

WARD CANDIDATES STUDY

Report

Prepared For:

Hamilton Chamber of Commerce

October 15, 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 Ward 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, the 70 candidates for the 15 Wards were interviewed over the phone, in-person or they completed the questionnaire themselves depending on their personal preference. This analysis consists of the 49 returned questionnaires by Ward candidates as of October 13, 2010. The main results were:

Light Rail Transit

- The level of support for Light Rail Transit was significantly higher among Ward candidates where 91.8% agreed that it should be brought to Hamilton.

Developing Employment Lands

- A total of 69.4% 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.

GO Transit

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

Separate Development Corporation

- Based on the results from the Ward candidates, support for a separate arms-length Development Corporation was as follows: 59.2% agreed, 24.5% disagreed, 12.2% were undecided and 4.1% did not answer.

Separate Transit Commission

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

Variable Property Tax Rate

- Slightly over one-half (53.1%) supported the practice of having variable tax rates reflecting different levels of municipal services. 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.

Jobs and Prosperity

-For the Ward candidates, a total of 91.8% agreed that jobs and prosperity are the key to Hamilton's economic success.

When the results from the Ward candidates were compared to the Public Opinion Study, May 2010 conducted with 750 residents, the Ward candidates indicated a higher level of support for Light Rail Transit, Employment Lands, GO Transit and a separate Development Corporation. The level of

support was comparable for a 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 Ward 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, the 70 candidates for the 15 Wards were interviewed over the phone, in-person or they completed the questionnaire themselves depending on their personal preference. This analysis consists of the 49 returned questionnaires by Ward candidates as of October 13, 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

3.1 Light Rail Transit

The large majority (91.8%) indicated that they agreed that the Light Rail Transit should be brought to Hamilton. There was a lower level of agreement among candidates in Wards 1, 6, 8 and 10.

Specific comments provided by the 49 candidates about Light Rail Transit were 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 69.4% 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. Candidates most likely to disagree were in Wards 3, 11 and 13.

The most frequently mentioned comment 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 candidates were asked whether GO Transit should be increased to all day two-way service in a central location, 91.8% agreed. Only 2.0% disagreed, 4.1% did not know and 2.0% did not answer. There was lower support in Wards 2 and 5. Comments were regarding '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

In comparison to the other issues 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. The highest level of agreement for a separate corporation was among candidates in Wards 1, 10 and 13. The lowest support was from candidates in Wards 4, 5, 8, 9, 12 and 14 where no one was in agreement.

The most frequently mentioned comments by candidates were that 'there is more knowledge and skill in the private sector' (24.5%), there will be an 'increase in opportunities and initiatives' (20.4%) and 'measure of success or failure will be needed' (12.2%). The main reasons for lack of support were that 'it is not needed' (12.2%), 'staff needed to be more efficient and accountable' (10.2%) and they should 'use an advisory committee instead' (4.1%).

3.5 Separate Transit Commission

The lowest overall level of support among the Ward candidates was to establish an arms-length Transit Commission (40.0% agree) whereas 38.8% disagreed, 8.2% did not answer and 12.2% were undecided. All candidates in Wards 1 and 15 were in agreement with the separate Transit Commission. In comparison, none of the candidates from Wards 4, 5, 8, 9, 11, 12 and 14 were in agreement. 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

Slightly over one-half (53.1%) supported the practice of having variable tax rates reflecting different levels of municipal services. 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. The highest support for the variable tax rate was among the outlying Wards 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14 and 15. None of the candidates from Wards 4, 5, 7 and 7 were in favour of the variable property tax rate.

Comments in support of the variable property tax rate 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 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

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. Candidates in Wards 3, 4, 5 and 15 were less likely to have agreed.

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%).

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 Ward 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 significantly higher among Ward candidates where 91.8% 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 49 Ward candidates, a total of 69.4% 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.

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

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 Ward candidates, support for a separate arms-length Development Corporation was higher (59.2% agreed, 24.5% disagreed, 12.2% were undecided and 4.1% did not answer.

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 Ward candidates to remain at City Hall (38.8% disagreed) was comparable to the previous study. A total of 40.0% were in agreement to establish an arms-length Transit Commission that was higher than the previous study. A total of 8.2% did not answer and 12.2% were undecided. The difference between the two studies was due to the higher percentage of the population who were undecided.

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 Ward candidate results, slightly over one-half (53.1%) supported the practice of having variable tax rates reflecting different levels of municipal services. 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.

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 Ward candidates, a total of 91.8% 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>Difference for Candidates</u>
Light Rail Transit	6.59 (on a scale of 1 – 10)	91.8%	*Higher
Developing Employment Lands	57.1%	69.4%	*Higher
GO Transit	80.0%	91.8%	*Higher
Separate Development Corporation	44.0%	59.2%	*Higher
Separate Transit Commission			
<i>Agree</i>	23.1%	40.0%	*Comparable
<i>Disagree</i>	42.1%	38.8%	
Variable Property Tax Rate	51.2%	53.1%	*Comparable

5.0 DETAILED RESULTS

Q1A Support For Light Rail Transit

WARD	Q1A LIGHT RAIL TRANSIT						Total	
	Yes		No		Undecided		Count	%
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%		
1	2	66.7%	1	33.3%	0	.0%	3	100%
2	15	100%	0	.0%	0	.0%	15	100%
3	5	100%	0	.0%	0	.0%	5	100%
4	3	100%	0	.0%	0	.0%	3	100%
5	2	100%	0	.0%	0	.0%	2	100%
6	3	75.0%	1	25.0%	0	.0%	4	100%
7	3	100%	0	.0%	0	.0%	3	100%
8	0	.0%	0	.0%	1	100%	1	100%
9	1	100%	0	.0%	0	.0%	1	100%
10	1	50.0%	1	50.0%	0	.0%	2	100%
11	2	100%	0	.0%	0	.0%	2	100%
12	1	100%	0	.0%	0	.0%	1	100%
13	3	100%	0	.0%	0	.0%	3	100%
14	1	100%	0	.0%	0	.0%	1	100%
15	3	100%	0	.0%	0	.0%	3	100%
Total	45	91.8%	3	6.1%	1	2.0%	49	100%

Q2A Support For Employment Lands

WARD	Q2A EMPLOYMENT LANDS						Total	
	Yes		No		Undecided		Count	%
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%		
1	2	66.7%	1	33.3%	0	.0%	3	100%
2	11	73.3%	4	26.7%	0	.0%	15	100%
3	1	20.0%	2	40.0%	2	40.0%	5	100%
4	2	66.7%	1	33.3%	0	.0%	3	100%
5	2	100%	0	.0%	0	.0%	2	100%
6	4	100%	0	.0%	0	.0%	4	100%
7	3	100%	0	.0%	0	.0%	3	100%
8	1	100%	0	.0%	0	.0%	1	100%
9	0	.0%	0	.0%	1	100%	1	100%
10	2	100%	0	.0%	0	.0%	2	100%
11	1	50.0%	1	50.0%	0	.0%	2	100%
12	1	100%	0	.0%	0	.0%	1	100%

13	1	33.3%	2	66.7%	0	.0%	3	100%
14	1	100%	0	.0%	0	.0%	1	100%
15	2	66.7%	1	33.3%	0	.0%	3	100%
Total	34	69.4%	12	24.5%	3	6.1%	49	100%

Q3A Support For GO Transit

WARD	Q3A GO TRANSIT								Total	
	Yes		No		Undecided		No answer		Count	%
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%		
1	3	100%	0	.0%	0	.0%	0	.0%	3	100%
2	12	80.0%	1	6.7%	2	13.3%	0	.0%	15	100%
3	5	100%	0	.0%	0	.0%	0	.0%	5	100%
4	3	100%	0	.0%	0	.0%	0	.0%	3	100%
5	1	50.0%	0	.0%	0	.0%	1	50.0%	2	100%
6	4	100%	0	.0%	0	.0%	0	.0%	4	100%
7	3	100%	0	.0%	0	.0%	0	.0%	3	100%
8	1	100%	0	.0%	0	.0%	0	.0%	1	100%
9	1	100%	0	.0%	0	.0%	0	.0%	1	100%
10	2	100%	0	.0%	0	.0%	0	.0%	2	100%
11	2	100%	0	.0%	0	.0%	0	.0%	2	100%
12	1	100%	0	.0%	0	.0%	0	.0%	1	100%
13	3	100%	0	.0%	0	.0%	0	.0%	3	100%
14	1	100%	0	.0%	0	.0%	0	.0%	1	100%
15	3	100%	0	.0%	0	.0%	0	.0%	3	100%
Total	45	91.8%	1	2.0%	2	4.1%	1	2.0%	49	100%

Q4A Support For Economic Development

WARD	Q4A ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT								Total	
	Yes		No		Undecided		No answer		Count	%
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%		
1	3	100%	50	.0%	0	.0%	0	.0%	3	100%
2	13	86.7%	2	13.3%	0	.0%	0	.0%	15	100%
3	2	40.0%	0	.0%	2	40.0%	1	20.0%	5	100%
4	0	.0%	3	100%	0	.0%	0	.0%	3	100%
5	0	.0%	1	50.0%	0	.0%	1	50.0%	2	100%
6	2	50.0%	2	50.0%	0	.0%	0	.0%	4	100%
7	1	33.3%	1	33.3%	1	33.3%	0	.0%	3	100%
8	0	.0%	0	.0%	1	100%	0	.0%	1	100%
9	0	.0%	1	100%	0	.0%	0	.0%	1	100%
10	2	100%	0	.0%	0	.0%	0	.0%	2	100%
11	1	50.0%	1	50.0%	0	.0%	0	.0%	2	100%
12	0	.0%	0	.0%	1	100%	0	.0%	1	100%
13	3	100%	0	.0%	0	.0%	0	.0%	3	100%
14	0	.0%	0	.0%	1	100%	0	.0%	1	100%
15	2	66.7%	1	33.3%	0	.0%	0	.0%	3	100%
Total	29	59.2%	12	24.5%	6	12.2%	2	4.1%	49	100%

Q5A Support For Transit Commission

WARD	Q5A TRANSIT COMMISSION								Total	
	Yes Count	%	No Count	%	Undecided Count	%	No answer Count	%	Count	%
1	3	100%	0	.0%	0	.0%	0	.0%	3	100%
2	7	46.7%	6	40.0%	2	13.3%	0	.0%	15	100%
3	1	20.0%	2	40.0%	1	20.0%	1	20.0%	5	100%
4	0	.0%	2	66.7%	0	.0%	1	33.3%	3	100%
5	0	.0%	1	50.0%	0	.0%	1	50.0%	2	100%
6	2	50.0%	2	50.0%	0	.0%	0	.0%	4	100%
7	1	33.3%	1	33.3%	1	33.3%	0	.0%	3	100%
8	0	.0%	1	100%	0	.0%	0	.0%	1	100%
9	0	.0%	0	.0%	0	.0%	1	100%	1	100%
10	1	50.0%	1	50.0%	0	.0%	0	.0%	2	100%
11	0	.0%	1	50.0%	1	50.0%	0	.0%	2	100%
12	0	.0%	0	.0%	1	100%	0	.0%	1	100%
13	2	66.7%	1	33.3%	0	.0%	0	.0%	3	100%
14	0	.0%	1	100%	0	.0%	0	.0%	1	100%
15	3	100%	0	.0%	0	.0%	0	.0%	3	100%
Total	20	40.8%	19	38.8%	6	12.2%	4	8.2%	49	100%

Q6A Support For Variable Property Tax Rate

WARD	Q6A PROPERTY TAX RATE								Total	
	Variable tax Count	%	Single tax Count	%	Undecided Count	%	No answer Count	%	Count	%
1	1	33.3%	1	33.3%	1	33.3%	0	.0%	3	100%
2	9	60.0%	4	26.7%	2	13.3%	0	.0%	15	100%
3	2	40.0%	2	40.0%	0	.0%	1	20.0%	5	100%
4	0	.0%	1	33.3%	0	.0%	2	66.7%	3	100%
5	0	.0%	1	50.0%	0	.0%	1	50.0%	2	100%
6	1	25.0%	3	75.0%	0	.0%	0	.0%	4	100%
7	0	.0%	2	66.7%	1	33.3%	0	.0%	3	100%
8	1	100%	0	.0%	0	.0%	0	.0%	1	100%
9	0	.0%	0	.0%	1	100%	0	.0%	1	100%
10	2	100%	0	.0%	0	.0%	0	.0%	2	100%
11	2	100%	0	.0%	0	.0%	0	.0%	2	100%
12	1	100%	0	.0%	0	.0%	0	.0%	1	100%
13	3	100%	0	.0%	0	.0%	0	.0%	3	100%
14	1	100%	0	.0%	0	.0%	0	.0%	1	100%
15	3	100%	0	.0%	0	.0%	0	.0%	3	100%
Total	26	53.1%	14	28.6%	5	10.2%	4	8.2%	49	100%

Q7 Support For Jobs Prosperity

Q7A JOBS PROSPERITY			Total	
Yes	No	answer	Count	%

WARD	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
1	3	100%	0	.0%	3	100%
2	15	100%	0	.0%	15	100%
3	4	80.0%	1	20.0%	5	100%
4	2	66.7%	1	33.3%	3	100%
5	1	50.0%	1	50.0%	2	100%
6	4	100%	0	.0%	4	100%
7	3	100%	0	.0%	3	100%
8	1	100%	0	.0%	1	100%
9	1	100%	0	.0%	1	100%
10	2	100%	0	.0%	2	100%
11	2	100%	0	.0%	2	100%
12	1	100%	0	.0%	1	100%
13	3	100%	0	.0%	3	100%
14	1	100%	0	.0%	1	100%
15	2	66.7%	1	33.3%	3	100%
Total	45	91.8%	4	8.2%	49	100%

Q1B Light Rail Comments

Q1B LIGHT RAIL COMMENTS	Frequency	Percent
Economic growth directly related	23	46.9%
Needs government funding and support	15	30.6%
Need cost/benefit analysis	14	28.6%
Should be acted on now	7	14.3%
Have seen benefits in other cities	5	10.2%
Need to sort out design	5	10.2%

No answer	3	6.1%
Would increase house values	2	4.1%
Explore private/public partnerships	2	4.1%
Will help environment	1	2.0%
Money is not in place right now	1	2.0%
Total	49	100.0%

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

Q2B Employment Lands Comments

	Frequency	Percent
Q2B EMPLOYMENT LANDS COMMENTS		
Important for economic future	17	34.7%
Brownfields should be first	16	32.7%
Overall plan should be accountable	7	14.3%
Have minimal impact on greenfields, hereditary sites	5	10.2%
Shovel-ready prospects are positive	4	8.2%
Needs more study/research	4	8.2%
Development from new business relocating to Hamilton	3	6.1%
Is not a long-term solution	3	6.1%
Only specific industries should be developed	2	4.1%
Businesses may not be high employment manufacturing	2	4.1%
Long-term return of tax base is important	1	2.0%
Maintain land values/remove liability	1	2.0%
Should have been done already	1	2.0%
May have a large effect on taxpayers	1	2.0%
No answer	2	4.1%
Total	49	100.0%

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

Q3B GO Transit Comments

	Frequency	Percent
Q3B GO TRANSIT		
Key to growth opportunities	25	51.0%
Support Liuna option	10	20.4%
Will link downtown	7	14.3%
Continue to integrate with regional/local transit	7	14.3%
Good for environment/less traffic	4	8.2%
Current system is behind the times	3	6.1%
Tourism would increase	3	6.1%
Needs research to ensure reliability	2	4.1%
Centre Mall should have a location stop	1	2.0%
Lobby government for funds	1	2.0%

Concentrate only on peak hours	1	2.0%
No answer	4	8.2%
Total	49	100.0%

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

Q4B Economic Development Comments

	Frequency	Percent
Q4B ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT		
There is more knowledge and skill in private sector	12	24.5%
Increase opportunities/new initiatives	10	20.4%
Measure of success or failure needed	6	12.2%
Better at making timely decisions	6	12.2%
Not needed	6	12.2%
Staff needs to be more efficient and accountable	5	10.2%
Current system is behind the times	3	6.1%
Need more information	3	6.1%
Mayor and council should be officers	2	4.1%
Use an advisory committee instead	2	4.1%
Concerns with conflict of interest	2	4.1%
Would create duplication of services	2	4.1%
More time needed for existing businesses	1	2.0%
Local-only approach for outsourcing	1	2.0%
No answer	5	10.2%
Total	49	100.0%

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

Q5B Transit Commission Comments

	Frequency	Percent
Q5B TRANSIT COMMISSION		
Build upon what they already have in place	17	34.7%
Should be run more like a business	11	22.4%
Services would improve	6	12.2%
More research is required	6	12.2%
Would be more accountable to citizens	4	8.2%
Current system does not work	3	6.1%
Fares may increase	3	6.1%
Would have better control of fares	2	4.1%
More creative	1	2.0%
As long as unionized workers are protected	1	2.0%
Needs to be subsidized for disadvantaged	1	2.0%
Absence of leadership is the real issue	1	2.0%
No answer	7	14.3%

Total	49	100.0%
-------	----	--------

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

Q6B Variable Property Tax Rate Comments

	Frequency	Percent
Q6B PROPERTY TAX RATE		
The service levels vary from area to area	16	32.7%
Too much disparity across areas, pay equally	8	16.3%
Taxes must be tied to services received	5	10.2%
Continue to improve services where needed	4	8.2%
Have minimum tax structure and extra for other services	3	6.1%
Suburbs should acknowledge that City paid infrastructure	2	4.1%
Access other areas to ensure we are taxing accordingly	2	4.1%
Need to consider property values	2	4.1%
Should look at a new boundary for different needs	2	4.1%
People should be better advised what paying for	1	2.0%
Special consideration for rural areas	1	2.0%
Need more information	1	2.0%
Use provincial average as goal	1	2.0%
No answer	6	12.2%
Total	49	100.0%

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

Q7B Jobs and Prosperity Comments

	Frequency	Percent
Q7B JOBS AND PROSPERITY		
Need more business/tax base	19	38.8%
Improve image of downtown	10	20.4%
Reward success by setting standards and measuring programs	5	10.2%
Need improved maintenance and upgrades/infrastructure	4	8.2%
Create better communication with constituents and council	4	8.2%
Youth is the key/education	4	8.2%
Support removal of parking meters on Locke St. and SC	2	4.1%
Overcome poverty, with heavy law enforcement	2	4.1%
Engage residents in initiatives to beautify city	2	4.1%
Should have more imports and exports	2	4.1%
More police officers	2	4.1%
Affordable housing, green energy design	2	4.1%
Subsidized housing downtown will not help city	1	2.0%
Impressed with efforts of BLG	1	2.0%
Supportive of property standards for neighbourhoods	1	2.0%

Reduce unemployment using stakeholders	1	2.0%
Working families are the key	1	2.0%
Social services throughout city	1	2.0%
Move forward with transit decision	1	2.0%
Too much taxing and regulations	1	2.0%
No answer	8	16.3%
 Total	 49	 100.0%

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

6.0 ANALYSIS OF COMMENTS BY WARD

Q1B Light Rail Comments By Ward

	WARD							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Q1B LIGHT RAIL COMMENTS								
Economic growth directly related	1	9	2	1	1	1	1	0
Needs government funding and support	2	3	0	2	1	2	1	0
Need cost/benefit analysis	0	6	3	0	1	1	0	1
Should be acted on now	0	2	1	0	0	1	2	0
Have seen benefits in other cities	0	2	1	0	0	0	1	0
Need to sort out design	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	0
No answer	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Would increase house values	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Explore private/public partnerships	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Will help environment	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
Money is not in place right now	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
Total	3	15	5	3	2	4	3	1
	WARD							
	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	Total
Q1B LIGHT RAIL COMMENTS								
Economic growth directly								

related	1	1	0	1	1	0	3	23
Needs government funding and support	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	15
Need cost/benefit analysis	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	14
Should be acted on now	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	7
Have seen benefits in other cities	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5
Need to sort out design	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	5
No answer	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3
Would increase house values	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2
Explore private/public partnerships	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	2
Will help environment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Money is not in place right now	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Total	1	2	2	1	3	1	3	49

The numbers do not add to the total due to multiple mentions.

Q2B Employment Lands Comments By Ward

Q2B EMPLOYMENT LANDS COMMENTS	WARD							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Important for economic future	0	5	1	0	2	3	2	1
Brownfields should be first	1	7	1	2	1	0	2	0
Overall plan should be accountable	0	2	1	0	0	1	1	0
Have minimal impact on greenfields, hereditary sites	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
Shovel-ready prospects are positive	0	2	0	1	0	1	0	0
Needs more study/research	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0
Development from new business relocating to Hamilton	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0
Is not a long-term solution	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Only specific industries should be developed	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
No answer	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Businesses may not be high employment manufacturing	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Long-term return of tax base is important	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Maintain land values/remove liability	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Should have been done already	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
May have a large effect on taxpayers	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	3	15	5	3	2	4	3	1

* The numbers do not add to the total due to multiple mentions.

(continued)

Q2B Employment Lands Comments By Ward (Continued)

Q2B EMPLOYMENT LANDS COMMENTS	WARD							Total
	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	
Important for economic future	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	17
Brownfields should be first	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	16
Overall plan should be accountable	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	7
Have minimal impact on greenfields, hereditary sites	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	5
Shovel-ready prospects are positive	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Needs more study/research	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	4
Development from new business relocating to Hamilton	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3
Is not a long-term solution	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	3
Only specific industries should be developed	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2
No answer	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Businesses may not be high employment manufacturing	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2
Long-term return of tax base is important	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Maintain land values/remove liability	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Should have been done already	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
May have a large effect on taxpayers	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Total	1	2	2	1	3	1	3	49

The numbers do not add to the total due to multiple mentions.

Q3B GO Transit Comments By Ward

	WARD							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Q3B GO TRANSIT								
Key to growth opportunities	1	7	3	1	0	3	1	1
Support Liuna option	1	4	1	0	1	1	1	0
Will link downtown	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	1
Continue to integrate with regional/local transit	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	0
Good for environment/less traffic	0	2	1	0	0	1	0	0
No answer	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0
Current system is behind the times	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Tourism would increase	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
Needs research to ensure reliability	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Centre Mall should have a location stop	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lobby government for funds	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Concentrate only on peak hours	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	3	15	5	3	2	4	3	1

	WARD							Total
	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	
Q3B GO TRANSIT								
Key to growth opportunities	1	0	2	0	2	1	2	25
Support Liuna option	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	10
Will link downtown	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	7
Continue to integrate with regional/local transit	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	7
Good for environment/less traffic	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
No answer	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	4
Current system is behind the times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Tourism would increase	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3
Needs research to ensure reliability	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	2
Centre Mall should have a location stop	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Lobby government for funds	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Concentrate only on peak hours	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Total	1	2	2	1	3	1	3	49
-------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

The numbers do not add to the total due to multiple mentions.

Q4B Economic Development Comments By Ward

Q4B ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT	WARD							
	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>8</u>
There is more knowledge and skill in private sector	1	6	2	0	0	0	0	0
Increase opportunities/new initiatives	1	4	0	0	0	1	0	0
Measure of success or failure needed	0	2	1	0	0	0	1	0
Better at making timely decisions	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	0
Not needed	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	0
No answer	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	0
Staff needs to be more efficient and accountable	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0
Current system is behind the times	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
Need more information	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mayor and council should be officers	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Use an advisory committee instead	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0
Concerns with conflict of interest	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0
Would create duplication of services	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
More time needed for existing businesses	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
Local-only approach for outsourcing	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
Total	3	15	5	3	2	4	3	1

* The numbers do not add to the total due to multiple mentions.

(continued)

Q4B Economic Development Comments By Ward (Continued)

	WARD							Total
	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	
Q4B ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT								
There is more knowledge and skill in private sector	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	12
Increase opportunities/new initiatives	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	10
Measure of success or failure needed	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	6
Better at making timely decisions	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	6
Not needed	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	6
No answer	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Staff needs to be more efficient and accountable	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	5
Current system is behind the times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Need more information	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	3
Mayor and council should be officers	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Use an advisory committee instead	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Concerns with conflict of interest	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Would create duplication of services	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
More time needed for existing businesses	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Local-only approach for outsourcing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Total	1	2	2	1	3	1	3	49

The numbers do not add to the total due to multiple mentions.

Q5B Transit Commission Comments By Ward

	WARD							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Q5B TRANSIT COMMISSION								
Build upon what they already								

have in place	0	5	1	1	1	1	1	1
Should be run more like a business	0	6	0	0	0	1	0	0
No answer	0	2	1	2	1	0	0	0
Services would improve	2	1	0	0	0	1	1	0
More research is required	0	1	1	0	0	2	0	0
Would be more accountable to citizens	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0
Current system does not work	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0
Fares may increase	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
Better control of fares and increases	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
More creative	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
As long as unionized workers are protected	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Needs to be subsidized for disadvantaged	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Absence of leadership is the real issue	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Total	3	15	5	3	2	4	3	1

	WARD							
	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	Total
Q5B TRANSIT COMMISSION								
Build upon what they already have in place	0	1	2	0	1	1	1	17
Should be run more like a business	0	1	0	0	1	0	2	11
No answer	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Services would improve	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	6
More research is required	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	6
Would be more accountable to citizens	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4
Current system does not work	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Fares may increase	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Better control of fares and increases	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	2
More creative	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
As long as unionized workers are protected	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
Needs to be subsidized for disadvantaged	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Absence of leadership is the real issue	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Total	1	2	2	1	3	1	3	49

The numbers do not add to the total due to multiple mentions.

Q6B Property Tax Comments By Ward

	WARD							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Q6B PROPERTY TAX RATE								
The service levels vary from area to area	1	5	1	0	0	0	0	1
Too much disparity across areas, pay equally	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	0
No answer	0	0	1	2	1	1	0	0
Taxes must be tied to services received	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0

Continue to improve services where needed	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0
Have minimum tax structure and extra for other services	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	0
Suburbs should acknowledge that City paid infrastructure	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
Access other areas to ensure we are taxing accordingly	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Need to consider property values	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
Should look at a new boundary for different needs	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0
People should be better advised what paying for	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Special consideration for rural areas	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Need more information	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Use provincial average as goal	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Total	3	15	5	3	2	4	3	1

* The numbers do not add to the total due to multiple mentions.
(continued)

Q6B Property Tax Comments By Ward (Continued)

Q6B PROPERTY TAX RATE	WARD							Total
	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	
The service levels vary from area to area	0	2	2	1	1	1	1	16
Too much disparity across areas, pay equally	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
No answer	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	6
Taxes must be tied to services received	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	5
Continue to improve services where needed	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Have minimum tax structure and extra for other services	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Suburbs should acknowledge								

that City paid infrastructure	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Access other areas to ensure we are taxing accordingly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2
Need to consider property values	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Should look at a new boundary for different needs	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
People should be better advised what paying for	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Special consideration for rural areas	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Need more information	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Use provincial average as goal	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Total	1	2	2	1	3	1	3	49

The numbers do not add to the total due to multiple mentions.

Q7B Jobs Prosperity Comments By Ward

Q7B JOBS PROSPERITY	WARD							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Need more business tax base	1	5	3	1	0	1	2	0
Improve image of downtown	0	6	1	0	1	0	0	0
No answer	1	1	1	2	1	0	0	0
Reward success by setting standards and measuring programs	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	0
Need improved maintenance and upgrades/infrastructure	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0
Create better communication with constituents and council	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Youth is the key/education	0	0	2	0	0	1	1	0
Support removal of parking meters on Locke St. and SC	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Overcome poverty, with heavy law enforcement	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Engage residents in initiatives to beautify								

city	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
Should have more imports and exports	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
More police officers	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Affordable housing, green energy design	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Subsidized housing downtown will not help city	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Impressed with efforts of BLG	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Supportive of property standards for neighbourhoods	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Reduce unemployment using stakeholders	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Working families are the key	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Social services throughout city	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Move forward with transit decision	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Too much taxing and regulations	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	3	15	5	3	2	4	3	1

* The numbers do not add to the total due to multiple mentions.
(continued)

Q7B Jobs Prosperity Comments By Ward (Continued)

Q7B JOBS PROSPERITY	WARD							Total
	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	
Need more business tax base	0	2	1	1	1	0	1	19
Improve image of downtown	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	10
No answer	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	8
Reward success by setting standards and measuring programs	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	5
Need improved maintenance and upgrades/infrastructure	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	4
Create better communication with constituents and council	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	4
Youth is the key/education	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Support removal of parking meters on Locke St. and SC	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Overcome poverty, with heavy law enforcement	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	2
Engage residents in initiatives to beautify city	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Should have more imports and exports	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
More police officers	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
Affordable housing, green energy design	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2

Subsidized housing downtown will not help city	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Impressed with efforts of BLG	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Supportive of property standards for neighbourhoods	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Reduce unemployment using stakeholders	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Working families are the key	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Social services throughout city	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Move forward with transit decision	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Too much taxing and regulations	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Total	1	2	2	1	3	1	3	49

* The numbers do not add to the total due to multiple mentions.