

Executive Summary – Municipality of Chatham-Kent

Socio-Economic Factors

Socio-economic indicators describe and quantify a municipality's wealth and economic conditions and provide insight into a municipality's collective ability to generate revenue relative to the municipality's demand for public services. An evaluation of socio-economic factors contributes to the development of sound financial policies. An examination of local economic and demographic characteristics can identify the following situations:

- Changes in the tax base as measured by population, property value, employment, or business activity
- A need to shift public service priorities because of demographic changes in the municipality
- A need to shift public policies because of changes in economic conditions

Socio-Economic Factors	Cha	tham-Kent	Total Su	ırvey Average	Southwest
2018 Population Density per sq. km.		43		547	439
2011-2016 Population Increase %		-2.0%		4.8%	3.8%
2017 Building Construction Value per Capita	\$	374	\$	3,028	\$ 2,974
2018 Estimated Average Household Income	\$	77,014	\$	102,194	\$ 102,001
2018 Weighted Median Value of Dwelling	\$	160,128	\$	340,734	\$ 302,609
2018 Unweighted Assessment per Capita	\$	119,182	\$	154,140	\$ 152,484
2018 Weighted Assessment per Capita	\$	95,494	\$	156,898	\$ 143,624

Financial Indicators

The Municipal Financial Indicators section of the report includes a number or measures such as the financial position, operating surplus, asset composition ratio, reserves, debt and taxes receivables.

Key financial indicators have been included to help evaluate each municipality's existing financial condition and to identify future challenges and opportunities. A number of industry recognized indicators that are used by credit rating agencies and/or recommended by Government Finance Officers' Association (GFOA) and the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing have been included. Indicators related to Sustainability, Flexibility and Vulnerability have been included. It should be noted that Water and Wastewater indicators have also been included in the Water/Wastewater section of the report.

The tables on the following page provide highlights from this section of the report.

Sustainability

The ability to provide and maintain service and infrastructure levels without resorting to unplanned increases in rates or cuts to services.

2017 Sustainability Indicators	Chat	tham-Kent	Total Surv	ey Average
Financial Position per Capita	\$	948	\$	435
Tax Asset Consumption Ratio		48.6%		43.8%
Net Financial Liabilities Ratio		(0.4)		(0.4)

Vulnerability

Addresses a municipality's vulnerability to external sources of funding that it cannot control and its exposure to risks.

2017 Vulnerability Indicators	Cha	atham-Kent	Total Sur	vey Average
Reserves				
Tax Reserves (less WWW) as % of Taxation		94.7%		72.7%
Tax Reserves as % of Own Source Revenues		69.5%		52.3%
Tax Reserves / Capita	\$	1,347	\$	684
<u>Debt</u>				
Tax Debt Charges as % of Own Source Revenues		1.4%		4.4%
Total Debt Outstanding / Capita	\$	847	\$	731
Tax Debt Outstanding / Capita	\$	382	\$	507
Debt Outstanding per Own Source Revenue		35.8%		40.9%
Debt to Reserve Ratio		0.6		1.0

Flexibility

The ability to issue debt responsibly without impacting the credit rating. Also, the ability to generate required revenues.

2017 Flexibility Indicators	Chatham-Kent	Total Survey Average
Taxes Receivable as % of Taxes Levied	4.8%	6.0%
Rates Coverage Ratio	78.1%	92.1%

Analysis of Net Municipal Levy per Capita and Per Assessment

In order to better understand the relative tax position for a municipality, another measure that has been included in the study is a comparison of net municipal levies on a per capita and per \$100,000 basis. This measure indicates the total net municipal levy needed to provide services to the municipality. This analysis does not indicate value for money or the effectiveness in meeting community objectives. Net municipal expenditures per capita may vary as a result of:

- Different service levels
- Variations in the types of services
- Different methods of providing services
- Different residential/non-residential assessment composition
- Varying demand for services
- Locational factors
- Demographic differences
- Socio-economic differences
- Urban/rural composition differences
- User fees policies
- Age of infrastructure
- What is being collected from rates as opposed to property taxes

As such, this analysis is <u>not</u> an "apples to apples" comparison of services, but rather has been included to provide insight into the net cost of providing municipal services within each municipality. Further analysis would be required to determine the cause of the differences across each spending envelope and within each municipality. This analysis was completed using the most current information available – net municipal levies as per the 2018 municipal levy by-laws and the 2018 estimated populations.

2018	Chath	am-Kent	Survey erage	S	outhwest
Net Municipal Levy per Capita	\$	1,439	\$ 1,527	\$	1,497
Net Municipal Levy per \$100,000					
Unweighted CVA	\$	1,207	\$ 1,111	\$	1,071

User Fees

A number of user fees have been included in the Study including the following:

2018 Fees	Chatl	nam-Kent	Total Surv	ey Average	Sc	outhwest
Development Charges - Single Detached	\$	3,839	\$	33,411	\$	20,235
Residential Building Permit Fee	\$	1,797	\$	2,270	\$	2,081

Comparison of Tax Ratios

Tax ratios reflect how a property class tax rate compares to the residential rate. Changes in tax ratios affect the relative tax burden between classes of properties. Tax ratios can be used to prevent large shifts of the tax burden caused by relative changes in assessment among property classes as well as to lower the tax rates on a particular class or classes.

2018 Tax Ratios	Chatham-Kent	Total Survey Average
Multi-Residential	2.0000	1.7902
Commercial (Residual)	1.9504	1.6871
Industrial (Residual)	2.1118	2.1826

Taxes and Comparison of Relative Taxes

The purpose of this section of the report is to undertake "like" property comparisons across each municipality and across various property types. In total there are 12 property types in the residential, multi-residential, commercial and industrial classes. There are many reasons for differences in relative tax burdens across municipalities and across property classes including, but not limited to:

- Differences in values of like properties
- Differences in the tax ratios and the use of optional classes
- Non-uniform education tax rates in the non-residential classes
- Level of service provided and the associated costs
- Extent to which a municipality employs user fees
- Access to other sources of revenues such as dividends from hydro utilities and casino revenues

	Total Survey					
2018 Property Taxes	Cha	atham-Kent		Average		Southwest
Detached Bungalow	\$	3,136	\$	3,397	\$	3,093
2 Storey Home	\$	4,734	\$	4,524	\$	4,322
Senior Executive Home	\$	5,754	\$	6,286	\$	6,004
Walk Up Apartment (per Unit)	\$	1,709	\$	1,382	\$	1,377
Mid/High Rise (per Unit)	\$	1,870	\$	1,715	\$	1,771
Neigh. Shopping (per sq. ft.)	\$	3.92	\$	3.63	\$	3.33
Office Building (per sq. ft.)	\$	3.52	\$	3.04	\$	2.97
Hotels (per Suite)	\$	1,033	\$	1,602	\$	1,521
Motels (per Suite)	\$	1,236	\$	1,240	\$	1,296
Industrial Standard (per sq. ft.)	\$	1.05	\$	1.67	\$	1.42
Industrial Large (per sq. ft)	\$	0.66	\$	1.11	\$	0.86
Industrial Vacant Land (per Acre)	\$	848	\$	3,673	\$	2,007



Comparison of Water and Sewer User Costs

A comparison was made of water/sewer costs in each municipality. The following table summarizes the costs in the municipality for water and sewer on typical annual consumption against the overall survey average.

2018 Water/Sewer Cost of Service	Cha	atham-Kent	Total S	Survey Average	Southwest
Residential - 200 m ³	\$	1,056	\$	1,074	\$ 1,135
Commercial - 10,000 m ³	\$	25,560	\$	36,054	\$ 36,709
Industrial - 30,000 m ³	\$	68,065	\$	102,824	\$ 104,178
Industrial - 100,000 m ³	\$	162,501	\$	334,031	\$ 331,985
Industrial - 500,000 m ³	\$	699,881	\$	1,647,471	\$ 1,676,956

2018 Property Taxes and Water/Wastewater Costs as a % of Income

This section of the report provides a comparison of the availability of gross household income to fund municipal services on a typical household. This provides a measure of affordability within each community.

2018 Affordability Indicators	Chatham-Kent	Total Survey Average	Southwest
Property Taxes as a % of Household Income	3.9%	3.8%	3.6%
Water/Sewer + Taxes as a % of Household Income	5.2%	4.9%	4.8%

Economic Development Programs

A summary was completed of programs that municipalities have implemented to promote economic development in the areas of retention and expansion, downtown development, and brownfield redevelopment.