<b>.3</b> 8	.40	.40	<b>.</b> 36	•32	
EXAMPLE OF EFFECT OF ABOVE LEVIES ON MEDIAN RESIDENTIAL PROPERTY  Heneral purposes assessment \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$	loads	<del></del>	<u>.55</u>	<u>.98</u>	<u>1.31</u> ·	1.57	1.77	1.89	
#eneral purposes assessment			1.03	2.27	2.79	3.28	<u>3.67</u>	3.82	
#eneral purposes assessment						•		•	
m residential property of a market value of \$50,000 nn 1974 25,805 28,385 31,224 34,346 37,780 41,600 cocal improvements 2.84 6.25 9.37 12.71 15.87 18.72 torm sewers 3.61 6.53 9.37 9.62 9.82 10.40 carks .85 9.68 14.77 23.80 34.94 cibraries 11.87 13.74 15.11 14.98 coads 15.61 30.60 13.74 59.31 73.63	XAMPLE OF EFFECT OF ABOVE LEVIE	S ON MEDIAN R	ESIDENTIAL PROPE	RTY		•	•		1
25,805 28,385 31,224 34,346 37,780 41,600  cocal improvements 2.84 6.25 9.37 12.71 15.87 18.72 ctorm sewers 3.61 6.53 9.37 9.62 9.82 10.40  carks	n residential property of a	\$	\$	<b>\$</b>	<b>.</b> <b></b> 	. \$	\$	\$	
Storm sewers     3.61     6.53     9.37     9.62     9.82     10.40       Parks     .85     9.68     14.77     23.80     34.94       Storm sewers     11.87     13.74     15.11     14.98       Storm sewers     15.61     30.60     13.74     59.31     73.63	n 1974	25,805	28,385	31,224	34,346	37,780	41,600	45,800	
Parks  .85  9.68  14.77  23.80  34.94  dibraries  11.87  13.74  15.11  14.98  coads  15.61  30.60  13.74  59.31  73.63	ocal improvements	2.84	6.25	9.37	12.71	15.87	18.72	21.53	
11.87     13.74     15.11     14.98       Roads     15.61     30.60     13.74     59.31     73.63	torm sewers	3.61	6.53	9.37	9.62	9.82	10.40	10.53	
oads 15.61 30.60 13.74 59.31 73.63	arks		.85	<b>9.</b> 68	14.77	23.80	34 <b>.</b> 94	41.68	
	ibraries			11.87	13.74	15.11	14.98	14.66	T,
<u>6.45</u> <u>29.24</u> <u>70.89</u> <u>64.58</u> <u>123.91</u> <u>152.67</u> <u>1</u>	oads		<u>15.61</u>	30.60	13.74	59.31	<u>73.63</u>	86.56	
		6.45	29.24	70.89	64.58	123.91	_152.67	174.96	COONCIL MEETING
									200
									3
그는 그를 가는 것이 되었다. 그는 그들은 그는									
도 보고 있는 것이 되었다. 그는 사람들은 사람들은 사람들은 사람들은 사람들이 되었다. 그는 사람들이 사 									May 26/75

Lumany d' de l'Agent Ly-haw - Operating lait - 1975 Rote + Squittail Fite TARLE! 1917 CONST. 1978 CONST. 1979 CONST. 1980 CONST. 1977. SONST. 1978 OP 1978 OP 1972 OP 1972 OP 1972 OP ITEM 1.8

MANAGER'S REPORT NO. :
COUNCIL MEETING May : 28175 ~3

90

			Ģ:
Police Summery List of	Proportizy-how - Operate	ing lost - 1975 Rate + Sofiated Rate	TALLE 11 (com-)
1234		2005-1-10 8 1979 2015-1 1980 CONST 1981 CONST 1981 CONST 1981 CONST 1982 OF	12:3::
ment Jeit ier	500 300 1,000 1,000 8,85	760 855 100, usp 5:5 60, 1249 201, 3134 7/22 9405 112514 1646	3
April Layer a Court - le sol Equertran Cuntre-Road Park Forence Playerance	(1000) (1000) (1000) (1000) (1000) (1000) (1000) (1000) (1000) (1000) (1000) (1000) (1000) (1000) (1000) (1000)	1150 1322 1521 1749 201 1822 1521 1749 201 2145 3042 3492 462 3042 8492 462 6094 6996 804	
Porish Playston, & 300 7. E. Eurosing Cacro = 300 Rivery of the Boundary (Ray Price Wo. Contra Pelli, Pring Private on Auf Boundary - 18 No			MANAGER'S REPORT NO. COUNCIL MEETING May
173			39 26/75

	ير من المسلم
Dike Summary Sheet of Proposed By-Law - Operating Conts - 1975 Pater & Separated Pater	
1 2 3 4 5 6 77 CONST 1778 CONST 1970 CONST 1990 CONST 1981 CONST 1981 CONST 1981 CONST 1980 CONST 1981 CONST 1980 CONST 1	=13
The fall of the second of the	ITEM 18 MANAGER'S REPORT NO. 39 COUNCIL MEETING May 26/75
P3-1314 — W-MLXXX RATIONES	4