

MAYOR CANDIDATES STUDY

Report

Prepared For:

Hamilton Chamber of Commerce

October 19, 2010



Hendershot Research Consultants

124 James St. South, Suite 205 Hamilton, ON L8P 2Z4
Tel: 905.528.6523 Fax: 905.528.7033 Toll Free: 1.888.893.7634
Website: hendershotresearch.com

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In preparation for the upcoming election, the objective of the research was to determine the level of support among Mayor candidates regarding specific major issues in the City of Hamilton. It was also important to obtain their comments about each of the issues. Based on the objectives of the research, candidates were interviewed over the phone, in-person or they completed the questionnaire themselves depending on their personal preference. This analysis consists of the 10 completed questionnaires by Mayor candidates as of October 18, 2010. The main results were:

Light Rail Transit

- A total of 70.0% of the Mayor candidates agreed that Light Rail Transit should be brought to Hamilton. In comparison, support among Ward candidates was higher (91.8%).

Developing Employment Lands

- A total of 60.0% of the Mayor candidates indicated that they should move ahead quickly in developing employment lands around the airport whereas 40.0% disagreed. This was slightly lower than Ward candidates with 69.4% who agreed.

GO Transit

- When Mayor candidates were asked whether GO Transit should be increased to all day two-way service in a central location all 10 (100%) agreed. This was comparable to 91.8% of Ward candidates who agreed.

Separate Development Corporation

- There was a high level of support for a separate arms-length Development Corporation (90.0% agreed) among Mayor candidates and only 1 candidate (10.0%) disagreed. Among Ward candidates, there was lower support (59.2% agreed) in comparison to candidates who disagreed (24.5%).

Separate Transit Commission

- Among Mayor candidates, 70.0% agreed to establish an arms-length Transit Commission and 30.0% disagreed. The lowest overall level of support among the Ward candidates (40.0% agreed) and 38.8% disagreed.

Variable Property Tax Rate

- All (100%) of the Mayor candidates were in support of the variable property tax rates reflecting different levels of municipal services. Among the Ward candidates, slightly over one-half (53.1%) supported the practice of having variable tax rates.

Jobs and Prosperity

- All (100%) of the Mayor candidates agreed that jobs and prosperity are the key to Hamilton's economic success which was similar to Ward candidates (91.8% agreed).

Combining both the results of the Mayor candidates and Ward candidates for a total of 59 candidates, further analysis was conducted with specific questions. The results indicated that candidates who supported the variable property tax were the most likely to support the Development Corporation (77.8% vs. 42.9% for single tax rate) and a separate Transit Commission (52.8% vs. 35.7% for single tax rate). In comparison, those who supported the single tax were more likely to support the Employment Lands (85.7% vs. 63.9% for variable tax rate).

When the results from the Mayor candidates were compared to the Public Opinion Study, May 2010 conducted with 750 residents, the Mayor candidates indicated a comparable level of support for Light Rail Transit and Employment Lands; but a higher level of support for GO Transit, separate Development Corporation, separate Transit Commission and variable property tax (see Section 4.0 for a comparison analysis).

1.0 BACKGROUND AND OBJECTIVES

In preparation for the upcoming election, the objective of the research was to determine the level of support among Mayor candidates regarding specific major issues in the City of Hamilton. It was also important to obtain their comments about each of the issues.

2.0 METHODOLOGY

Based on the objectives of the research, candidates were interviewed over the phone, in-person or they completed the questionnaire themselves depending on their personal preference. This analysis consists of the 10 completed questionnaires by Mayor candidates as of October 18, 2010. All of their specific comments were data entered into a spreadsheet by staff at MJS Communications. This spreadsheet was used to create a database indicating the level of support for each issue and all detailed comments provided by candidates were coded into major categories. Therefore, this allowed for a more comprehensive overview of the comments for each of the issues.

3.0 SUMMARY OF RESULTS

As previously mentioned, a total of 10 questionnaires were completed with Mayor candidates. As the population size of candidates is 15, the numbers can be calculated as percentages given the majority of the sample provided a response. In this section, a comparison analysis to the Ward candidates will also be provided.

3.1 Light Rail Transit

A total of 70.0% of the Mayor candidates agreed that Light Rail Transit should be brought to Hamilton. In comparison, the large majority (91.8%) of Ward candidates indicated that they agreed that the Light Rail Transit should be brought to Hamilton.

Specific comments provided by the 10 Mayor candidates were in reference to 'economic growth would be directly related' (20.0%), 'need cost benefit analysis' (20.0%) and 'plan Barton St. line' (20.0%). The negative comment was in reference to 'money not in place right now' (20.0%). The Ward

candidates were the most likely to mention that ‘economic growth would be directly related’ (46.9%), ‘needs government funding and support’ (30.6%) and ‘need cost/benefit analysis’ (28.6%).

3.2 Developing Employment Lands

A total of 60.0% of the Mayor candidates indicated that they should move ahead quickly in developing employment lands around the airport whereas 40.0% disagreed. A total of 69.4% of the Ward candidates indicated that they should move ahead quickly in developing employment lands around the airport, 24.5% disagreed and 6.1% did not provide an answer.

The most frequently mentioned comment by the Mayor candidates was ‘Brownfields should be first’ (30.0%), followed by ‘important for economic future’ (20.0%), ‘overall plan should be accountable’ (20.0%). Reasons for lack of support were ‘cannot afford infrastructure’ (20.0%) and ‘too high a risk without guarantee’ (10.0%).

The most frequently mentioned comment by Ward candidates was it is ‘important for economic future’ (34.7%). While candidates agreed and supported the employment lands, one-third (32.7%) still felt it was important that the ‘Brownfields should be first’. Other comments were that the ‘overall plan should be accountable’ (14.3%) and ‘should have minimal impact on greenfields and hereditary sites’ (10.2%).

3.3 GO Transit

When Mayor candidates were asked whether GO Transit should be increased to all day two-way service in a central location all 10 candidates agreed. In comparison, 91.8% of Ward candidates agreed. Only 2.0% of Ward candidates disagreed, 4.1% did not know and 2.0% did not answer.

Comments provided by Mayor candidates were that it was ‘key to growth opportunities’ (30.0%), ‘support Liuna option’ (20.0%) and ‘current system is behind the times’ (20.0%). Similar to the Mayor candidates, Ward candidates were most likely to mention ‘key to growth opportunities’ (51.0%), and that they ‘support the Liuna option’ (20.4%). Other mentions included that it ‘will link downtown’ (14.3%) and they should ‘continue to integrate with regional and local transit’ (14.3%).

3.4 Separate Development Corporation

There was a high level of support for a separate arms-length Development Corporation (90.0% agree) among Mayor candidates and only 1 candidate (10.0%) disagreed. Among Ward candidates, there was lower support for a separate arms-length Development Corporation (59.2% agree) in comparison to candidates who disagreed (24.5%). A total of 12.2% were undecided and 4.1% did not answer.

Mayor candidates were more likely to comment that ‘there is more knowledge and skill in the private sector’ (50.0%) and ‘better at making timely decisions’ (30.0%). The most frequently mentioned comment by Ward candidates was also that ‘there is more knowledge and skill in the private

sector' (24.5%), followed by 'increase in opportunities and initiatives' (20.4%) and 'measure of success or failure will be needed' (12.2%).

3.5 Separate Transit Commission

Among Mayor candidates, 70.0% agreed to establish an arms-length Transit Commission and 30.0% disagreed. The lowest overall level of support among the Ward candidates was to establish an arms-length Transit Commission (40.0% agreed) whereas 38.8% disagreed, 8.2% did not answer and 12.2% were undecided.

The main comments by Mayor candidates were that 'the current system does not work' (30.0%), 'should be run more like a business' (10.0%) and 'would be more accountable to citizens' (10.0%). Two candidates (20.0%) felt that they should 'build upon what they already have in place'. Among Ward candidates, the main comments for agreement were that it 'should be run more like a business' (22.4%), 'services would improve' (12.2%) and would be more accountable to citizens (8.2%). Reasons why they disagreed or were undecided were 'build upon what they already have in place' (34.7%) and 'more research is required' (12.2%).

3.6 Variable Property Tax Rate

All (100%) of the Mayor candidates were in support of the variable property tax rates reflecting different levels of municipal services. Among the Ward candidates, slightly over one-half (53.1%) supported the practice of having variable tax rates. In comparison, almost one-third (28.6%) preferred to implement a single, uniform tax rate across the entire City regardless of the level of municipal services. A total of 10.2% were undecided and 8.2% did not answer

Comments provided by Mayor candidates were 'the service levels vary from area to area' (40.0%) but others felt that 'other areas should be assessed to ensure taxing accordingly' (30.0%). Comments by Ward were that 'the service levels vary from area to area' (32.7%), 'taxes must be tied to services received' (10.2%) and 'continue to improve services where needed' (8.2%). The main comment by Ward candidates in support of the single property tax was that there was 'too much disparity across areas and should pay equally' (16.3%).

3.7 Jobs and Prosperity

All (100%) of the Mayor candidates agreed that jobs and prosperity are the key to Hamilton's economic success. Among Ward candidates, a total of 91.8% agreed that jobs and prosperity are the key to Hamilton's economic success. There were no candidates who disagreed and only 8.2% did not provide an answer.

Mayor candidates provided general comments such as 'need more business tax base' (40.0%) and 'improve image of downtown' (20.0%). They also provided individual comments such as: 're-evaluate core services to prioritize spending', 'develop trade/commerce internationally', 'improve environment' and 'develop Ambassador Program to attract people'. Among the Ward candidates, the

most frequently mentioned specific comments regarding jobs and prosperity were ‘need more business/tax base’ (38.8%), ‘improve image of downtown’ (20.4%), ‘reward success by setting standards and measuring programs’ (10.2%), ‘need improved maintenance and upgrades/infrastructure’ (8.2%), ‘create better communication with constituents and council’ (8.2%) and ‘youth is the key/educating youth’ (8.2%).

ADDITIONAL ANALYSIS

Combining both the results of the Mayor candidates and Ward candidates for a total of 59 candidates, further analysis was conducted with specific questions. The results indicated that candidates who supported the variable property tax were the most likely to support the Development Corporation (77.8% vs. 42.9% for single tax rate) and a separate Transit Commission (52.8% vs. 35.7% for single tax rate). In comparison, those who supported the single tax were more likely to support the Employment Lands (85.7% vs. 63.9% for variable tax rate).

4.0 COMPARISON TO PREVIOUS RESEARCH STUDY

The Public Opinion Study, May 2010 was conducted for the Hamilton Chamber of Commerce and Flamborough Chamber of Commerce. In this study, a total of 750 respondents among the 15 Wards were asked questions regarding these major issues. While some of the actual wordings of the questions were not the same, their level of support for these major issues can be compared with the Mayor candidates results.

Light Rail Transit

- In the previous study, on a scale of 1 to 10 where 10 was strongly agree, an overall average of 6.59 was provided for agreement that Light Rail Transit would help attract jobs and growth to the City, particularly the downtown core. In addition, 33.1% of the population would use an East/West route and 34.0% would use a North/South route. The level of support for Light Rail Transit was comparable among Ward candidates where 70.0% agreed that it should be brought to Hamilton.

Developing Employment Lands

- In the previous study, the majority (57.1%) agreed that the City should move ahead quickly to develop property surrounding the airport to create jobs. Over one-third (36.1%) disagreed and 6.8% did not

know. Based on the 10 Mayor candidates, a total of 60.0% indicated that they should move ahead quickly in developing employment lands around the airport which was comparable.

GO Transit

- When respondents in the previous study were asked whether they strongly agree, somewhat agree or disagree that improved GO Transit service to and from downtown Hamilton would improve opportunities for jobs and growth, one half (49.3%) strongly agreed, 30.7% somewhat agreed, 17.5% disagreed and 2.5% did not know. Therefore, there was agreement among 80.0% of the respondents. When Mayor candidates were asked whether GO Transit should be increased to all day two-way service in a central location, all 10 (100%) agreed which was a higher level of support.

Separate Development Corporation

-In the Public Opinion Study, the results were divided when they were asked whether they felt that the City should have a separate Development Corporation to support new development or should this function remain at City Hall. A total of 44.0% felt there should be a separate organization, 30.8% felt it should remain at City Hall and 25.2% were undecided. Based on the results from the Mayor candidates, support for a separate arms-length Development Corporation was significantly higher (90.0% agreed).

Separate Transit Commission

-All 750 respondents in the previous study were asked whether they feel that the transit services in Hamilton should be managed by a separate organization or should it continue to be managed directly by City Hall. As a result, 23.1% felt that it should be managed by a separate organization, 42.1% felt it should remain at City Hall and 34.8% were undecided. Agreement among the Mayor candidates to establish an arms-length Transit Commission that was higher than the previous study (70.0% agreed).

Variable Property Tax Rate

-In the previous study, all respondents were asked whether The City should continue with the variable property tax rate or if should there be only one property tax rate regardless of the services available. Overall, the majority (51.2%) felt that The City should continue with the variable property tax, 22.7% felt there should be one property tax for everyone and 26.1% were undecided. Based on the Mayor candidate results, all 10 (100%) supported the variable property tax rate.

Jobs and Prosperity

- All 750 respondents in the previous study were asked unaided (in their own words) what were the three most important issues in their community. Combining all three mentions, 'taxes' (35.2%) was the most frequently mentioned, followed by 'jobs/prosperity' (29.3%), 'health care' (22.9%) and 'downtown

core' (22.3%). For the Mayor candidates, all 10 (100%) agreed that jobs and prosperity are the key to Hamilton's economic success. Given that in the previous study 'jobs/prosperity' was only an unaided mention, a comparison analysis is not feasible between the two results. However, the study results indicated that it rated second only to 'taxes'.

COMPARISON SUMMARY OF SUPPORT FOR MAJOR ISSUES

	<u>Public Opinion-May 2010</u>	<u>Ward Candidates</u>	<u>Mayor Candidates</u>	<u>Difference Between Mayor & Public Opinion</u>
Light Rail Transit	6.59 (on a scale of 1 – 10)	91.8%	70.0%	*Comparable
Developing Employment Lands	57.1%	69.4%	60.0%	*Comparable
GO Transit	80.0%	91.8%	100%	*Higher
Separate Development Corporation	44.0%	59.2%	90.0%	*Higher
Separate Transit Commission				
<i>Agree</i>	23.1%	40.0%	70.0%	*Higher
<i>Disagree</i>	42.1%	38.8%	30.0%	
Variable Property Tax Rate	51.2%	53.1%	100%	*Higher
Jobs and Prosperity	N/A	91.8%	100%	*N/A

5.0 DETAILED RESULTS

Q1A Support For Light Rail Transit

	CANDIDATE				Total	
	Mayor		Ward		Count	%
	Count	%	Count	%		
Q1A LIGHT RAIL TRANSIT						
Yes	7	70.0%	45	91.8%	52	88.1%
No	3	30.0%	3	6.1%	6	10.2%
Undecided	0	.0%	1	2.0%	1	1.7%
Total	10	100%	49	100%	59	100%

Q2A Support For Employment Lands

	CANDIDATE				Total	
	Mayor		Ward		Count	%
	Count	%	Count	%		
Q2A EMPLOYMENT LANDS						
Yes	6	60.0%	34	69.4%	40	67.8%
No	4	40.0%	12	24.5%	16	27.1%
Undecided	0	.0%	3	6.1%	3	5.1%
Total	10	100%	49	100%	59	100%

Q3A Support For GO Transit

	CANDIDATE				Total	
	Mayor		Ward		Count	%
	Count	%	Count	%		
Q3A GO TRANSIT						
Yes	10	100%	45	91.8%	55	93.2%
No	0	.0%	1	2.0%	1	1.7%
Undecided	0	.0%	2	4.1%	2	3.4%
No answer	0	.0%	1	2.0%	1	1.7%
Total	10	100%	49	100%	59	100%

Q4A Support For Economic Development

	CANDIDATE				Total	
	Mayor		Ward		Count	%
	Count	%	Count	%		
Q4A ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT						
Yes	9	90.0%	29	59.2%	38	64.4%
No	1	10.0%	12	24.5%	13	22.0%
Undecided	0	.0%	6	12.2%	6	10.2%
No answer	0	.0%	2	4.1%	2	3.4%
Total	10	100%	49	100%	59	100%

Q5A Support For Transit Commission

	CANDIDATE				Total	
	Mayor		Ward		Count	%
	Count	%	Count	%		
Q5A TRANSIT COMMISSION						
Yes	7	70.0%	20	40.8%	27	45.8%
No	3	30.0%	19	38.8%	22	37.3%
Undecided	0	.0%	6	12.2%	6	10.2%
No answer	0	.0%	4	8.2%	4	6.8%
Total	10	100%	49	100%	59	100%

Q6A Support For Property Tax Rate

	CANDIDATE				Total	
	Mayor		Ward		Count	%
	Count	%	Count	%		
Q6A PROPERTY TAX RATE						
Variable tax	10	100%	26	53.1%	36	61.0%
Single tax	0	.0%	14	28.6%	14	23.7%
Undecided	0	.0%	5	10.2%	5	8.5%
No answer	0	.0%	4	8.2%	4	6.8%
Total	10	100%	49	100%	59	100%

Q7 Support For Jobs Prosperity

	CANDIDATE				Total	
	Mayor		Ward		Count	%
	Count	%	Count	%		
Q7A JOBS PROSPERITY						
Yes	9	90.0%	45	91.8%	54	91.5%
No answer	1	10.0%	4	8.2%	5	8.5%
Total	10	100%	49	100%	59	100%

Q1B Light Rail Comments

	CANDIDATE		Total	
	Mayor	Ward	Count	%

	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Q1B LIGHT RAIL COMMENTS						
Economic growth directly related	2	20.0%	23	46.9%	25	42.4%
Need cost/benefit analysis	2	20.0%	14	28.6%	16	27.1%
Needs government funding and support	1	10.0%	15	30.6%	16	27.1%
Should be acted on now	0	.0%	7	14.3%	7	11.9%
Have seen benefits in other cities	0	.0%	5	10.2%	5	8.5%
Need to sort out design	0	.0%	5	10.2%	5	8.5%
Money is not in place right now	2	20.0%	1	2.0%	3	5.1%
Would increase house values	0	.0%	2	4.1%	2	3.4%
Explore private/public partnerships	0	.0%	2	4.1%	2	3.4%
Plan Barton St. line	2	20.0%	0	.0%	2	3.4%
Will help environment	0	.0%	1	2.0%	1	1.7%
Harmonize transit with land use	1	10.0%	0	.0%	1	1.7%
Coincide with zoning/development	1	10.0%	0	.0%	1	1.7%
Impact on business with construction	1	10.0%	0	.0%	1	1.7%
No answer	1	10.0%	3	6.1%	4	6.8%
Total	10	100%	49	100%	59	100%

The percentages do not add to 100% due to multiple mentions.

Q2B Employment Lands Comments

	CANDIDATE				Total	
	Mayor		Ward		Count	%
	Count	%	Count	%		
Q2B EMPLOYMENT LANDS COMMENTS						
Important for economic future	2	20.0%	17	34.7%	19	32.2%
Brownfields should be first	3	30.0%	16	32.7%	19	32.2%
Overall plan should be accountable	2	20.0%	7	14.3%	9	15.3%
Have minimal impact on greenfields,						

hereditary sites	0	.0%	5	10.2%	5	8.5%
Shovel-ready prospects are positive	1	10.0%	4	8.2%	5	8.5%
Needs more study/research	0	.0%	4	8.2%	4	6.8%
Development from new business relocating to Hamilton	0	.0%	3	6.1%	3	5.1%
Is not a long-term solution	0	.0%	3	6.1%	3	5.1%
Only specific industries should be developed	0	.0%	2	4.1%	2	3.4%
Businesses may not be high employment manufacturing	0	.0%	2	4.1%	2	3.4%
Cannot afford infrastructure	2	20.0%	0	.0%	2	3.4%
Long-term return of tax base is important	0	.0%	1	2.0%	1	1.7%
Maintain land values/remove liability	0	.0%	1	2.0%	1	1.7%
Should have been done already	0	.0%	1	2.0%	1	1.7%
Use phased-in approach	1	10.0%	0	.0%	1	1.7%
Construction costs better	1	10.0%	0	.0%	1	1.7%
May have a large effect on taxpayers	0	.0%	1	2.0%	1	1.7%
Too high risks without guarantee	1	10.0%	0	.0%	1	1.7%
No answer	1	10.0%	2	4.1%	3	5.1%
Total	10	100%	49	100%	59	100%

The percentages do not add to 100% due to multiple mentions.

Q3B GO Transit Comments

	CANDIDATE				Total	
	Mayor		Ward		Count	%
	Count	%	Count	%		
Q3B GO TRANSIT						
Key to growth opportunities	3	30.0%	25	51.0%	28	47.5%
Support Liuna option	2	20.0%	10	20.4%	12	20.3%
Will link downtown	1	10.0%	7	14.3%	8	13.6%
Continue to integrate with regional/local transit	1	10.0%	7	14.3%	8	13.6%
Current system is behind the times	2	20.0%	3	6.1%	5	8.5%
Good for environment/less traffic	0	.0%	4	8.2%	4	6.8%
Tourism would increase	0	.0%	3	6.1%	3	5.1%
Will increase property values	2	20.0%	0	.0%	2	3.4%
Needs research to ensure reliability	0	.0%	2	4.1%	2	3.4%

Centre Mall should have a location stop	0	.0%	1	2.0%	1	1.7%
Lobby government for funds	0	.0%	1	2.0%	1	1.7%
Favour Fruitland Rd.	1	10.0%	0	.0%	1	1.7%
Concentrate only on peak hours	0	.0%	1	2.0%	1	1.7%
Taxes will increase around Liuna	1	10.0%	0	.0%	1	1.7%
No answer	1	10.0%	4	8.2%	5	8.5%
Total	10	100%	49	100%	59	100%

* The percentages do not add to 100% due to multiple mentions.

Q4B Economic Development Comments

	CANDIDATE				Total	
	Mayor		Ward		Count	%
	Count	%	Count	%		
Q4B ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT						
There is more knowledge and skill in private sector	5	50.0%	12	24.5%	17	28.8%
Increase opportunities/new initiatives	1	10.0%	10	20.4%	11	18.6%
Better at making timely decisions	3	30.0%	6	12.2%	9	15.3%
Measure of success or failure needed	1	10.0%	6	12.2%	7	11.9%
Not needed	0	.0%	6	12.2%	6	10.2%
Staff needs to be more efficient and accountable	0	.0%	5	10.2%	5	8.5%
Current system is behind the times	0	.0%	3	6.1%	3	5.1%
Need more information	0	.0%	3	6.1%	3	5.1%
Mayor and council should be officers	0	.0%	2	4.1%	2	3.4%
Use an advisory committee instead	0	.0%	2	4.1%	2	3.4%
Concerns with conflict of interest	0	.0%	2	4.1%	2	3.4%
Would create duplication of services	0	.0%	2	4.1%	2	3.4%
More time needed for existing businesses	0	.0%	1	2.0%	1	1.7%
Local-only approach for outsourcing	0	.0%	1	2.0%	1	1.7%
Current staff doing an excellent job	1	10.0%	0	.0%	1	1.7%
Too expensive to set up	1	10.0%	0	.0%	1	1.7%
No answer	2	20.0%	5	10.2%	7	11.9%
Total	10	100%	49	100%	59	100%

* The percentages do not add to 100% due to multiple mentions.

Q5B Transit Commission Comments

	CANDIDATE				Total	
	Mayor		Ward		Count	%
	Count	%	Count	%		
Q5B TRANSIT COMMISSION						
Build upon what they already have in place	2	20.0%	17	34.7%	19	32.2%
Should be run more like a business	1	10.0%	11	22.4%	12	20.3%
Services would improve	0	.0%	6	12.2%	6	10.2%
Current system does not work	3	30.0%	3	6.1%	6	10.2%
More research is required	0	.0%	6	12.2%	6	10.2%
Would be more accountable to citizens	1	10.0%	4	8.2%	5	8.5%
Fares may increase	0	.0%	3	6.1%	3	5.1%
Better control of fares and increases	0	.0%	2	4.1%	2	3.4%
More creative	0	.0%	1	2.0%	1	1.7%
As long as unionized workers are protected	0	.0%	1	2.0%	1	1.7%
As long as does not affect current employees	1	10.0%	0	.0%	1	1.7%
Needs to be subsidized for disadvantaged	0	.0%	1	2.0%	1	1.7%

Absence of leadership is the real issue	0	.0%	1	2.0%	1	1.7%
Would undermine morale	1	10.0%	0	.0%	1	1.7%
Have advisory committee	1	10.0%	0	.0%	1	1.7%
No answer	2	20.0%	7	14.3%	9	15.3%
Total	10	100%	49	100%	59	100%

The percentages do not add to 100% due to multiple mentions.

Q6B Property Tax Rate Comments

	CANDIDATE				Total	
	Mayor		Ward		Count	%
Q6B PROPERTY TAX RATE	Count	%	Count	%		
The service levels vary from area to area	4	40.0%	16	32.7%	20	33.9%
Too much disparity across areas, pay equally	0	.0%	8	16.3%	8	13.6%
Taxes must be tied to services received	0	.0%	5	10.2%	5	8.5%
Access other areas to ensure we are taxing accordingly	3	30.0%	2	4.1%	5	8.5%
Continue to improve services where needed	0	.0%	4	8.2%	4	6.8%
Have minimum tax structure and extra for other services	0	.0%	3	6.1%	3	5.1%
Suburbs should acknowledge that City paid infrastructure	0	.0%	2	4.1%	2	3.4%
Need to consider property values	0	.0%	2	4.1%	2	3.4%
Should look at a new boundary for different needs	0	.0%	2	4.1%	2	3.4%
People should be better advised what paying for	0	.0%	1	2.0%	1	1.7%
Citizen forum to educate about services received	1	10.0%	0	.0%	1	1.7%
Long term strategy for single						

tax/assessments increase	1	10.0%	0	.0%	1	1.7%
Special consideration for rural areas	0	.0%	1	2.0%	1	1.7%
Need more information	0	.0%	1	2.0%	1	1.7%
Use provincial average as goal	0	.0%	1	2.0%	1	1.7%
No answer	2	20.0%	6	12.2%	8	13.6%
Total	10	100%	49	100%	59	100%

The percentages do not add to 100% due to multiple mentions.

Q7B Jobs Prosperity Comments

	CANDIDATE				Total	
	Mayor		Ward		Count	%
	Count	%	Count	%		
Q7B JOBS PROSPERITY						
Need more business tax base	4	40.0%	19	38.8%	23	39.0%
Improve image of downtown	2	20.0%	10	20.4%	12	20.3%
Reward success by setting standards and measuring programs	0	.0%	5	10.2%	5	8.5%
Need improved maintenance and upgrades/infrastructure	1	10.0%	4	8.2%	5	8.5%
Youth is the key/education	1	10.0%	4	8.2%	5	8.5%
Create better communication with constituents and council	0	.0%	4	8.2%	4	6.8%
Overcome poverty, with heavy law enforcement	1	10.0%	2	4.1%	3	5.1%
Support removal of parking meters on Locke St. and SC	0	.0%	2	4.1%	2	3.4%
Supportive of property standards for neighbourhoods	1	10.0%	1	2.0%	2	3.4%
Engage residents in initiatives to beautify city	0	.0%	2	4.1%	2	3.4%
Should have more imports and exports	0	.0%	2	4.1%	2	3.4%
More police officers	0	.0%	2	4.1%	2	3.4%
Affordable housing, green energy design	0	.0%	2	4.1%	2	3.4%
Subsidized housing downtown will not help city	0	.0%	1	2.0%	1	1.7%
Impressed with efforts of BLG	0	.0%	1	2.0%	1	1.7%
Reduce unemployment using stakeholders	0	.0%	1	2.0%	1	1.7%
Working families are the key	0	.0%	1	2.0%	1	1.7%
Social services throughout city	0	.0%	1	2.0%	1	1.7%
Move forward with transit decision	0	.0%	1	2.0%	1	1.7%

Too much taxing and regulations	0	.0%	1	2.0%	1	1.7%
Establish relationship with prov/fed government	1	10.0%	0	.0%	1	1.7%
Re-evaluate core services to prioritize spending	1	10.0%	0	.0%	1	1.7%
Develop trade/commerce internationally	1	10.0%	0	.0%	1	1.7%
Improve environment	1	10.0%	0	.0%	1	1.7%
Ambassador Program to attract people	1	10.0%	0	.0%	1	1.7%
Develop farmlands	1	10.0%	0	.0%	1	1.7%
No answer	2	20.0%	8	16.3%	10	16.9%

Total 10 100% 49 100% 59 100%

* The percentages do not add to 100% due to multiple mentions.

-
-

6.0 ADDITIONAL ANALYSIS

Q2A Support For Employment Lands

	Variable tax		Q6A PROPERTY TAX RATE Single tax		TAX RATE Undecided		No answer		Total	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Q2A EMPLOYMENT LANDS										
Yes	23	63.9%	12	85.7%	3	60.0%	2	50.0%	40	67.8%
No	12	33.3%	2	14.3%	1	20.0%	1	25.0%	16	27.1%
Undecided	1	2.8%	0	.0%	1	20.0%	1	25.0%	3	5.1%
Total	36	100%	14	100%	5	100%	4	100%	59	100%

Q4A Support For Economic Development

	Variable tax		Q6A PROPERTY TAX RATE Single tax		TAX RATE Undecided		No answer		Total	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Q4A ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT										
Yes	28	77.8%	6	42.9%	4	80.0%	0	.0%	38	64.4%
No	4	11.1%	6	42.9%	1	20.0%	2	50.0%	13	22.0%
Undecided	3	8.3%	2	14.3%	0	.0%	1	25.0%	6	10.2%
No answer	1	2.8%	0	.0%	0	.0%	1	25.0%	2	3.4%
Total	36	100%	14	100%	5	100%	4	100%	59	100%

Q5A Support For Transit Commission

Variable	Q6A PROPERTY TAX RATE Single		TAX RATE Undecided		No answer		Total	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%

	tax		tax		Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Q5A TRANSIT	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
COMMISSION										
Yes	19	52.8%	5	35.7%	3	60.0%	0	.0%	27	45.8%
No	12	33.3%	7	50.0%	1	20.0%	2	50.0%	22	37.3%
Undecided	4	11.1%	2	14.3%	0	.0%	0	.0%	6	10.2%
No answer	1	2.8%	0	.0%	1	20.0%	2	50.0%	4	6.8%
Total	36	100%	14	100%	5	100%	4	100%	59	100%