

From: Dee G

Sent: April 3, 2026 1:58 PM

To: Clerks <Clerks@durham.ca>; Bob Chapman; chair; Wilma Wotten; Shaun Collier; Maleeha Shahid; Rick Kerr; Willie Woo

Cc: Sterling Lee

Subject: April 2026 Community Growth and Economic Development Committee

To the Members of the Community Growth and Economic Development Committee,

I am writing regarding the April 7, 2026 agenda and associated reports. Clerk, I respectfully request that this correspondence be included as part of the public record and considered by Committee.

The core issue is simple: there is no consistent line of sight between activity, outcomes, and taxpayer impact.

Across multiple reports, there is detailed activity reporting, but limited evidence of measurable results.

1. Investment Attraction Metrics (Report #2026-EDT-3)

The report highlights:

- “139 leads or investment inquiries” with “104 leads (75 per cent) still open” and only “11 leads (8 per cent) [as] Active Investors” (p.3)
- “1,301 touchpoints with prospective investors” (p.4)

However, it does not clearly quantify:

- How many jobs were created
- What new tax assessment was generated
- Total investment dollars realized

It also notes some “wins” had “no direct involvement” (p.5).

The Issue: Effort is measured, outcomes are not and this council and residents cannot assess whether this work is producing real economic growth.

2. Durham District Energy Strategy (Report #2026-CG-10)

The report outlines:

- Strategy development, feasibility work, and opportunity mapping (p.3–4)
- \$200,000 in grant funding secured (p.3)

It does not clearly outline:

- Total capital costs
- Funding model (public vs private)
- Long-term taxpayer exposure

The Issue: Strategic direction without financial clarity. Infrastructure decisions of this scale require transparent cost and risk disclosure.

3. Growing North Durham Plan (Report #2026-EDT-2)

The report highlights:

- Workshops, campaigns, and “129” promotional mentions (p.2–3)

But it does not quantify:

- Business growth
- Job creation
- Economic impact

The Issue: Activity reported without actual outcome measurement does help determine value.

4. Durham Greener Buildings Program (Report #2026-CG-9)

The report identifies:

- Increased participation and improved data completeness (p.3)
- Ongoing reliance on “hands-on technical support” (p.4)

It does not quantify:

- Program cost vs savings
- Return on investment
- Emissions reduction per dollar spent

It also proposes a single-source agreement (p.1).

The Issue: Expansion without clear value-for-money metrics. More of the same like above

Unfortunately, there is a pattern here in not only this month’s reports, but previous months reports as well – across all of the committees at Durham Region.

- Strong visibility on activity
- Limited visibility on outcomes
- Weak linkage to taxpayer impact

If this Committee is driving economic development and accountable governance, reports should consistently answer:

1. What did this cost?
2. What measurable outcomes were achieved?
3. What is the impact to residents and the tax base?

Instead, current reporting makes it difficult to determine whether these initiatives are delivering meaningful results. I respectfully ask that the Committee:

- Review and strengthen reporting standards
- Require clear, consistent outcome metrics and financial context
- Ensure activities are directly tied to measurable results and taxpayer impact

There is clearly significant work underway. The opportunity now is to ensure it is transparently measured and aligned with outcomes that matter to residents.

Thank you for your consideration.

D Glass