

## Letter quoted out of context: Councillor

(Re: Reader won't forget comment at election time. January 23)

As your Councillor and elected representative, fiscal responsibility and respect for the taxpayers' hard earned dollar is the most important of the many responsibilities that I am committed to uphold.

I appreciate Mr Rogers has taken the time to express his opinion, but upon reflection it is obvious that Mr. Rogers has taken the comments I made in the article out of context.

Clearly, he has taken two different elements of the article, and combined incomplete bits of each to inadvertently misrepresent the whole meaning of my comment

?(Costs) are a little bit more than we anticipated and it still comes in at market value. It is central, it is practical and it is a large piece of land that will serve the purposes that we have deemed? (The Auroran ? January 16, Page 14)

I am commenting on the cost or the final adjusted value of the property purchased. On January 7, Councillors went into detail inquiring as to why the excavation and grading costs were greater than the previous Class C estimate. Councillors knew beforehand there would be preparation cost for the site.

\$3 million is a lot of money, however, combined with the original discounted purchase price, the total came in at market value or at \$580,000/acre, which is slightly more than the \$550,000/acre I had anticipated. These are the figures that I was referring to, the figures that were discussed at GC, but not included in the body of the article.

Mr. Rogers calculated a figure from numbers at the beginning of the article and connects that number of \$4.4 million, with five words of my above comments to conclude and portray a reckless disregard for taxpayers money.

I do not believe it was intentional. Given the courtesy of an explanation, I am hopeful Mr. Rogers may change his opinion.

Scanlon Yard was originally built in 1974 (pop.14,000), with a subsequent expansion in 1988 (pop.30,000 ). As far back as 2004, growth demands and age had identified the need to expand and replace the facility.

We had temporary relief, 2006 ? 2010, from a Town owned asset that Council resolved in 2006 to be used solely for Municipal uses, namely, the old Hydro Building, for the Parks department to operate.

The Scanlon Yard still had to be rebuilt, however this temporary dual arrangement took a lot of pressure off.

One thought would be to sell both properties and purchase one larger property. Construction of the new combined facility would be funded by Development Charges.

There would be no impact to the taxpayers and it could be debt financed exactly the same way as the new Library and SARC. At the very end of last Term's Council (Sept 2010), the Hydro Building was leased, and the Parks department had to vacate the building.

From the very start of our term, this Council has been aware of the critical need for an expanded new facility.

Fiscal responsibility to provide services to residents requires managing the Budget funded largely from property taxes levied (along with revenues collected and grants).

Just as important and in concert with the Budget, is the need for long term planning of future growth for capital costs investment of new infrastructure funded separately through development charges.

To simply say no, is in my opinion, irresponsible.

Councillor John Abel

Aurora