

Jan.16,2026

To: Mayor Simon Yu, Council Members, Ramsay, Sampson, Polillo, Bennett, Skakum, Klassen, Frizzel and Scott

Four topics that warrants input to the Public Budget Discussion

1. Tax increase: It was suggested that a 5.98% increase was needed to maintain services at the current level. That is an increase in city tax not including provincial tax nor the regional approx. 3.75% tax increase. City property taxation has increased 25.67% from 2021 to 2025 average taxes \$2922, add the 5.98% increase for 2026 equates to aprox. \$3100. A 32% tax increase over 5 years. This doesn't include garbage and water levees or the rain tax that will take affect 2027(to be discussed later) at an undisclosed amount of tax.

The projected tax increases 2027-5.74%, 2028-5.10% an additional 10.84% tax increase resulting in a \$3445 compounded tax increase to 2028. An average of \$430 per year a 42.49% increase from 2021.

People of PG are in an economic crisis. Loss of investment, employment, development, increase in living cost has put many residents into make a choice, pay for food or pay for heat; they cannot afford a tax increase. We all know tax increases are part of the norm for some councillors. Year after year taxes have increased without questioning in depth Administrations` rational, but just accepting the bureaucrat's presentation. Perhaps this year Administration should take control of their spending of taxpayers' money. Instead work within confines as Corporations must. Prince George must be run as a corporation. Also, councillors should start governing for the people. This year warrants **a 0% tax increase, which is obtainable**. But admin. and some councillors have always relied on tax increases, makes it easier to meet projected budgets that are presented by administration. That practice is **unsustainable and must stop**. Almost feels like extortion.

2. Council salary increase: Even though this feel-good tax increase would not take effect until 2027, it is still an excessive amount. Considering a councillor's position is parttime. An increase of aprox. 38% should go to referendum for approval, not to individuals that might benefit from the raise.

Remember city employees will get in the 5% range increase. There again it would be a tax burden.

3. Rain tax: Where did this ever come from. Now Admin. wants an additional tax (rain tax) to be leveled but not to all. When will it stop. But if you want to be exempt one must pay an undisclosed fee to be assessed one's exemption... When taxes are constantly raised in one way or another, it shows poor Admin. practices. **But some councillors as does Admin. believe tax increase are just part of the norm.** Year after year taxes have increased to no avail. So new means must be created along with buzz words to make it sound appealing. Homeowners will be taxed on 304 sq meters of hard surface on average starting 2027 and fully taxable 2029. But no dollar amount has been forthcoming. This fee is to enhance storm drainage in a system that has already been paid for through taxation. In time this tax will end up as general revenue. **NO** this is just a tax grab, a scam because taxpayers' money is poorly managed. Taxes can keep on rising in small increments. It is easier to implement and doesn't require referendum. But over the years and projected increases from 2021-2028 if the taxes were suddenly increased by 42%, then council would be forced to have a referendum. This is why taxes only rise by small increments and with different categories. This additional tax rain tax should never have been entertained by council. Yet Admin. is giggling, just waiting for fourth reading. If it was brought before referendum, it would never pass. Being taxed on an act of God, just how far will this Administration go to keep increasing taxes. A solution might be to remove hard surface from property line to road. That would alleviate the storm drainage tax. Or terminate those who mismanage taxpayer money.

4. Seniors: How embarrassing is it to have a council (6-3 vote) turning down senior centers request for financial assistance. Just to tide them over till years end. As they also turned down the Legion in their time of need. Standing Committee on Intergovernmental Affairs have no problem wanting an additional \$16k for travel expense. The same council that took over an hour and a quarter to debate a lousy \$17k from the contingency fund. Which if not spent by year-end would-be city surplus. To be spent on one-time item or emergency items. But the same council members pass tens of million-dollar expenditures within 10-minute debates. Authorize spending \$1m to replace

sound equipment at CN center, whether needed or not. Nor did the councillors debate in depth why the replacement was warranted. **(What ever happened to the sound system that was removed?)**

They all had their own reasoning to turn down the senior's request. They could have ended 2025 on a positive note. But instead angered the Seniors of our city and their families, a huge voting bloc. These people who have worked hard and paid their taxes, paid their dues, proud people, who deserve respect. Were given none. Some councillors have painted themselves into a corner, narcissism, theatrics and power got in the way of doing the right thing. Hopefully they will take this second opportunity and do the right thing. Pass the motion for expenditure from contingency funds to be divided among the five senior centers.

M J Mahoney

Milton J Mahoney, **Redacted**

2801 Greenforest Cres., PG, V2K 5B8

Redacted

Reference: Standing Committee on Finance and Audit, PG Citizen publication, and PG council broadcast.