Agenda - Executive Policy Committee – May 17, 2006

REPORTS

Item No. 3 Ronald Houston Park - Land Dedication Reserve
File EP-2

COMMUNITY COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:

On May 9, 2006, the East Kildonan-Transcona Community Committee recommended to the Executive Policy Committee:

1. That funding to assist with the cost of the lighting project in Ronald Houston Park, in the amount of $1,500.00, be allocated from the East Kildonan-Transcona Land Dedication Reserve Fund.

2. That the Proper Officers of the City be authorized to do all things necessary to implement the intent of the foregoing.

DECISION MAKING HISTORY:

COMMUNITY COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:

On May 9, 2006, the East Kildonan-Transcona Community Committee recommended:

1. That funding to assist with the cost of the lighting project in Ronald Houston Park, in the amount of $1,500.00, be allocated from the East Kildonan-Transcona Land Dedication Reserve Fund.

2. That the Proper Officers of the City be authorized to do all things necessary to implement the intent of the foregoing.

and submitted the matter to the Executive Policy Committee.

COMMUNITY COMMITTEE DECISION:

On January 13, 2004, the East Kildonan-Transcona Community Committee concurred in the administrative recommendation and approved a Community Incentive Grant in the amount of $6,210.04 to purchase and install two lights in Ronald Houston Park.

-----Original Message-----
From: Beaton, Donna
Sent: Fri 4/21/2006 5:27 PM
To: Wyatt, Russ
Cc:
Subject: Ronald Houston Park

Hi Councillor Wyatt,

Further to our discussion earlier today, the following is to outline a request for additional funds for Ronald Houston Park to complete their lighting project.

Because we seemed to be short of funds even though contractor unit prices seemed reasonable, I decided to go back and recheck all my numbers. In the process I found an email to David Low of the Canterbury Park residents association, dated December 1, 2003 which indicated we required $14,090 to install two lights complete with electrical service to the site. The total of funds turned over by the group for the project is $12,385.95 - this $1704.05 less than the 2003 estimate.

Despite inflation, we seem to have obtained good prices. However, with $12,385.95 we can only install one light standard. With an additional $1500.00 we would be able to do both. (Luckily Hydro gave us a better cost for the electrical service than initially estimated).

My apologies for only noting this now. Unfortunately, I am never sure what information the resident groups put forward when they request funds, and I made an assumption they had requested enough to cover the project, based on a knowledge of their own bank accounts. It could be that we all anticipated more $ in their account at the conclusion of Phase 1 than there was in reality??

In any case, if there an additional $1500.00 can be allocated to the Ronald Houston project, then we can get both lights installed as originally planned.

Please contact me if you require any additional information.

Best Regards,

Donna Beaton, B.E.S., MLArch
Urban Designer
Parks, Riverbanks & Community Initiatives Branch
Planning Property & Development Department
City of Winnipeg

COMMUNITY INCENTIVE GRANT PROGRAM
APPLICATION EVALUATION

Applicant: Canterbury Park Residents' Association
Project Description: Ronald Houston Park

Date of Application: December 19, 2003

Total Project Cost:$12,420.08
Grant Requested:$ 6,210.04
Maximum Allowed: $ 6,210.04
% of Total Project Cost: 50%

Funding Sources:	**Amount**	**Confirmed**
Transcona Credit Union (resources from 4 years of fundraising)	$6,210.04	YES
Total	$6,210.04	

	Meets Program Eligibility and Selection Criteria	**Yes**	**No**
1a)	Organization is a **non-profit community organization offering sport or recreation services** or is a non-profit community organization that **contributes to the health and well-being of the community**;	X	
b)	through the development of a **sport or recreation capital project**;	X	
c)	that is **accessible to the community**.	X	
2	Makes a significant contribution to the **long-term benefit** of the community at large in terms of **improved facilities.**	X	
3	Does not compete with or duplicate other community facilities.	X	
4	**Benefits the community at large** and remains **accessible to all members of the community**.	X	
5	Includes confirmation of sufficient resources to maintain and operate completed projects.	X	
6	Clearly articulates a plan of activities including projected work schedules, material, labour, equipment and other project requirements. Project leads to the completion of a substantial physical product.	X	
7	Is feasible within the project management capabilities of the applicant.	X	
8	Total project funding is confirmed.	X	
9	**Does not include any funds from the City**.	X	

Criteria Exceptions:
Department Financial Implications:
Departmental Recommendations:
That this application be approved subject to the following conditions:
1. Confirmation of other funding sources
2. Approval of final plans and specifications for the project by the City of Winnipeg
3. The applicant entering into a formal agreement with the City of Winnipeg

Prepared by: Community Services Department
Date: **December 19, 2003**
Application Evaluation Revised September 25, 2003