

**SUMMARY OF  
FINANCE COMMITTEE  
SUBMISSIONS**

**April 14, 2025**

**Correspondence received  
Thursday after 12:00 p.m.**

**Finance Committee – April 14, 2025**

**Support**

A. Ivens expressed support for the proposal citing detailed information on public safety, increase in bylaw services and hiring of new staff rather than consultants.

S. Lattanzio, Surrey Fire Fighters Association, expressed support for the proposal citing public safety.

**Concern**

J. Young, Surrey Board of Trade, expressed support for the proposed Surrey Charter and Auditor General position and expressed concerns regarding prioritizing Enterprise-Wide Risk Management, investment portfolio strategy transparency, quarterly financial reporting, and actual capital expenditures.

A. Soni expressed concerns regarding the volunteer water meter program and late penalty fee for utilities and property taxes.

S. Sloane expressed concerns regarding funding for the proposed pier for ash scattering.

M. Hunter & E. Bianchini expressed concerns regarding funding for the proposed pier for ash scattering.

**From:** [MySurrey Portal](#)  
**To:** [Clerks Department Webmail](#)  
**Subject:** 10/04/2025, A Ivens, expressing Support to the Draft Five-Year (2025 – 2029) Financial Plan General Operating  
**Date:** April 10, 2025 9:23:16 PM

---



---

## New submission received.

---

### Contact Information

First Initial: A  
Last Name: Ivens  
Are you a resident of Surrey or do you own property in Surrey? Yes  
Select Your Neighbourhood: Guilford

### Submission Details

Select a Category: 4.Item that Council is Soliciting Feedback On  
Select an Item: F002 Draft Five-Year (2025 – 2029) Financial Plan General Operating | |  
Select your support level:: Support  
Comments - Optional: 1. Appreciate the detail reported on the Public Safety section Am concerned that the promised funding from Provincial Government for policing transition costs may still be reduced or pulled, in light of so many changes experienced to the Provincial budget. Pleased to see evidence of increased Bylaws service with funding for this expansion. 2. Support hiring for listed new staff positions rather than hiring out to external consultants.



[www.surrey.ca](http://www.surrey.ca)

**From:** [MySurrey Portal](#)  
**To:** [Clerks Department Webmail](#)  
**Subject:** 11/04/2025, S Lattanzio, expressing Support to the Draft Five-Year (2025 – 2029) Financial Plan General Operating  
**Date:** April 11, 2025 10:52:05 AM

---



---

## New submission received.

---

### Contact Information

First Initial: S  
Last Name: Lattanzio  
Are you a resident of Surrey or do you own property in Surrey? No  
Select Your Neighbourhood: n/a

### Submission Details

Select a Category: 4.Item that Council is Soliciting Feedback On  
Select an Item: F002 Draft Five-Year (2025 – 2029) Financial Plan General Operating | |  
Select your support level:: Support  
Comments - Optional: The Surrey Fire Fighters support the Operating and capital financial plans as presented. This demonstrates the mayor and council's commitment to public safety. Investing in the fire service saves lives and makes the community safer for all who live and work here. The Surrey Fire Fighters have submitted a report for the Mayor and Council to reference during the budget discussion.



[www.surrey.ca](http://www.surrey.ca)



inclusive | innovative | independent

April 11, 2025

Mayor and Council  
City of Surrey  
13450 – 104 Avenue  
Surrey, BC V3T 1V8  
Email: [clerks@surrey.ca](mailto:clerks@surrey.ca)

**RE: Feedback on the 2025-2029 Five-Year Financial Plan**

Dear Mayor Locke and Members of Council,

On behalf of the Surrey Board of Trade (SBOT), representing thousands of Surrey businesses across diverse sectors, we thank you for the opportunity to provide input into the City's 2025 Five-Year Financial Plan. As Surrey continues its evolution into what will soon be British Columbia's largest city, we believe the financial decisions made today must reflect the scale, complexity, and strategic importance of our community to the province and to Canada's economic future.

We commend the City for its efforts to maintain financial transparency and fiscal stability, particularly in this period of rapid urbanization and population growth. That said, we believe there are opportunities to consider governance and fiscal adjustments in this year's plan, especially in anticipation of a Surrey City Charter.

Please find enclosed our observations and recommendations you may wish to consider:

---

**1. Surrey City Charter – Planning for a Governance Model that Reflects Our Scale**

We support Mayor Locke's July 2024 motion to explore a Surrey Charter, akin to the Vancouver Charter. Greater local autonomy is essential for a city of Surrey's size. To prepare for this transition:

- **Governance Structure:** We recommend Council initiate an independent assessment to evaluate whether the current composition of one Mayor and eight Councillors is sufficient to govern a city of Surrey's projected future size. Vancouver, by comparison, has 10 Councillors.
- **Education and Engagement:** We recommend the City engage with community members to ensure residents are informed and aware of what being a Charter City means and how it would impact them.



inclusive | innovative | independent

---

## 2. Auditor General for the City of Surrey

We understand that the proposed 2025–2029 General Operating Plan and Utility Plan, with a planned expenditure of over \$8 billion, combined with a \$1.8 billion Capital Program over the next five years, represents the most significant financial commitment in the City’s history. In light of this, we reiterate our recommendation that the City establish an Auditor General who reports directly to Council. An independent audit office would enhance transparency, accountability, and public trust – offering Council greater support in achieving its goals.

As background, the City of Vancouver established its Auditor General office in 2021, with a mandate to strengthen financial accountability and promote value-for-money in municipal operations.

---

## 3. Enterprise-Wide Risk Management (ERM)

The City’s Annual Plan and website acknowledge efforts toward an Enterprise-Wide Risk Management (ERM) framework.

For a city of Surrey’s size, complexity, and growth trajectory, we recommend that Council **elevate prioritization of ERM implementation** supported by appropriate resourcing. This would provide both Council and the public with further visibility into the top risks facing our city’s strategic and operational objectives.

---

## 4. Investment Portfolio Strategy Transparency

Our review of the 2024 and 2025 Five-Year Financial Plans shows that the City is planning to spend about \$1.7 billion over each period. Of that, around \$1.2 billion is for infrastructure and general capital projects, with only \$400 million set aside for community amenities. Over half of that amount—\$230 million—is for the Newton Community Centre in 2025, which will be funded through borrowing. That leaves an average of just \$35–\$37 million per year for other amenities, which seems low given the needs of Surrey’s growing population. At the same time, the City’s Q3 2024 financial report shows it has \$2.275 billion in its investment portfolio, with 23% or \$523 million invested in long-term holdings (5+ years). The size of the 5+ year holding is a major increase from previous years and may be limiting the City’s ability to fund more projects now.

**We encourage Council to request an explanation from City Management about this shift in investment strategy**, and to consider whether some of these funds could be used to support important amenity capital projects in the near term—especially those not currently included in the 2025–2029 plan.





inclusive | innovative | independent

---

## 5. Quarterly Financial Reporting – Expand to Full City Operations

Surrey is a leader in issuing quarterly financial reports. However, the current format only reports on **General Operating** financials, which in Q3 2024 accounted for **57%** of the City's full consolidated budget.

We recommend that quarterly reporting be expanded to reflect **consolidated financials**, as is common in other large municipalities.

---

## 6. Capital Expenditures – Actual vs. Planned Reporting

The current financial plan outlines \$1.847 billion in planned capital spending over five years. However, we were unable to locate regular public reporting that compares **actual capital expenditures to planned budgets**. The City completed its integration of capital project tracking into its financial management system in 2023. This should now enable quarterly and annual reports that transparently show capital project progress, budget variances, and investment efficiency.

We recommend this be implemented starting in 2025.

---

We welcome your feedback on this letter and are open to any corrections or clarifications you may wish to share. If there are any points that would benefit from further discussion, we would be glad to connect to better understand City reports and processes.

In conclusion, the Surrey Board of Trade recognizes the significant fiscal responsibilities the City is managing, including infrastructure investment, population growth, and public safety. Surrey is well-positioned for continued success and is recognized as a leader among Canadian municipalities. Strengthening this leadership through modernized governance, enhanced oversight, and greater financial transparency will help secure long-term prosperity for the community.

Thank you for your time and consideration. We look forward to continuing a collaborative dialogue that supports a strong, sustainable, and economically vibrant City of Surrey.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Joslyn Young', written in a cursive style.

Joslyn Young  
CEO, Surrey Board of Trade

**From:** [MySurrey Portal](#)  
**To:** [Clerks Department Webmail](#)  
**Subject:** 14/04/2025, A SONI, expressing Concerned to the City Grants for 2025  
**Date:** April 14, 2025 10:46:12 AM

---



---

## New submission received.

---

### Contact Information

First Initial: A  
Last Name: SONI  
Are you a resident of Surrey or do you own property in Surrey? Yes  
Select Your Neighbourhood: Fleetwood

### Submission Details

Select a Category: 4.Item that Council is Soliciting Feedback On  
Select an Item: F004 City Grants for 2025 | |  
Select your support level:: Concerned  
Comments - Optional: Please see email sent to [clerks@surrey.ca](mailto:clerks@surrey.ca) regarding Utility Bills.



[www.surrey.ca](http://www.surrey.ca)

**From:** [A. Soni](#)  
**To:** [Clerks Department Webmail](#)  
**Subject:** Regarding volunteer water meter program & utility bill.  
**Date:** April 14, 2025 11:24:20 AM

---

Ladies and gentlemen of the council,

My name is A. Soni and I am an owner and resident of [S.22\(1\)](#), Surrey.

I am a long-time resident of Surrey, having lived here for 35 years. Until now, I have never felt the need to address the council on any issue. However, upon receiving my utility bill for 2025, I felt compelled to speak to you today to highlight several pressing concerns that I and many of my neighbors are facing.

The City of Surrey introduced a voluntary water meter program for older homes, which has been provided free of charge to homeowners who opted in. Currently, about 70% of Surrey's homes are covered under this program.

Upon reviewing my 2025 utility bill, I was shocked to see a 14.5% increase from the previous year, amounting to a 29.9% increase since 2023. This substantial rise poses a significant burden on homeowners, particularly those like myself who live on a fixed income. It seems as though owning a home in this city is becoming increasingly unaffordable, and I fear that the city's management and council are inadvertently forcing long-standing residents like myself to consider leaving.

After conducting a survey in my neighborhood, I discovered that homeowners with meters are paying nearly half the amount of those without them. Over the years, many of us who were unaware of these disparities have paid thousands of dollars extra. When I inquired about installing a meter at my home, I was informed that I would need to cover the cost of plumber services myself, which was previously provided by the city. This is not only expensive but also unfair, given the precedent set by the city's past practices. Estimates from plumbing companies range from \$4,000 to \$6,500, an amount I am unable to afford.

I respectfully request that the city install a meter at my home at no cost to me, as was the case for other homeowners in the past. I have already paid a portion of my bill up to March 31 on a per diem basis and will pay the remainder based on actual usage.

Furthermore, I would like to address several other issues. Firstly, the 5% penalty for late payment of utility and property taxes is

excessive and should be applied proportionately on a per diem basis for the days a person is late. I agree with the principle of a penalty but believe it should be more equitable.

Additionally, I was told that if I pay the full amount and install a meter, I would receive a \$2,000 credit. I find this offer misleading and suspect it may indicate mismanagement of residents' funds. Why should I pay for a service I have not yet used and then receive a rebate?

Lastly, the fine print on the back of the bill states that homeowners who overpay and request a refund must pay an administration fee. This practice is unfair and should be discontinued immediately.

I urge you to address these issues promptly and make necessary adjustments to ensure fairness and transparency in your policies.

Thank you for your attention to these matters.

s.22(1) Sloan  
s.22(1)  
Surrey BC  
V4N 3H1

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am writing in response to the article published in the Surrey Leader on Thursday, April 3rd (page A5), titled "Mayor says tax hike will be among lowest in the region." My concern specifically relates to the proposal to invest \$3.8 million in the construction of a pier intended for the scattering of cremated ashes into the Fraser River.

While I understand and respect the cultural and religious significance of such practices, I am deeply concerned about the environmental implications. Considerable effort has gone into restoring the health of the Fraser River and protecting its delicate ecosystem, including the fish and wildlife that depend on it. Introducing a permanent site for the release of human ashes—potentially in large and unregulated quantities—poses risks that we cannot ignore.

To further inform myself on this issue, I spoke with Andrei Dmitriev from the Ministry of Forest, Lands and Natural Resource Operations & Rural Development s.22(1), who confirmed that depositing ashes or any foreign matter into flowing water is not permitted under current regulations. This is not a one-time occurrence; this proposal would establish an ongoing practice, the scale of which could be difficult or impossible to monitor.

In addition, I have contacted local First Nations communities to raise awareness of this plan and ensure that it aligns with our reconciliation efforts. Both the Katzie and Kwantlen Nations expressed that they were unaware of the proposal and voiced their own concerns. They have indicated that they will also be following up to oppose this initiative and support the exploration of alternative, environmentally sustainable solutions for the scattering of human remains.

I respectfully urge you to show your support to suspend this proposal, which is scheduled for reading on Monday, April 4th at 1:00 PM at the City of Surrey. We must explore other methods that honor cultural practices without compromising the integrity of our river systems or our commitment to reconciliation and environmental stewardship.

Sincerely,

s.22(1)

s.22(1) Sloan  
Phone: s.22(1)

*Sent to Surrey Council?  
on behalf of* s.22(1)

s.22(1)

*12 April 2025*

s.22(1)

**From:** [Mayor Brenda Locke](#)  
**To:** [Clerks Department Webmail](#)  
**Subject:** FW: \$3.8million for Surrey pier for Scattering cremated ashes into the Fraser River Opposed  
**Date:** April 14, 2025 11:05:44 AM  
**Attachments:** [c145969f-71c6-44db-80d3-d2250d8c8039.png](#)  
[SCN\\_0048.pdf](#)  
[image001.png](#)  
[image002.png](#)  
[image003.png](#)  
[image004.png](#)  
[image005.png](#)  
[image006.png](#)  
[image007.png](#)

---

Please register

Best regards,

Carole

CAROLE RICHARDSON, BA, Cert. Con Res Mediation



OFFICE of the MAYOR, EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT

13450 104th Ave, Surrey, BC, Canada V3T 1V8

T 604.591.4664 | F 604.591.4481 | [www.surrey.ca](http://www.surrey.ca)



Connect, Share and Engage with your City

Confidentiality Warning: This message and any attachments are confidential and subject to copyright. They are intended only for the use of the intended recipient(s) and may be privileged. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any review, retransmission, conversion to hard copy, copying, circulation or other use of this message and any attachments is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify the sender immediately by return e-mail, and delete this message and any attachments from your system.

---

**From:** Ms.22(1) Hunter s.22(1) >  
**Sent:** April 13, 2025 7:51 PM  
**To:** Elford, Doug <Doug.Elford@surrey.ca>; Mayor Brenda Locke <Mayor@surrey.ca>; Annis, Linda <Linda.Annis@surrey.ca>; mike farnworth MLA <mike.farnworth.MLA@leg.bc.ca>; mike farnworth MLA <mike.farnworth.MLA@leg.bc.ca>  
**Subject:** Fwd: \$3.8million for Surrey pier for Scattering cremated ashes into the Fraser River Opposed

All Surrey Councillors' Please take note of this letter

----- Forwarded message -----

**From:** Surrey Talk Radio s.22(1)  
**Date:** Sat, Apr 12, 2025 at 7:33 PM  
**Subject:** \$3.8million for Surrey pier for Scattering cremated ashes into the Fraser River Opposedmik  
**To:** <[doug.elford@surrey.ca](mailto:doug.elford@surrey.ca)>, mayor <[mayor@surrey.ca](mailto:mayor@surrey.ca)>, <[Gordon.Hepner@surrey.ca](mailto:Gordon.Hepner@surrey.ca)>, <[linda.annis@surrey.ca](mailto:linda.annis@surrey.ca)>, mike bose <[mike.bose@surrey.ca](mailto:mike.bose@surrey.ca)>, pardeep kooner <[pardeep.kooner@surrey.ca](mailto:pardeep.kooner@surrey.ca)>, harry bains <[harry.bains@surrey.ca](mailto:harry.bains@surrey.ca)>, rob stutt <[rob.stutt@surrey.ca](mailto:rob.stutt@surrey.ca)>

Cc: <[editor@whiterocksun.com](mailto:editor@whiterocksun.com)>, s.22(1) s.22(1) A<sup>s.22(1)</sup> Huberman  
s.22(1), M<sup>s.22(1)</sup> Scott s.22(1), p<sup>s.22(1)</sup> short s.22(1), B<sup>s.22(1)</sup>  
Locke s.22(1), B<sup>s.22(1)</sup> Mackin, Jr s.22(1) s.22(1)  
s.22(1)

Surrey City Council  
CcTsawwassen First Nation; Kwantlen First Nation; Katze First Nation, Semiamhoo First Nation; DFO

I have attached a letter that I received from Ms. S<sup>s.22(1)</sup> Sloan, s.22(1) which she handed to me personally and asked me to send a copy on to Surrey City Council (especially to Mr. Elford) as she does not have access to the internet and email. This I am happy to do. The letter is as follows:

s.22(1) Sloan

s.22(1)

Surrey BC  
V4N 3H1

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am writing in response to the article published in the Surrey Leader on Thursday, April 3rd (page A5), titled "Mayor says tax hike will be among lowest in the region." My concern specifically relates to the proposal to invest \$3.8 million in the construction of a pier intended for the scattering of cremated ashes into the Fraser River.

While I understand and respect the cultural and religious significance of such practices, I am deeply concerned about the environmental implications. Considerable effort has gone into restoring the health of the Fraser River and protecting its delicate ecosystem, including the fish and wildlife that depend on it. Introducing a permanent site for the release of human ashes—potentially in large and unregulated quantities—poses risks that we cannot ignore.

To further inform myself on this issue, I spoke with Andrei Dmitriev from the Ministry of Forest, Lands and Natural Resource Operations & Rural Development (778-572-2231), who confirmed that depositing ashes or any foreign matter into flowing water is not permitted under current regulations. This is not a one-time occurrence; this proposal would establish an ongoing practice, the scale of which could be difficult or impossible to monitor.

In addition, I have contacted local First Nations communities to raise awareness of this plan and ensure that it aligns with our reconciliation efforts. Both the Katzie and Kwantlen Nations expressed that they were unaware of the proposal and voiced their own concerns. They have indicated that they will also be following up to oppose this initiative and support the exploration of alternative, environmentally sustainable solutions for the scattering of human remains.

I respectfully urge you to show your support to suspend this proposal, which is scheduled for reading on Monday, April 14th at 1:00 PM at the City of Surrey. We must explore other methods that honor cultural practices without compromising the integrity of our river systems or our commitment to reconciliation and environmental stewardship.

Sincerely,

s.22(1)

s.22(1) Sloan

Phone: s.22(1)

*Sent to Surrey Council?  
on behalf of  
who does not have internet  
facilities*

s.22(1)

*12 April 2025*

s.22(1)

Ms. Sloan urges all persons receiving a copy of this letter to attempt to attend the 14 April Council meeting (incl Bcc) or email council to voice either opposition or to urge a stay on the project for at least 12 months during which time appropriate consultations could be had with stakeholders.

s.22(1) Scott - No Surrender

Surrey Talk Radio

s.22(1), Surrey, V3Z 0Y2

s.22(1)



s.22(1)

We support this through and through for all the concerns for the environment Ms Sloan has mentioned, she is a cherished part of this community and takes pride what goes on in our City.

Ms.22(1) Hunter/ E s.22(1) Bianchini