

File

A G E N D A

For the meeting of City Council to be held in the Council Chambers on Monday, February 3, 1958 at 7:30 p.m.

---

1. Present:

Confirmation of the minutes of the meeting held January 27, 1958

2. Correspondence:

1. Re: Sale of Water by the City to RCAF Station, Penhold

2. Ted Obdeyn re Application for License Approval

3. M.E.L. Construction re Application to Purchase Lot 4, Block 7, Plan 1355 K.S.

3. By-laws:

1. No. 1941 - Closing of 43 Avenue

4. Aldermen's New Business:

5. Reports:

1. Re: Seal Coating of Paved Roads

2. Re: District Planning Commission Budget 1958/59

3. Re: Light Rates Charged to Trailer Owners

4. Re: 1958 Mill Rate

5. Re: Notes on Recent Meeting of Alberta Municipalities Assoc.

6. Re: Parking Meter Collections

6. New Business:

1. Payment of Accounts

CORRESPONDENCE:

LETTER NO. 1

September 18, 1957

Mr. Denis Cole, Director  
Red Deer District Planning Commission  
Red Deer, Alberta

Re: Sale of Water by the City of Red Deer  
to R.C.A.F. Station, Penhold

Dear Mr. Cole:

We are preparing preliminary plans and estimates of cost to provide additional water supply facilities for the R.C.A.F. Station Penhold. We have made a thorough investigation of costs of obtaining water from the Red Deer River and treating it for the needs of the Station. The preliminary estimate indicates that the capital cost of laying a water line to the City of Red Deer would be considerably less, and if water could be bought from the City of Red Deer for a reasonable price, it may be the best solution for the water supply problem at the Air Force Station.

We would, therefore, appreciate it very much if you could advise us of the approximate price, if the City of Red Deer is willing to sell water at its southern boundary. It is possible that off-peak service may be satisfactory so that you might work prices out on both the constant demand and the off-peak demand basis.

Yours very truly,

STANLEY, GRIMBLE, ROBLIN LTD.

-----

September 27, 1957

Messrs. Stanley, Grimble, Roblin  
Consulting Engineers  
11605 - Jasper Avenue  
Edmonton, Alberta

Dear Sirs:

Re: Sale of Water by City of Red Deer  
to R.C.A.F. Station, Penhold

Thank you for your letter dated September 18, 1957. I think it is probable that the City would be interested in your proposal, but before we can quote you figures it will be necessary for us to know the approximate quantities involved.

There is little doubt in my mind that arrangements would have to be made whereby the line would have to be taken from the intersection of 48th Avenue and Springbett Drive (14" line) and taken out to the Highway and thence past the Chrysler Plant, on the South side of which the metering would take place. This route would fit in with our future plans and arrangements might have to be made whereby the pipe as far as the Chrysler Plant would be larger than Penhold requires so that it can service properties along the Highways.

As soon as we receive a reply from you regarding quantities, we will be pleased to go into this matter with the City and let you know their views and comments as soon as possible.

Yours truly,

Denis Cole  
Director, R.D.D.P.C.

October 1, 1957

Mr. Denis Cole, Director  
 Red Deer District Planning Commission  
 Red Deer, Alberta

Re: Sale of Water by City of Red Deer  
 and RCAF Station, Penhold

Dear Mr. Cole:

Regarding your letter of September 27, the estimated requirement of water by the RCAF Station, Penhold, is 200,000 Imperial gallons per day.

Yours very truly,

STANLEY, GRIMBLE, ROBLIN LTD.

-----  
 January 29, 1958

To: City Commissioners  
 From: City Engineer  
 Re: Sale of Water to Penhold

We have had correspondence from Stanley, Grimble, and Roblin, Consulting Engineers, who are acting on behalf of the Federal Government. We are given to understand that the government would like to buy water from this City if the cost to them would be less than the cost of producing their own water. They would probably be willing to enter an agreement whereby they would build the line from the City boundary line to Penhold and would pay us to maintain the line. Also they probably would contribute a fair share for that portion of the line within the City limits. We feel confident that we can work out a satisfactory arrangement in connection with the installation of the line.

The problem of arriving at a charge for the water is quite complicated and in the final analysis may be a matter of opinion. The purpose of this report is to present all the facts to the Commissioners, and later to Council, for their critical analysis of our thinking, so that it will be possible to arrive at a charge which is profitable to the City, but less than the maximum economical unit rate from the viewpoint of the consumer, i.e. the Government.

It might be advisable at this point to clarify the City's position as to satisfying its own domestic and fire demand plus Penhold's demand. In 1957 the City used about 365,000,000 gallons of water. This amounts to 1,000,000 per day on the average. On the peak day, 2,800,000 gallons of water were used. In five years the peak will probably reach the plant's maximum capacity (4.3 MGD) and the plant will have to be expanded. When we reach the peak our average daily consumption will not be over 2,000,000 per day. However, the plant will have to be expanded, notwithstanding reservoirs, in order to cope with the peak domestic demand plus fire over a period of weeks in summer. We have been told that the government would agree to use their own wells and reservoir during periods of peak demand in the City. These periods would only last two or three days at a time.

This means that for about 97% of the time we would have no trouble supplying Penhold with water. For the other 3% of the time they would presumably draw on their own water supply so that we could supply our own peak demand and have our reservoirs full in the morning to take care of the next days peak and be prepared for a conflagration.

Last year the City produced 365,000,000 gallons of water at a cost of \$224,000.00. This represents a unit cost of 62.2 cents per 1000 gallons. It can be appreciated that a number of the costs are fixed costs which remain constant whether you produce 365 million gallons or 1000 million gallons. Other costs may increase slightly whereas some costs may increase in exact proportion to production. It could be dangerous if any cost increased radically i.e. early expansion of the filter plant. Under the arrangement that could be made it is not likely that this could happen. Theoretically, eventually it could mean earlier expansion but actually other considerations would be over riding.

In order to make a first comparison we have the following table showing the actual costs of producing 365 million gallons of water in 1957. On the same table the estimated costs of producing water in 1962 are also shown. These costs are based on our own thoughts as to the degree of increase or decrease, based on a consumption of 730 million gallons annually. Some of the unit costs in 1962 would be reduced further, but we are being conservative.

	1957 (365 M.G.)	1962 (730 M.G.)
Salaries and Wages (billing)	0.90	0.90
Stationary and Phones	0.27	0.27
Meter Reader's Wages	0.44	0.44
Production Expense (Labour Materials, Power)	18.40	13.30
Distribution Mtce.	16.50	16.50
Misc. Expense	0.19	0.19
Franchise	2.58	2.58
Treasurer's Office Charge	0.82	0.82
Debt. Interest	8.90	
Debt. Principle	12.90	17.50
Prov. for bad debts	<u>0.27</u>	<u>0.27</u>
	62.17	52.77
Say	<u>62.2</u>	<u>52.8</u>

The average cost over the next five years would then be 57.5 cents per 1000 gallons. Note: debenture repayments include distribution system.

Penhold is interested in obtaining about 200,000 gallons of water a day. In 1957 the cities average annual consumption was one million gallons, in 1962 it will be about two million gallons. The problem is to decide what the true cost will be to produce the extra 200,000 gallons per day. Following is a table showing what we consider to be the increase in cost for producing this particular 200,000 gallons of water which is over and above the normal demand.

Salaries and wages (billing)	- little or no increase	0.90
Stationary and Phones	- " " " "	0.27
Meter reader's wages	- " " " "	0.44
Production expense	- (materials and power only)	12.00
Distribution Mtce.	- $\frac{2 \text{ miles}}{39.6 \text{ miles}} \times 16.50$	0.84
Misc. Expense	-	0.19
Franchise	-	2.58
Treasurer's Office Charge	-	0.82
Debt Interest	- nil	-
Debt Principle	- nil	-
Provision for Bad Debts	-	0.27
Cost in cents for 1000 gallons of water		<u>18.31</u>

If the City agreed to sell water to Penhold at price we believe may be accepted (33¢) and charged Penhold for a minimum of 200,000 gallons each day, the profit would be - \$10,700 per annum

Going back to the items which make up the total of 18.31 cents per 1000 gallons, you will note that no levy has been made for debenture interest and principle. Last year we budgeted about \$79,500 to handle these items. The repayment on the filter plant amounts to \$31,000 out of this total. The City pays this amount annually whether we use the total plant capacity or not. However, we believe that it would be fair and equitable to shift a portion of this capital cost to the government because all other consumers share in the cost. The share would be -  $\frac{200,000 \text{ gallons daily}}{4,300,000 \text{ gallons daily}} \times \$31,000 = \$1,400$  per annum.

This would then mean that the above mentioned profit would become \$10,700 - \$1,400 = \$9,300 per annum.

We have thought that perhaps the government should contribute some share of the capital expenditure required to construct the water tower and the reservoir. However, they maintain that they will be drawing water in off peak periods and this storage is not necessary to them. This can be delved into futher, if and when an agreement is drawn up. If the agreement is drawn up, to the effect that they draw water on off peak periods and we eventually find that they have to draw water during peak periods, reconsideration of the agreement may be necessary. It is our feeling that they would honour the agreement and even if they didn't the \$9,300 net profit shown above would still handle their portion of capital cost of reservoirs quite nicely with a margin to spare.

When we require a filtration plant addition it will cost about \$750,000, at about 5% interest. The repayment of principle and interest over 20 years would amount to \$60,000 annually.

If Penhold still requires water when we build the new plant we believe the following would apply:

- (a) The City would require all of the old plants productions.
- (b) The first 200,000 G.P.D. from the new addition would be available for Penhold.
- (c) Penhold would pay 18.31 cents per 1000 gallons of water.
- (d) Penhold would not make the \$1,400 annual payment (through the water rate of 33 cents) to retire the debenture on the old plant.
- (e) Penhold would be required to contribute to the capital expenditure on the new plant only.

i.e.  $\frac{\text{Penhold daily demand}}{\text{New Plant capacity}} \times \text{annual debenture repayment}$

$$= \frac{200,000}{4,300,000} \times \$60,000 = \$2,800$$

Summing up this would mean that if we sold water to Penhold today we could make an annual profit of \$9,300, based on a charge of 33 cents per 1000 gallons. When the new plant extension takes place, the profit would be as follows:

Charge	33.00¢
Actual cost of producing extr water	<u>18.31¢</u>
Difference	<u>14.69</u>
Profit before capitalization -	
	$\frac{200,000 \times 365 \times 14.69}{1,000 \times 100} = 10,700$
Capitalization	<u>2,800</u>
Net Profit annually	<u>\$7,900</u>

It should be noted that Penhold would be paying for the actual cost of producing the water plus \$10,700 for capitalization and profit. This represents almost 18% of the annual debenture repayment on a new plant extension, whereas they would only use about 5% of the plant capacity.

Following are a number of comparisons

Domestic: average rate	56 cents/1000 gallons
Commercial: average rate	80 cents/1000 gallons
P.T.S. standard rate	37 cents/1000 gallons
C.A.D.P. - standard rate	8 cents/1000 gallons

NOTE: P.T.S. uses about 100,000 gallons a day  
C.A.D.P. has a special arrangement with the City.

We believe that negotiations should not be carried any further until the unit rate is set. The Commissioners and Council's opinion in this matter is vital.

From this fairly exhaustive study of water rates we have gleaned some other information which may be of interest at this time. The important item to note is that the waterworks department is approaching the stature of being a revenue producing department. There are several reasons why this is not obvious i.e.

(a) The revenue from special assessment for water is not shown on the performance statement. It is shown in revenue from taxation.

(b) Frontage charges on water mains are not shown as a revenue from waterworks. They are shown in revenue from taxation. This revenue will increase as a frontage charge or as a prepayment. Prior to 1953 no charge was made, thus there was no revenue.

(c) Prepayment on water mains is not being shown as a revenue in waterworks.

The above mentioned items are not shown in the performance statements, mainly for reasons of bookkeeping.

One other item which could affect the amount of revenue the waterworks department acquires is the rental of fire hydrants to the Fire Department. It has been estimated that 70% of waterworks expenditures, for a City this size, is required to take care of fire demand. The charge at present is \$50.00 per hydrant, whereas in Edmonton the charge is \$100 per hydrant. We should actually be charging more than Edmonton does.

The above discussion pertains mainly to taking money out of one pocket and putting it in another. However, we all do take pride in our work, and we think there is merit in showing as exactly as possible each department's true financial position.

Yours truly,

N.J. Deck  
City Engineer

LETTER NO. 2

5902 - 54th Avenue  
Red Deer, Alberta  
January 24, 1958

To the City of Red Deer:

I would like to have a permission to run the business "North Red Deer Welding and Blacksmithing", before under the name of "Red Deer Industries".

Yours truly,

Ted Obdeyn

NOTE:

Would require resolution of Council.

COMMISSIONERS

LETTER NO. 3

January 14, 1958

City of Red Deer

Dear Sirs:

M.E.L. Construction Co. Ltd. wishes to purchase Lot 4, Block 7, Plan 1355 K.S., 3.11 acres on 49 Street. The proposed building will be 60 feet by 100 feet long, and used primarily as a repair shop. This building will be built of cement blocks with a round roof. The front end of the building will have 2 story office space and parts room.

This building will value approximately \$35,000.

The reason that we require this amount of land is that M.E.L. Construction Co. Ltd., now has 24 units, not including 8 trucks, and we are looking forward to possible future expansion

Yours truly,

M.E. Layden

-----  
January 20, 1958

City Assessor  
City of Red Deer  
Red Deer, Alberta

Dear Sir:

Re: Application from M.E.L. Construction Co. Ltd.

In reply to your enquiry regarding the above application for land in the City industrial area west of the C.P.R. tracks, I would submit the following comments:

(i) The land in question is intended to be serviced with trackage at a future date.

(ii) It would seem most unlikely that the applicant will require trackage.

(iii) The disposal of large areas of land (over 3 acres) which will be largely used for vehicle parking is considered inadvisable, even though the applicant proposed to erect a \$35,000 building. The City is very limited in its Industrial Areas, having filled one half of the total in 3-4 years, and the present industrial area is ideally suited to concentrated warehouse development and will be required for this purpose during the coming years, due to its proximity to the City Centre.

(iv) From the planning point of view, this type of development should be located further from the City Centre, and I advised the applicant (who asked my advise) to try and acquire a small frontage on the west side of Highway No. 2 for his building with adequate area behind that for parking his vehicles. The applicant agreed with my advice, but on contacting the owner was unable to obtain a firm price on the Highway frontage, and he considered the price on the unimproved rear land as excessive. He will also be free of the personal property tax levy on his vehicles to which he would presumably be subject in the M.D. He is therefore seeking land in the City.

#### Recommendations

(i) As the land applied for is later to be served by trackage, and the applicant will not require it, it is recommended that the City offer him alternative land which cannot be served by trackage. e.g. north of 55th Avenue, even if a concession has to be made on the sale price, and improvements/frontage ratio due to the long frontage, shallow depth, and Calgary Power Easement restriction.

(iii) It is suggested the sale policy should be clarified. Presumable if trackage is to be supplied to a lot or parcel in the future, the appropriate charge should be made at the time of sale, in the same way as for sewer, water and roads, otherwise when the trackage is installed, recovery will be difficult if not impossible.

(iii) It is suggested that the improvement/frontage ratio application should be clarified. It is my understanding that the following is the present policy.

- (a) \$250 improvements per foot frontage - 54th Avenue.
- (b) \$150 improvements per foot frontage - elsewhere with trackage.
- (c) \$100 improvements per foot frontage - elsewhere without trackage.

Item (C) was low, not because the lack of trackage makes the improvement requirement lower, but because the land to which this applied (north of 55th Avenue), was subject to a restrictive Calgary Power Easement, and only a small part of each lot could be built on.

Now that the Southern section of the Industrial area is being opened up and excellent unrestricted land is being made available, it is recommended that item (c) should be changed to \$150.00 improvements per foot frontage, except on the lots north of 55th Avenue, restricted by the Calgary Power Easement, which would remain at \$100.00.

Your truly,

Denis Cole  
Director, R.D.D.P.C.

449' x 300'	
Land	3,367.50
Survey	125.00
P. Utilites	4,714.50
S & W	125.00
	<hr/>
Total	\$8,332.00

NOTE: Would agree to this recommendation of selling the land north west of 55 Ave.

Commissioners

January 29, 1958

To City Commissioners

From City Engineer

Re: Seal Coating Roads

Following is a letter in connection with seal coating which explains our position.

January 24, 1958

L. M. E. Hawkins,  
Haddin, Davis & Brown Ltd.  
1134 - 8th Avenue West,  
Calgary, Alberta.

Dear Sir:

Re: Seal Coating

This matter was discussed to some extent with Mr. Vickerman. We think that seal coating could be handled as follows:

1. State in the road contract that it is anticipated that \$30,000 worth of seal coating will be done in conjunction with the road programme. This seal coating will be done on roads constructed in the last three years, etc.
2. Draw up complete plans and specifications and ask for a unit price.
3. This could be considered as an unclassified item.

The reason why we cannot be absolutely sure this work will be done is because it is a maintenance charge rather than a capital expenditure. Consequently, the money for the work must be derived from general revenue. In order to determine whether this money is available from general revenue we must wait until the budget is set. You can appreciate that \$30,000 represents 2½ mills which seems like an awful lot about budget time.

There are several advantages in handling seal coating in this unusual way. First, we have never done seal coating and therefore have no idea what the cost may be. (We have had quotes from "reliable" sources varying from 12 cents to 25 cents per square yard.) When we receive the unit prices we can then determine exactly how many blocks we can coat. Secondly, it will give us time to decide on what blocks to do and the timing of the work.

If you can see any problems in handling the matter in this way, please let us know as soon as possible.

Yours truly,

N. J. Deck,  
City Engineer.

Mr. Hawkins phoned me today and asked whether we would like to stock-pile the gravel for this project. He feels that we could save a considerable amount of money by negotiating a contract perhaps with the successful bidder of the 40,000 tons of gravel. This suggestion has considerable merit but it would mean an outlay of \$5,000 to \$6,000 this year whereas the gravel may not be used until next year.

Your thoughts on this matter would be appreciated.

Yours truly,

N. J. Deck,  
City Engineer

NOTE

Would suggest that even if we could not manage the \$30,000.00 for such coating this year, we could manage the \$5 - 6000.00 for the gravel subject to the price being reasonable.

Commissioner

City Clerk,  
City of Red Deer,  
RED DEER, Alberta.

Dear Sir:

Re: Commission Budget 1958/59

Herewith ten copies of the budget unanimously approved by the members of this Commission.

The work of the Commission is expanding both for the existing members and by the addition of new members. Two new members will be added in 1958-59, namely the M. D. of Mountain View and the Village of Bowden.

It will be noted that the share of the City of Red Deer of the total budget has been reduced from 47% in 1953 and 1954 to 40.0% in 1957-58 and 36.5% in 1958-59.

Work undertaken for the City since April 1st, 1957, includes:

- (i) Completion of Traffic Report \$5847.29  
(total cost \$10,843.19).
- (ii) Downtown Recreation Area Design \$1200.00  
(by request - contracted)
- (iii) Collection of data in connection with  
Boundary Extension Application
- (iv) Report on cost of servicing residential land with  
recommendations ( in conjunction with your  
Engineering Dept.)
- (v) 60% of work on Land Use Survey for preparation of  
new Zoning Map.

Work now on hand and which will be completed before the 31st March 1958 is the major design and re-design of about 100 acres in West Park.

It will be appreciated that a major portion of the time of the staff of the Commission is taken up with day to day planning matters, such as private applications for subdivision and enquiries regarding development whereby it is suggested the Commission renders an invaluable service to the City.

It is hoped that the City is well satisfied with the service provided by the Commission and that your Council will provide us with its final approval of the 1958-59 budget as soon as possible.

Yours truly,

Denis Cole,  
Director  
Red Deer District Planning Commission

NOTE:

Would recommend the adoption of this budget.

Commissioner

City Commissioners  
City of Red Deer

Gentlemen:

At your request I submit the following, being the electric accounts for the premises previously submitted for a one month period, these being for a period of six months, Aug. to Dec. 1957.

K.W.hrs. used	Gross account	Cost per k.w.h.
Red Deer Auto Court 53285	1921.60	3.6¢
H. A. Thull 10755	667.30	6.2¢
Buffalo Hotel 41700	1902.24	4.56¢
Waskaseo Hotel 9000	547.83	6.08¢
Domestic #4-136 1840	52.50	2.85¢
#4-020 1010	39.90	3.95¢
#4-130 965	37.93	3.94¢
#4-060 600	27.60	4.6¢
#4-094 490	24.30	4.96¢

Respectfully submitted,

(O. C. Mills)  
Elec. Supt.

The above report was requested by Council and shows a very interesting picture, which is self explanatory. We also felt the following information would assist Council in making a decision on the request for reduction in light rates by the trailer owners.

The taxes on the Red Deer Auto Court land used for trailer stalls, plus the washroom totals	\$559.90 gross
City license for 50 trailers	80.00
A high estimate of possible revenue from Provincial Government license, for City and School purposes - 50 trailers at average of \$60.00	<u>3,000.00</u>
	\$3,639.90

Average revenue to City - \$3,639.90 ÷ 50 = \$72.71

Examples of home taxes:

House in West Park - Lot 29, Blk. 11, Plan 970 K.S. - 936 sq. ft.	- 218.40
" " " " - Lot 5, Blk. 49, Plan 1231 HW - 832 sq. ft.	- 237.65
House in Grandview - Lot 19, Blk. 12, Plan 5897 - 960 sq. ft.	- 232.05
" " " " - Lot 7, Blk. 11, Plan 5897 - 1040 sq. ft.	- 241.50

The above figures only represent property taxes and do not include frontage taxes.

Regarding use of Block G (triangle) and the road allowance. As we see by the plan, there are 12 trailers presently located on the road allowance, and 3 trailers on Block G.

The following resolutions are brought to Council's attention.

## Council Meeting Minutes - March 9, 1953

A letter was received from the Red Deer Auto Court re a site for trailer camp, expressing some dissatisfaction with the Council's proposal. There was also a delegation of tenants of the trailer camp to present their case before the Council. After a thorough discussion, it was moved by Alderman Johnstone, seconded by Alderman MacKay, that we reconfirm our lease proposal to Red Deer Auto Court for five years, on a yearly basis, at yearly rental of \$50.00 a year, plus responsibility of filling the low spots in this area. Should City have to cancel lease before the end of a five year term, the City would reimburse the Red Deer Auto Court proportionately on cost of filling, which cost must not exceed \$600.00. The resolution carried with Alderman Sim dissenting. The Commissioners are to further negotiate with the Red Deer Auto Court with a view to implementing the Council's decision.

## Council Meeting Minutes - March 23, 1953

The Commissioners had reported regarding their negotiations with the Red Deer Auto Court in connection with their application for additional space for a trailer camp. As a result of discussion, it was moved by Alderman Johnstone, seconded by Alderman McKay, that Council confirm arrangements with Red Deer Auto Court re leasing them a portion of the unused road east of their trailer camp for a period of five years at a rental of \$50.00 for the five years, but with the understanding that Red Deer Auto Court stand cost of the fill. Resolution of March 9th, is hereby rescinded. The motion carried with Alderman Sim and Anderson dissenting.

-----  
 Mr. Geo. Les Strange feels there is an agreement on these two parcels, however, to the best of our knowledge there is not. Regarding Block G., Mr. Les Strange states this arrangement was agreed, not through Council, but with Mr. J. Bettenson, who was Mayor in 1950, and the Red Deer Auto Court were to be allowed to place one trailer there as a caretaker, and the City was to provide comfort station facilities. This was not done, and Mr. Les Strange claims the people from the park are still using his toilet facilities.

Some time in the future this road allowance will be required by the City in connection with the traffic report.

What arrangements would Council recommend we make to clarify this situation.

## COMMISSIONERS

---

 Re: 1958 Mill Rate

It has been tradition for many years past that the City of Red Deer set the Mill Rate in mid March, and have the tax demands due April 1.

In view of the possible changes in financial assistance to the municipalities from the Provincial Government, we recommend that we notify the ratepayers that it is quite possible that in 1958 the mill rate decision may be delayed for 1 month.

## COMMISSIONERS

The Mayors Notes on the Recent Meeting of the Executive of the Alberta Municipalities Association with the Hon. Mr. Hinman.

1. Total estimated requirements of municipalities capital requirements \$108,000,000.00. Government unable to arrange to loan this money.
  2. Government will pick up 2 - 3 million dollars of bonds for the smaller towns who will be unable to finance at a reasonable rate, to be issued in small sums of approximately 50,000.00
  3. Municipal Finance Corporation was suspended, not closed off for all time.
  4. It is understood that no municipality will be required to borrow at over 6%.
  5. Government will not guarantee any bonds either for municipalities, schools or hospitals.
  6. Believe the 1958 grant will be on a per capita basis for schools and cities.
  7. Believe <sup>the desirable</sup> formula for future grants should be -
    - (a) assuming the average mill rate at 40 mills
    - (b) if City mill rate exceed 40
 

1st 10	above 40	Government	pay	2/10
10 - 20	" "	"	"	3/10
20 - 30	" "	"	"	4/10
- We feel this might develop when the equalized assessment has been settled.
8. Hope for help to hospital capital cost over 3 mills.
  9. Industrial Assessment will not be changed in 1958.
  10. Assessment on Government property unchanged in 1958. Grants as now.
  11. Education costs 5 million higher in 1958, total 72 million. Forecast predicts 5 million increase per year, or an average of 4 mills.
  12. Gas royalties on export will increase government revenue.
  13. Capital School Grants will continue on a revised formula.
  14. It was suggested that repairs and remodelling be considered in school grants.

Conclusion:

My opinion after attending several such meetings is that we in Alberta are divided in our thinking at the municipal level.

1. Union of Alberta Municipalities Association
2. Municipal Districts Association
3. School Boards
4. Hospital Boards

It is my firm opinion that due to difference of opinion in and between the above mentioned groups, that we are not receiving a fair share of Provincial Taxation.

J.M. McAfee  
Mayor

Comparative Parking Meter Collections  
For One Week Period January 29/58 and January 30/57

Location	Jan. 29/58	Rev. Per Meter	Jan. 30/57	No. of Meters
1. Post Office Parking Lot	69.57	6.88	46.86	101
2. Gaetz Ave. - West Side 52 St. to 53 St.	3.20	.80	2.28	4
3. Gaetz Ave. - East Side 52 St. to 53 St.	7.74	1.29	5.96	6
4. Gaetz Ave. - East Side 51 St. to 52 St.	11.83	1.31	11.74	9
5. Gaetz Ave. - West Side 51 St. to 52 St.	16.22	1.47	13.74	11
6. 51 St. - North Side 49 Ave. to Gaetz Ave.	19.48	1.08	16.27	18
7. 51 St. - South Side 49 Ave. to Gaetz Ave.	13.53	.75	13.35	18
8. Ross St. - North Side 48 Ave. to 49 Ave.	23.89	.63	19.84	38
9. Ross St. - South Side 48 Ave. to 49 Ave.	9.28	.36	6.23	26
10. Ross St. - North Side 49 Ave. to Gaetz	33.41	1.76	36.47	19
11. Ross St. - South Side 49 Ave. to Gaetz	33.15	1.75	27.02	19
12. Ross St. - North Side Gaetz Ave. to 51 St.	36.78	1.60	38.26	23
13. Ross St. - South Side Gaetz Ave. to 51 St.	37.30	1.87	33.32	20
14. 49 Ave. - East Side Ross St. to 49 St.	5.58	.56	4.46	10
15. 49 Ave. - West Side Ross St. to 49 St.	7.57	1.26	5.11	6
16. 49 St. - North Side 49 Ave. to Gaetz	17.93	1.38	13.97	13
17. 49 St. - South Side 49 Ave. to Gaetz	13.98	.93	10.62	15
18. 49 St. - North Side Gaetz Ave. to 51 Ave.	11.60	1.29	9.76	9
19. 49 St. - South Side Gaetz Ave. to 51 Ave.	16.70	1.39	15.82	12
20. 48 St. - North Side 49 Ave. to Gaetz Ave.	10.03	.63	7.23	16
21. 48 St. - South Side 49 Ave. to Gaetz Ave.	10.08	.72	5.70	14
22. Gaetz Ave. - East Side 48 St. to 49 St.	19.69	1.97	14.65	10
23. Gaetz Ave. - West Side 48 St. to 49 St.	10.53	1.75	9.39	6

\$439.07

Respectfully submitted,  
R. N. McGregor, Treas.