













### 1. How have you learned about this project?

		Response Percent	Response Count
By attending Markham public meetings		18.1%	26
<b>Through media reporting</b>		<b>82.6%</b>	<b>119</b>
Through URA communications and meetings		54.9%	79
By word of mouth		25.7%	37
I know very little about it		6.3%	9
Other (please specify)		2.8%	4
answered question			<b>144</b>
skipped question			<b>0</b>







2. Please indicate below the one statement that best describes your current view of this GTA Centre proposal:

		Response Percent	Response Count
I am definitely in favour of the GTA Centre proposal	<div></div>	19.0%	27
I am definitely opposed to the GTA Centre proposal	<div></div>	52.1%	74
I have not made up my mind on the GTA Centre proposal	<div></div>	28.9%	41
	Comments:		30
	answered question		142
	skipped question		2






**3. If you have indicated that you are definitely in favour of the GTA Centre proposal, please indicate which statements best describe your reasons.**

		Response Percent	Response Count
I am excited about having world class sports and entertainment available in Markham		51.5%	17
I know that there is no NHL team in the current plan, but I believe there will be in the future		27.3%	9
The GTA Centre will attract more restaurants and shopping to Markham		30.3%	10
The GTA Centre will attract more businesses and people wanting to live in Markham		51.5%	17
The GTA Centre will help make Markham Centre an exciting destination		42.4%	14
Other:		18.2%	6
answered question			33
skipped question			111

**4. If you have indicated that you are definitely opposed to the GTA Centre proposal, please indicate which statements best describe your reasons.**

		<b>Response Percent</b>	<b>Response Count</b>
<b>The GTA Centre should be owned and operated by private enterprise and not by the City of Markham</b>		<b>84.3%</b>	<b>70</b>
Taxing developers for this project will limit future tax sources for community projects		55.4%	46
I don't trust the statement that the GTA Centre won't require a property tax increase		78.3%	65
I don't want to see Markham incur large amounts of debt for this project		78.3%	65
The GTA Centre will result in traffic, transit and other societal issues		68.7%	57
Other :		24.1%	20
<b>answered question</b>			<b>83</b>
<b>skipped question</b>			<b>61</b>

**5. If you have indicated that you have not made up your mind on the GTA Centre proposal then please indicate which statements below best describe your current thinking.**

		Response Percent	Response Count
<b>I need more information</b>		<b>60.0%</b>	<b>27</b>
I want an independent consultant study to determine whether this is in our best interest		55.6%	25
This is not an important topic for me		4.4%	2
I am satisfied to let our elected Council and Markham staff make the best decision		2.2%	1
Other		26.7%	12
		<b>answered question</b>	<b>45</b>
		<b>skipped question</b>	<b>99</b>

**Q1. How have you learned about this project?**

1	visit by Joe Li	Sep 30, 2012 9:43 AM
2	Personal research	Sep 29, 2012 9:41 AM
3	I am the Ward 3 Councillor.	Sep 27, 2012 8:06 PM
4	MP.	Sep 27, 2012 7:05 PM



**Q2. Please indicate below the one statement that best describes your current view of this GTA Centre proposal:**

1	There are too many unanswered questions and our most of our elected representatives on Council are in the developers pockets.	Oct 5, 2012 5:59 PM
2	My only concern, as I am sure everyones, is the in the infrastructure issue and how it will be dealt with...there is too much development in a core, centralized area (unionville) and the potential traffic delays is a huge concern...	Oct 4, 2012 11:07 PM
3	The GTA centre may attract people(especially young people) to live in the surrounding area. This is good for the local business. This may make Markham to be the future business centre in GTA. But the traffic will be an issue.	Oct 4, 2012 9:48 PM
4	This will bring Markham City and its residents to be viewed as one of the best place to live in Canada. There is a challenge to ensure sufficient roads and accessibility and disipating a large crowd of patrons. This will increase the value of property in Markham so I feel this will be very good and Markham will still own the land & Arena.	Oct 4, 2012 7:23 PM
5	Waste of taxpayers \$. Let it be privately owned if they want to build it. Lots of examples where this has turned into a financial disaster.	Oct 3, 2012 8:54 PM
6	Can the city guarantee that there will NOT be a tax increase due to this proposal?	Oct 2, 2012 4:21 PM
7	GTA SPORS IS A CORPORATE ENTITY FORMED FOR THIS PARTICULAR PROJECT. IT WILL HAVE LIMITED ASSETS AND IN THE EVENT THAT THE PROJECT DOES NOT ACHEVE "PLANNED REVENUE OBJECTIVES", GTA SPORTS WILL ENTER BANKRUPTCY AND FOLD, LEAVING MARKHAM AND ITS RATEPAYERS TO PICK UP THE "NEVER-ENDING" OPERATING LOSSES.	Oct 2, 2012 7:39 AM
8	I don't trust that the municipal taxes will not go up as a result. I don't understand how such a facility would tax the municipal infrastructure, primarily traffic and parking. It would add a little diversity to the cultural offering of Markham with concerts etc.	Oct 1, 2012 8:01 PM
9	does this initaive actually have any benefit to markham tax payers..or is it a large liability? The town should not have any financial involvement in non resident participation facilities...it should ALL be private. Frankly, AS A MARKHAM RESIDENT I do not want to own such a facility that has potential to be a white elephant sitting ontop of a dark deep hole where future tax dollars I pay for, as I say, more partcipatory plant will go to fill this very black hole of debt emanating from professional out of town users such as sports teams and high paid singers.	Oct 1, 2012 2:41 PM
10	I strongly disagree with putting up the arena at this time with the current economic situations. Markham is putting up far too many new buildings without the concerns for the already clogged roads in and out of Markham.Only yesterday,Sunday when traffic should be lighter we took almost 15 minutes to get to the 407 from Kennedy and 16th avenue.16th avenue was backed up from Kennedy to Warden with one lane open;highway 7 at Scibberas was also bumper to bumper to Warden. Into this mess which I am sure will continue until every last foot of space on Hwy 7 from Woodbine to Hwy. 48 will be filled you want to put in an arena holding 20,000 people with no laid out plans for parking. Let's get the addition to the Markham Stouffville hospital finished and paid for before we ask people to take on another huge debt!!!	Oct 1, 2012 10:07 AM



**Q2. Please indicate below the one statement that best describes your current view of this GTA Centre proposal:**

11	Without a firm committment of personal and Business financial support this is a dangerous undertaking. The burden will fall on us, the tax payers. We don't need this burden. Taxes are for necessary services like garbage, road repair etc.	Oct 1, 2012 8:15 AM
12	It should be privately owned and operated. Markham should not incur large debt. I do think this will require tax dollars to run and operate.	Sep 30, 2012 4:38 PM
13	No matter how this is presented, the following applies (in my opinion): 1. The money from developers would be better spent on improving the current City infrastructure, especially roads. 2. The risk that the City council is taking on (with Taxpayers money) is substantial and not well mitigated. The underlying assumptions are far too optimistic and a disinterested party should be asked to assess the risks objectively before the City proceeds. 3. If the City council is so sure its tax paying residents support this, it should be taken to the electorate to vote on.	Sep 30, 2012 12:14 PM
14	Unionville has changed so such (we have been here for 44 years). I know that there has to be change and progression in areas of society as time goes by but sadly we feel that our rights as tax payers in this area have been badly managed.- -too much building too quickly , precious farmland being squandered on ugly housing. NOW AN ARENA - A WHITE ELEPHANT- ! people don't want this! What happened to democracy- let's have a vote! I DO NOT WANT TO SPEND ONE PENNY ON THIS NONSENSE!!	Sep 30, 2012 12:07 PM
15	Perhaps "Urban Planning 101" should be taught as a refresher course to the Mayor and Council and staff. Has anyone on council even noticed the gridlock in this town? Without any new infrastructure initiatives, adding a 20,000 person arena is a very foolish idea, given that the current road system can barely handle the current population and the new development in the area is going to tax it well beyond it's capacity. Imagine 20,000 people trying to get and trying to leave from to Kennedy and 407 at 6pm and 10pm respectively 3 times a week. Not to mention the amount of undeniable undesireables that will accompany them into our region each time, Crime and vandalism will increase....it's statistically proven. As almost 100% of staff do not live in our town, perhaps we should mandate that in order to govern and make recommendations for this region, one must actually live here. Perhaps then they'd wake up.	Sep 30, 2012 10:30 AM
16	Im in favour as I think it will add value to Markham as a city and bring more services to us, however, I dont think there should be any charges to resident and if it is then I 'm opposed to it.	Sep 30, 2012 10:19 AM
17	I like the idea because it would be a good attraction, but I also don't trust that our taxes will not increase. Also don't believe that there is enough transit to support this project. I would also we more optimistic about the project if it was privately owned, Markham is really putting the community into a lot of risk.	Sep 30, 2012 10:05 AM
18	It would probably be a worthwhile project somewhere, but parking and added density to the area is far more than we can handle and tax payers will end up paying for it..	Sep 29, 2012 9:18 PM
19	I am concerned that Markham 'expects' to avoid property tax increases....sounds like an escape clause to me...I do not want my taxes to support this complex...	Sep 29, 2012 6:23 PM

**Q2. Please indicate below the one statement that best describes your current view of this GTA Centre proposal:**

20	What will happen to the Markham Theater if the Centre happens. They have trouble filling it now. We also have many arenas around. What will happen to them.	Sep 28, 2012 8:37 PM
21	Definitely opposed under current financial structure. OK if 100% funded, operated and maintained by private enterprise.	Sep 28, 2012 4:04 PM
22	" Markham would own the arena and land, and incur \$325 million of debt"- How much of this is for the land? Is this land currently owned by Remington? " GTA Sports would commit to and guarantee payment of half the debt" Would this debt be charged to the town ? or is this given from the benevolence of Remington? "Markham would lease the building to GTA Sports under a long term lease" How long and at what price? "GTA Sports would pay all ongoing costs, and be responsible for building upgrades" Is this not the standard? in all commercial contracts of lease that I have been party to ,the tenant is responsible for all upgrades and maintenance. Am i missing something? "Markham expects to avoid any property tax increase to residents" Expects is not satisfactory to me_If the City is sure that there are to not end up having the taxpayers pay any deficit(realistically folks??) then the Town guarantees this and replaces the work expects with guarantees. "The proposal to be voted on by Markham Council does not include an NHL team" Really then i guess you can be assured that we end up in the same boat as the ACC or Quebec _ We the tax payers will end up paying for a stadium that is pushed on the citizens because it becomes for some a feature in their caps?	Sep 28, 2012 2:28 PM
23	1.Proposal / Information disclosed is not firmed & not enough to iron any decision. 2. Too many open 'answers' 3. It looks project owner is seeking the authority to rubber stamp the project with all the freedom of dynamic alternatives.	Sep 28, 2012 2:26 PM
24	This type of project i.e. Rogers Centre Montreal Olympic Stadium, always has entailed cost overruns and ends up in huge public debt. We do not need another large venue in the GTA. It will not be sufficiently in use to cover the operating expenses	Sep 28, 2012 8:48 AM
25	If this is such a great idea let private enterprise invest and reap any benefits or losses not the taxpayer. The demographics of Markham will NOT support sports venues etc. This is going to become a white elephant we are left to pay for!	Sep 27, 2012 9:51 PM
26	there's going to a pan am centre built in Unionville, why do we need another huge complex that may or may not be profitable and could possibly cost all of us a lot of money.	Sep 27, 2012 9:12 PM
27	We have other priorities like improving roads and transit. We have been told the city doesn't have money for important improvements of active transportation and public spaces. Or necessary recreational indoor facilities for tennis, but they can borrow money for an arena! The common people, who don't have too much money to spend on expensive entertainment and hockey venues will not benefit from this arena. Other sports facilities or infrastructure will get many residents moving and get healthier, which will save society billions of dollars. The demographics of Markham is such, that hockey is not a priority, but racket sports are (badminton, tennis and table tennis). Traffic is already bad and a 20 000 seat arena is going to make it worse, since we don't have subway most people will use a car. Let private business people invest a 100% into the arena, so we	Sep 27, 2012 9:11 PM

**Q2. Please indicate below the one statement that best describes your current view of this GTA Centre proposal:**

don't take any risks with taxpayers' money. Viability very low, especially without an NHL team. So, why build an arena for just 100 events? Public use is questionable.

- |    |  |                      |
|----|--|----------------------|
| 28 | If it were 100% owned and funded by GTA Sports then I would be very much in favour. The history of government involvement in business has been pretty disastrous and the poor bloody taxpayer has to pick up the pieces. Just look at Ontario Hydro and its successors.  | Sep 27, 2012 9:04 PM |
| 29 | Edmonton currently being subjected to extortion by the Oilers for an UPGRADE to the current arena is just the latest in a very long line of similar situations evolving from this ill conceived Public/Private Sports venue business model. Every time this is attempted the Public ends up taking a bath and left holding the empty bag. This is a bad idea and I find it even more concerning that the leader of the Private pack, Mr. Roustan, has left his high profile position with Bauer to commit himself full time to a project that we are told is not yet even close to approval from our Town Council. Mr. Rostan appears to believe strongly that the deal is a lock. This continues, in my opinion, a rapidly growing pattern of behaviour of disinterest in the wishes of the citizens of Markham on the part of our Council. I feel that all of our protestations are for naught. The fix seems to be in. I can clearly remember that Markham used to be run by a small clique of insiders with very little input from the citizenry. I had been under the happy impression that we had outgrown this situation. Apparently not. I applaud the URA leadership and active membership for your advocacy on our behalf. Thank you Tom Cordina | Sep 27, 2012 8:25 PM |
| 30 | I am hoping to obtain more information on the proposed deal. I also need to obtain input from residents through vehicles like this survey.   | Sep 27, 2012 8:06 PM |

**Q3. If you have indicated that you are definitely in favour of the GTA Centre proposal, please indicate which statements best describe your reasons.**

1	great attraction to markham	Oct 6, 2012 10:22 PM
2	Generating income from public resource is good because the income should come back to the town and thus less burdon on the town from more developers going into green space. The fact that the town will enter into an agreement with a private company has some issues only if the town counsil doesn't have the town's best interests in their deceision. Can we trust the town counsil.....not really, but there will be an arena build either with some public money or none. The town being on the hook is or should be the same as what the private co. is on the hook forand the town should look 20years forward as to possible more revenue than they expect with no concessions. As for transit, the town should have a full scale commetment from the Ontario go transit and TTC along with viva before entering into an agreement. The burdon of infastrucure costs should be held jointly with the private sector.	Oct 1, 2012 6:29 PM
3	folks will travel to venue and leave town and what if they do stay...not everyday is an event day and restuarants need consistent traffic	Oct 1, 2012 2:41 PM
4	I am concerned, however, with how the infrastructure will accommodate the additional traffic during events.	Sep 30, 2012 7:08 PM
5	All are dreams of the future at extra cost.	Sep 28, 2012 2:26 PM
6	All of the above can come true.	Sep 27, 2012 8:06 PM



**Q4. If you have indicated that you are definitely opposed to the GTA Centre proposal, please indicate which statements best describe your reasons.**

1	bring in more revenue and less travelling to downtown	Oct 6, 2012 10:22 PM
2	Too many questions, too little transparency, not nearly enough answers.	Oct 5, 2012 5:59 PM
3	Summed up my concerns in these bullets.	Oct 3, 2012 8:54 PM
4	The various sporting and entertainment events will NOT appeal to all of the many ethnic cultures that live in Markham and therefore the area will not be profitable. Concert tickets and sporting event tickets at the Air Canada Centre and various other facilities in Toronto are very, very expensive. Will the prices at the GTA Centre be equal, or even more expensive? Are people going to pay for expensive tickets? HOPING we get the World Junior Hockey tournament, PanAm games or an NHL team is not definite enough to propose the GTA Centre as being a successful and profitable arena. Look what happened in Hamilton.	Oct 2, 2012 2:09 PM
5	CONTEMPORARY HISTORY HAS PROVEN THAT MEGA ARENA PROJECTS ABSOLUTELY REQUIRE AN NHL TEAM TO EVEN HAVE A HOPE OF ACHIEVING FINANCIAL STABILITY/SUSTAINABILITY; WITHOUT A FIRM NHL TEAM COMMITMENT AT THE OUTSET, MARKHAM DOES NOT HAVE ANY REALSTIC CHANCE OF ACHIEVING "BREAKEVEN" STATUS. TO IMPLY OTHERWISE IS TO IGNORE REALITY. IF FRANK SCARPITTI IS SO CERTAIN OF OBTAINING AN NHL FRANCHISE, THEN HE SHOULD CLOSE THAT TRANSACTION FIRST, NOT LAST. IT MAKES NO BUSINESS SENSE TO CONSUME 40% OF MARKHAM'S DEBT CAPACITY ON A FRINGE BENEFIT JUST ON A HOPE. THERE IS NO EMPIRICAL EVIDENCE THAT THIS PROJECT WILL DRIVE INCREMENTAL REVENUE TO THE TOWN'S OTHER BUSINESSES, OR TO THE TOWN ITSELF. WE ONLY HAVE TO LOOK TO THE DOME IN TORONTO, TO THE CITY OF GLENDALE ARIZONA AND TO OTHER SOUTHERN CITIES IN THE USA TO SEE FINANCIAL DISASTERS AS A RESULT OF AMBITIOUS POLITICIANS' DESIRES TO HAVE AN NHL FRANCHISE. WHEN THE DUST SETTLES, THE POLITICIANS ARE HOME COLLECTING THEIR PENSIONS WHILE THE NEXT GENERATION PICK UP THE TAB. RUSHING INTO THIS PROJECT WITHOUT FULL PUBLIC HEARINGS APPEARS UNDERHANDED AND STRONGLY SUGGESTS "POLITICAL CORRUPTION" AS THE REAL MOTIVE.	Oct 2, 2012 7:39 AM
6	I have no objection if the GTA Centre is owned and operated by private enterprise. If the City owns and operates it instead, then the City will be assuming financial risks for a venture that it is least experienced to undertake. Moreover, the impact of the risks will eventually be transferred to citizens of Markham. This is not a good deal.	Oct 1, 2012 7:48 PM
7	I guess I already said all this above.. Glad it was question	Oct 1, 2012 2:41 PM
8	I do not want my tax dollars used for this risky development. Too many ventures like this have ended in bankruptcy for the developer meaning the city (ie the taxpayer) would have to pay the price. The city would have to sell at a discount eg Rogers Center. The parking is not adequate for such an arena. There is no way that you will see the majority using transit especially with most events at night. Anyone living north of Markham will not see adequate transit at night for years. As the population ages, seniors will not want to come to Markham at night	Sep 30, 2012 6:48 PM

**Q4. If you have indicated that you are definitely opposed to the GTA Centre proposal, please indicate which statements best describe your reasons.**

	on transit. The noise, congestion and decreased quality of life in the area around the arena will have many moving before it is even built and home prices will depreciate in that area.	
9	N/A	Sep 30, 2012 10:19 AM
10	Some downsides don't become clear until a proposal becomes reality . Not everything can be predicted with the global economy in such flux.	Sep 29, 2012 4:04 PM
11	THE PROCESS - Scarpitti and company have lost the confidence of many taxpayers since this project has been under a cloud of secrecy since inception in March 2010. What happened to open, forthright, transparent municipal government? Even many of the 12 counsellors have no idea what is going on.	Sep 28, 2012 4:04 PM
12	THE FOLKS ON COUNCIL VOTING THIS PROGRAM IN ARE NOT TO BE TRUSTED. THEIR INTEREST IS IN THE DEVELOPERS NOT THE HOME OWNERS.	Sep 28, 2012 3:39 PM
13	Many of our residents have indicated they will move if this traffic and resultant noise pollution factor (stadium) is added to the mix. It has been proven that Government make the worst business people__they have no bottom as they have all the tax payer base. They should be in the business of governance and leave the business in the hands of the sector that can best take care of Business When (and I am a business person) there is a limit to cash and a requirement to make enough to cover expenses only then are you going to achieve a possibility of success. The City has a safety net -- Let us please be realistic and ask them to stay out of business that cannot and should not concern them.	Sep 28, 2012 2:28 PM
14	Would like to see the real total planning. How it could work well with Markham and York region Master Plan?	Sep 28, 2012 2:26 PM
15	giving the land for the project is all i would see doing	Sep 28, 2012 10:27 AM
16	I don't trust our Mayor - Frank Scarpitti; he is too eager to say yes to the GTA Centre & Bratty & Developers in general. There needs to be more disclosure and transparency. Projections are just that - projections. Frank is too much of a slick, smooth talking car salesman.	Sep 28, 2012 8:04 AM
17	I don't trust the guarantee provided by GTA Sports. Have they pledged hard assets with enough liquidity to cover their share to support their guarantee? If they have it has not been publicized.	Sep 27, 2012 9:41 PM
18	All of the above. We are so weary of these secret meetings and decisions. What part of "public servant" do our esteemed city council not understand?	Sep 27, 2012 9:06 PM
19	Above are all excellent points and could well come true.	Sep 27, 2012 8:06 PM
20	I also object to the whole process surrounding the Mayor's proposal. It has been secretive, condescending, deceitful, anti-democratic and questionable from both a Procurement and Fiscal standpoint.	Sep 27, 2012 7:08 PM





**Q5. If you have indicated that you have not made up your mind on the GTA Centre proposal then please indicate which statements below best describe your current thinking.**

1	not opposed	Oct 6, 2012 10:22 PM
2	Markham residents definitely need to receive more information. Definitely an independent consultant study should be conducted to determine if this is the best decision for Markham.	Oct 2, 2012 2:09 PM
3	1-See results of public meetings. 2-Need to assess the integrity of GTA Sports 3 Independent study & review on other cities experience with sports facilities. Not every stadium is a Lambeau Stadium in Green `Bay. Quebec City has backing of Quebecor and business for their stadium. Will Toronto Maple Leafs allow a 2nd hockey team in the GTA. Is that a sure thing. 4-What other priorities does Markham have to meet - ie infrastructure projects: roads, sewage, water works,...	Oct 1, 2012 9:01 PM
4	N/A	Sep 30, 2012 10:19 AM
5	i want a solid 100% guarantee/commitment that my property taxes will not be used, or increased, to support this complex...this would include any special levies	Sep 29, 2012 6:23 PM
6	Greater disclosure of information by the City of Markham Council wrt to any agreements ate required.	Sep 29, 2012 9:41 AM
7	How will increased traffic to the area be addressed. The exit at 407 and Kennedy is already very congested	Sep 28, 2012 7:17 PM
8	Detailed & comprehensive planning is required to disclose for public review. If it remains a public project even 10%.	Sep 28, 2012 2:26 PM
9	I believe that the GTA would benefit from having another major sports and entertainment complex (ACC and Rogers Centre being the others) to enhance the opportunities to host significant events. Markham is well located for this venue. However, I feel that any new facility in Markham should be set up to compete with the other venues for events on a level playing field. The other venues are privately owned and operated. As such, they have the capability to rapidly adjust to market swings/pressures. These facilities continue to operate because market demand and financial return exist. If the market disappears or the owners can't make it work financially, then they close up shop. Public ownership forces us to ask four questions: Why hasn't the private sector taken this project on if the market is strong enough to support a third major venue? Has consuming 40% of its debt capacity for a prestigious but non-essential asset significantly hindered Markham's ability to maintain the future serviceability of its essential current assets and infrastructure? What effect will public ownership have on the venue's ability to compete for key sports and entertainment events over the long-term? How will the City tangibly benefit from this investment?	Sep 28, 2012 10:11 AM
10	I am concerned about the validity of the cost and the quality of the product. This is a deign build project run by a single sourced contractor. What is the City of Markham buying for \$325 million? Is this the real cost? Will we be getting a good quality Arena? Will we be getting a well designed arena? The City of Markham does not have the expertise to answer these simple questions and they are 100 % relying on the developer and the sole sourced contractor to define these	Sep 28, 2012 8:03 AM

**Q5. If you have indicated that you have not made up your mind on the GTA Centre proposal then please indicate which statements below best describe your current thinking.**

parameters. I think an independent consultant payed for by the town (not the developer or contractor) should be retained to oversee this project. It is important that they remain independent from the developer to ensure they remain unbiased and look after the best interests of the owner(the residence of Markham) To define what is in the arena and to make sure it is meeting the needs of the city of Markham is a very complex task. Leaving it up to the contractor is ludicrous! Would anyone go to a car dealership with \$60,000 and say give me a car and leave it up to dealer to decide what kind of car you get! And we are not talking about \$60,000 we are talking about \$325 million!

- |    |   |                      |
|----|---|----------------------|
| 11 | I am concerned about the demands of the developers in return for paying extra taxes. Every month I hear about new requests from developers to build more houses/apartments then planned. However the support structure (hospitals, emergency services, community centres, parks, bicycle/walking paths, etc) does not does not increase. If the town gives in to these requests, partly through the OMB, then the quality of life will deteriorate. So it is mainly the indirect effects of the GTA Centre that concern me, even though in principal I like the idea. | Sep 27, 2012 9:25 PM |
| 12 | If it was totally private I would support it. Why is the City getting involved? What real benefit accrues to residents? Could the \$\$\$ be used elsewhere in a better fashion? Does Council have the mandate to place us in that large debt?   | Sep 27, 2012 8:06 PM |