

REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY OF OTTAWA-CARLETON
MUNICIPALITÉ RÉGIONALE D'OTTAWA-CARLETON

REPORT
RAPPORT

Our File/N/Réf. 03-07-98-0010
Your File/V/Réf.

DATE 26 March 1998

TO/DEST. Acting Co-ordinator
Corporate Services and Economic Development Committee

FROM/EXP. Regional Clerk

SUBJECT/OBJET **PROPOSED MEETING OF THE CORPORATE SERVICES AND
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE WITH THE
OTTAWA-CARLETON POLICE SERVICES BOARD**

DEPARTMENTAL RECOMMENDATION

That the Corporate Services and Economic Development Committee agree to meet with the Ottawa-Carleton Police Services Board at the start of the CS&ED Budget Review meeting on 21 Apr 98.

BACKGROUND

At its meeting of 3 Mar 98, the Corporate Services and Economic Development Committee considered a joint report entitled 1998 Draft Estimates - Responses to Increased Taxation Requirements from the Chief Administrative Officer and the Finance Commissioner. In the course of discussion, the following Motion was approved:

RESOLVED THAT the Regional Chair explore with the Chair of the Police Services Board that the Police Budget review be conducted through a joint meeting of the Police Services Board and Corporate Services and Economic Development Committee.

Further to this request, the Police Services Board, on 23 Mar 98, approved the following recommendation:

That the OCPSB will attend the Corporate Services and Economic Development Committee meeting on 21 Apr 98 to discuss the police service budget, share information and listen to their suggestions.

PURPOSE

The purpose of this report is to seek the CS&ED Committee's concurrence to meet with the Police Services Board at the start of the budget review meeting on 21 Apr 98 (9:00 a.m.).

A copy of Section 39 of the *Police Services Act* which describes the relationship and responsibilities of police services boards and municipal councils relative to budgetary matters is attached as Annex A. Also attached are Extracts of Draft Minutes from the CS&ED Committee meeting of 3 Mar 98 and from the Police Services Board meeting of 23 Mar 98.

This report is respectfully submitted.

Approved by
Mary Jo Woollam

Attachs: (3)

Section 39 of the Police Services Act

39. (1) The board shall submit operating and capital estimates to the municipal council that will show, separately, the amounts that will be required,

- (a) to maintain the police force and provide it with equipment and facilities; and
- (b) to pay the expenses of the board's operation other than the remuneration of board members.

(2) The format of the estimates, the period that they cover and the timetable for their submission shall be as determined by the council.

(3) Upon reviewing the estimates, the council shall establish an overall budget for the board for the purposes described in clauses (1) (a) and (b) and, in doing so, the council is not bound to adopt the estimates submitted by the board.

(4) In establishing an overall budget for the board, the council does not have the authority to approve or disapprove specific items in the estimates.

(5) If the board is not satisfied that the budget established for it by the council is sufficient to maintain an adequate number of police officers or other employees of the police force or to provide the police force with adequate equipment or facilities, the board may request that the Commission determine the question and the Commission, shall, after a hearing do so.

1998 DRAFT ESTIMATES - RESPONSES TO INCREASED
TAXATION REQUIREMENTS

- Chief Administrative Officer and Finance Commissioner's joint report
dated 11 Feb 98

The Regional Chair, R. Chiarelli, briefed the Committee on his recent meeting with provincial Finance Minister E. Eaves and senior Ministry Officials. He indicated that the RMOC delegation, which included the Chief Administrative Officer, M. Beckstead and the Finance Commissioner J. LeBelle was given a full and complete hearing and that participants engaged in lengthy and substantive discussions. Chair Chiarelli said regional officials received verbal assurances that substantive transitional funding would be made available to help the RMOC deal with uncertainties of downloading. In addition, the delegation was told that those uncertainties would be resolved within the next two to three weeks, and that there would be some movement in the RMOC's direction.

The Chair continued by saying the delegation also raised the matter of ongoing requests for funding related to transportation issues, i.e., the perception there had been ongoing commitments from the Province; the removal of transportation subsidies across the Province and the "grandfathering" of funding to Metro Toronto in the amount of \$1.2 billion. Provincial officials gave indications these matters would be the focus of review within the present context. Chair Chiarelli expressed his belief the provincial Finance Minister was sincere in both his words and in the time-frame he suggested and he asked that any Motion made by Committee and Council take the present uncertainties into consideration.

The Finance Commissioner, J. LeBelle, presented the report, highlighting the following areas of concern and proposing recommended responses:

Existing Regional Programs

The regional corporation is facing an increased tax requirement of \$5.9 million in existing programs. Staff were proposing to increase the Vested Benefits Reserve Fund contribution by \$1.4 million to assist with workforce adjustments contemplated in the next few years, however it is felt this proposal cannot be afforded from the tax-supported funds. A second response, a reduction target of \$4.5 million, would see staff identifying alternatives that do not require front-line service reductions. This directive was replaced by a Motion from Councillor B. Hill, approved by Council, asking departments to undertake a detailed review of their budgets to identify further cuts.

OC Transpo Requirements

On 18 Feb 98, the OC Transpo budget tabled with the Transportation Commission identified a number of reductions, resulting in draft estimates that are in keeping with Council directions.

Police Service Requirements

The Police Services Board (PSB) will require direction on the maximum tax requirement Regional Council is willing to accept for 1998. A copy of Section 39, *The Police Services Act*, which refers, is provided.

Provincial Downloading

The RMOC has expressed to Ministry officials its desire to stop fighting about the downloading numbers and have asked that Ministry staff provide numbers that are structurally accurate. Base budget savings will not be achievable without significantly reducing services to residents or seriously impairing the fiscal integrity of the regional corporation. The only other alternative is structural change to local government in Ottawa-Carleton and, since this restructuring may not occur before several years, interim financial assistance should be provided by the Province.

Other Related Budgetary Issues

Staff anticipate a one-time increase in Payments-in-Lieu, however it is not proposed this be incorporated in the budget base.

Ice Storm Costs

Staff recommend these costs be funded from reserve funds and not form part of the 1998 taxation requirement: it is hoped the provincial and federal governments will provide assistance.

Remissions

Staff anticipate that the RMOC share, because of adjustments made as the result of assessment appeals, could be two to three times higher than average, resulting in an additional requirement of \$4 or \$8 million.

Replying to a question from Councillor A. Munter, Commissioner LeBelle said staff will report on the ongoing review of all programs by regional departments, as per Councillor Hill's Motion, on 27th March. Councillor Munter asked whether staff could confirm that upper tier municipalities will be given the responsibility for assessment. Mr. LeBelle said staff anticipate the Province will make structural changes and should these costs "migrate" to the RMOC, appropriate adjustments will be made in the "education tax room". Staff believe the provincial estimate of \$221 million in education tax room is closer to \$210 million, and this leaves little room for additional allocation to the upper tier. Mr. LeBelle indicated the provincial Finance Minister was told this represents the largest portion of the entire downloading exercise and that it has the potential to increase the shortfall by \$10 million.

In response to questions of clarification from Councillor Munter on the police service budget process, Mr. S. Kanellakos, Director General, said staff intend to report back by 39rd March on measures needed to meet the envelope set by Regional Council. The Police Services Board will hold its deliberations and make final decisions on funding levels on 20 April.

The Chief Administrative Officer, Mr. Beckstead indicated, pursuant to a question from Councillor J. Legendre, that the Region will be receiving the revenues from fines levied (the Province received these in the past) and the funds will go into general revenues. Mr. LeBelle directed the Committee to p. 35 of the Executive Summary which refers. He added these revenues will be used to reduce the requirements of the police budget, not as operating revenues. Councillor Legendre said he wondered whether this was the correct way to proceed. He expressed his concern the police not be seen to be in a revenue-generating mode, and be distanced from such functions. Mr. LeBelle said he appreciated the policy concern and he indicated staff would take direction from Council on this matter.

Councillor A. Loney asked about the Gross Receipt Tax revenues. Mr. LeBelle said provincial staff realized they made a mistake in crediting the loss of this revenue to area municipalities and this mistake will be corrected. He could not say, further to additional questions from Councillor Loney, what the net result would be. Councillor Loney wanted to know whether the anticipated cost of remissions, i.e., \$12 million, was factored in the numbers. Mr. LeBelle replied in the negative.

Councillor D. Beamish expressed the view Council erred in not setting targets for the budgetary process. He speculated that, had this been done, the Committee would not have before it the estimates it has for the police service budget. He presented a Motion calling for the police service to set a budget for no tax increase and that reflects the philosophy of Regional Council relative to taking on new debt and capital expenditures. Councillor Beamish pointed out that, unlike OC Transpo, the police service has been unable to make changes to its budget, even in light of comments made by the Regional Chair in this respect.

Councillor G. Hunter pointed out decisions made early on about leaving gaps in service resulted in a large amount of hiring in 1997 and in the resulting annualization of the salaries. He indicated that, aside from recognizing the pressures stemming from Council-approved decisions, he agreed with comments made by the previous speaker.

Councillor Hunter asked whether it was coincidental that certain rural municipalities received more education tax room. Mr. LeBelle indicated that, typically, where the education portion of the residential tax bill is higher, as in rural municipalities, there is a more beneficial impact. Councillor Hunter requested that regional staff work with the area municipalities to present the overall impact to the taxpayer. He stressed the importance of knowing whether the impact on individuals is as bad as that on the regional tax bill. There are indications that rural municipalities are not as bad: coincidentally, the reassessment shows increases in property values in municipalities that generally benefited from downloading and decreases in value in municipalities that lost in the downloading equation. Commissioner LeBelle said the point was well taken that what is important is the impact on the taxpayer; staff have already started to work with area municipalities on a number of modeling issues relative to the impact on both urban and rural taxpayers.

In reply to a question from Councillor P. Hume, the Regional Solicitor, Mr. D. Cameron, clarified the process outlined in Section 39 of the *Police Services Act*. Councillor Hume said he believed the RMOC would be successful, thanks to Regional Chair's efforts, in getting additional funds from the Province to meet downloading requirements. He asked whether the Chief Administrative Officer could identify other activities the Region could undertake on behalf of area municipalities. Mr. Beckstead spoke about current initiatives related to short-term investments and surveying on a charge-back basis. He expressed the view there are many opportunities to do this. He added it would be fair to say the Regional Chair made the point strongly to the provincial Minister of Finance that restructuring savings would be needed to meet the targets.

In reply to questions from Councillor D. Holmes, the Deputy Treasurer, Mr. K Kirkpatrick, explained the changes to the Business Occupancy Tax (BOT). When asked whether a rebate program would be revenue neutral, Mr. Kirkpatrick replied in the negative, adding that a budgetary provision will have to be made and the tax requirement will have to be raised across all property classes.

Councillor Holmes inquired about the amount of the "windfall" related to Payments-in-Lieu (PIL). K. Kirkpatrick replied these numbers have not been finalized, however the Region's share could be in the order of \$10 million. He added these are very preliminary estimates and should be received as such.

Extract of Draft Minute
Corporate Services and
Economic Development Committee
03 March 1998

Councillor Holmes expressed disappointment with the fact that income from provincial offenses appears to be diminishing as opposed to increasing. She posited that hiring more officers for traffic enforcement could help increase revenues in this area.

The Regional Chair pointed out there have been legislative changes in the last few years regarding Provincial Offense Notices Net Revenues. He asked that staff report back in time for Regional Council, on the legislative changes made, the implications for the RMOC in terms of revenue and expenditures, on what revenues were from 1995 to 1997, what projections are for 1998, who is entitled to receive them and who pays the expenses to collect them.

In response to questions from Councillor R. Cantin about possible retirements, S. Kanellakos indicated that approximately 120 individuals are eligible to retire with 30 years service by the end of year 2001. He added that approximately 60 officers who are eligible to retire now have chosen to stay because it is to their benefit to stay to the end of the new Collective Agreement. Mr. Kanellakos pointed out that increments are not being offset by retirements, and that the budget requirement to cover Terminal Leave benefits represents between \$2.2 to 3 million.

Councillor Cantin asked why funds are being put into Pay-As-You-Go (PAYG) as opposed to paying off debt charges. The Director, Finance and Administration, Ms. D. Frazer, replied that debt charges are increasing because of capital work undertaken between 1995 and 1997; the PAYG contributions represent an effort by the Board to build reserve fund to replace the radio infrastructure technology now being developed and to keep in line with the RMOC's financing policies.

Responding to a question from Councillor R. van den Ham, Deputy Chief A. Mackie replied that a request from the Ontario Provincial Police (OPP) for 7 additional officers was made to the Board and was based on a statistical analysis of their operational requirements in Kanata. Councillor van den Ham wanted to know whether any of the Capital requirements could be delayed for a year since he did not believe they could all be undertaken in 1998. Mr. Kanellakos said the Board will have to make decisions about the phasing-in of capital projects: staff will identify projects that have higher priority, particularly accommodation-related projects in the east division building, and retrofits of existing buildings in order to ensure proper service delivery.

Chair Chiarelli asked about the nature of presentations made to the Board by police administration from January 1997 to December 1997; how decisions were made in terms of determining the budget or tax requirement, and how those decisions related to the Board. Mr. Kanellakos said the Board had been briefed on financial issues and on the pressures the last operating year would have on the budget. In late Summer, the Board directed staff bring forward a budget that would allow the service to be operated without having to deal with base budget shortfalls and that reflected the true cost of operating the service in 1998.

Chair Chiarelli asked whether the Board had given any direction in light of the fiscal challenges it knew would be forthcoming because of provincial downloading and other pressures. Mr. Kanellakos indicated that staff, because of its relationship to the Regional Finance Department, was aware of the constraints in bringing forward a budget, but felt it was its responsibility to develop a document that addressed some of the outstanding base issues that contributed to over-expenditures in 1997. Chair Chiarelli wanted to know whether only general principles had been presented or whether reference had been made to programs and budget constraints. Mr. Kanellakos replied that staff presented a detailed financial position report outlining problem areas.

Chair Chiarelli asked whether the budget requirement had come as a surprise to the Board and, if not, how were they aware of it. Mr. Kanellakos replied that staff did not make a direct numerical link to possible impacts on the 1998 operating estimates when they presented the financial position report and newly-appointed Board members may have been surprised by the numbers. In response to a further question, Mr. Kanellakos indicated the Board Chair was aware of many of the issues facing the police service. Mr. Vice would not have been aware of the numbers, but along with other Board members, he was apprised of issues around compensation and others the police service was struggling with then.

Responding to questions from Councillor B. Hill, Ms. D. Frazer indicated the amount of the debt service charges forecast in 1998 was \$3.1 million, with a forecast of . \$1 million in 1999 and \$1.7 in 2000. At the Councillor's request, Mr. Kanellakos provided additional details about the Professional Development Centre at Algonquin College, indicating this facility will be demolished in another year and will have to be replaced. It is a provincial requirement that the recruitment, testing and preparation of candidates be done at the community college level; other mandatory training requirements are in-service training for use-of-force, first aid, race relations, supervisory training and criminal investigative training .

Councillor Hill expressed grave concerns about the police service budget. She said it appears that the extension of regional policing into the rural areas will cost substantially more than had been originally estimated. She quoted from a 21 June 96 report entitled "Final Report on Unifying Police Services in the OPP Policed Municipalities" which calculated that the one-time start-up costs would be in the range of \$1.5 to \$2 million should the OPP leave and take their inventory of assets and equipment. That number today is \$3.2 million, in addition to the requirement for new facilities to fulfill the police services mandate in areas currently served by the OPP. In addition, a provision of \$6 million has been included in both 1998 and 1999 to acquire facilities in both the eastern and western parts of the Region. Councillor Hill said that, in fairness to all taxpayers, and in light of the ongoing processes and discussions related to restructuring, Council should reconsider whether regional policing should be extended into the rural municipalities.

The Councillor indicated she would support any measures aimed at increasing revenues from fines. She added that legislative changes should also be made to ensure the Police Services Board is composed entirely of regional councillors.

In reply to a question from Chair Chiarelli regarding an earlier Motion proposed by Councillor Beamish, the Regional Solicitor reiterated that Council cannot direct the Police Services Board to submit a budget of any particular dimension. He suggested the Committee refer the current document to the Board, with a request it be reviewed in light of the concerns of the regional corporation regarding budget guidelines and expenditure limitations. This course of action will give the Board a clear indication the current document is unacceptable to Council.

Speaking to his Motion, Councillor Beamish, said he saw no impediment in requesting that the police service prepare a budget that has no new, net taxation requirement. Both Chair Chiarelli and the Regional Solicitor reiterated that Subsection 3 of Section 39 states that Council shall establish an overall budget. Councillor Beamish expressed the belief this requirement kicks-in after the public process is complete and has no bearing on setting guidelines leading up to final budget approval.

Councillor A. Munter disagreed with Councillor Beamish's interpretation of Section 39. He said he was not prepared to attach a specific number to the envelope and would not support this approach at Council. He expressed the hope that the Regional Councillors who are Board members and the public representative appointed by Council will ensure savings are identified.

Replying to a question from Chair Chiarelli, K. Kirkpatrick indicated the police service budget in 1997 was \$100 million and the operations component was \$99 million. The tax requirement in 1997 was \$93 million; in 1998 it is \$108 million, not including provincial downloading figures. Mr. Kirkpatrick suggested the Motion focus on the net tax requirement for police services.

Chair Chiarelli asked that the Chief Administrative Officer and the Finance Commissioner be directed to embark on discussions and negotiations to accommodate the tax requirements in a way that is acceptable to Council. He posited there may be an opportunity to assist the police service with some of the funds anticipated from the Province.

Speaking in reference to Councillor Beamish's Motion, Councillor van den Ham said that, for many years, the police service was forced by Council decisions to maintain its spending and the budget now before Committee represents catch-up time.

He disagreed with some of the comments about amalgamation, noting that the residents of Cumberland, having gone through this process, are very appreciative of the change and of the increased police presence.

The Councillor indicated his preference is to work in a cooperative fashion and to find a more balanced approach. He expressed the view there are a number of pressures that Council cannot ignore, as the police service has acted in response to Council's requirements and should not be abandoned at this time.

Chair Chiarelli said the previous comments were legitimate and he clarified that his earlier directive to the CAO and to the Finance Commissioner was to bring to Committee and Council a scenario that is reasonable. He added that the Board must realize that a \$10 million additional tax requirement is unacceptable: if it is going to be met, it should be met through strong, close consultation with the regional corporation within the next two to three weeks. Councillor van den Ham said he would support any effort to work towards achieving this goal.

Councillor M. Meilleur said she also could not support that there be no increase for police service, since Council has contributed to decreasing revenues by reversing the False Alarm Policy. She added she would appreciate any effort to find savings in the budget.

Councillor A. Loney expressed the view it was appropriate to provide guidance to the Board at this time. He indicated he did not wish for the relationship between the Board and Council to become confrontational. The Councillor added that the Board has not held its budget deliberations, and hopefully there will be changes to the numbers after that process is completed. The Region's goal to have an overall budget that will not require a tax increase but within that context, certain costs will need to be covered.

Councillor W. Stewart indicated she also wanted to continue fostering a partnership between the Police and the RMOC and would be reluctant to move in any direction that undermines that partnership. She said she believed the police are not immune from the funding pressures the Region faces. Supporting a modest increase is probably reasonable, in light of the fact that during the community visioning exercise undertaken a few years ago, policing, public safety and security issues were ranked by residents as top priorities. The Councillor added she could support more modest proposals in Capital expenditures.

At this point, the Committee considered the following Motion:

Moved by D. Beamish

RESOLVED THAT Regional Council request the Police Services Board to submit to Regional Council a budget which requires no tax increases.

CARRIED

Moved by P. Hume

RESOLVED THAT the Police Services Board be requested to critically review and reduce the capital program to minimize the requirement to issue new debt.

CARRIED

Speaking to Councillor Beamish's second Motion calling for a meeting between the Board and the CS&ED Committee, the Regional Solicitor indicated this could not be considered a joint meeting. Councillor Loney suggested that the Committee direct the CAO and the Regional Chair to work cooperatively with the Board to achieve the desired results: should a combined meeting be required, it could be held afterwards.

Councillor H. Kreling spoke in support of the approach suggested by Councillor Loney. He said the Committee has to realize that Board members, himself included, have given the public notice that the Board will deliberate the police services budget. The Councillor felt those deliberations should be allowed to proceed.

The Committee then considered the following Motion:

Moved by D. Beamish

RESOLVED THAT the Regional Chair explore with the Chair of the Police Services Board that the Police Budget review be conducted through a joint meeting of the Police Services Board and Corporate Services and Economic Development Committee.

CARRIED

(G. Hunter, A. Loney,
H. Meilleur dissented)

Councillor van den Ham said he believed the Committee must deal with the increased pressures on the corporation and should not wait until it hears from the Province before doing this if it wants to even think about a zero percent tax increase. He proposed the following course of action:

Moved by R. van den Ham

- a) **Be it resolved that the Budget Review Board of Management Committee identify alternatives to reduce expenditures totaling \$4.5 million as stated in the report.**
- b) **Be it further resolved that the Budget Review Board identify a menu of alternatives for additional expenditure reductions to offset the impact of Provincial downloading. This menu of alternative expenditure reductions would include service level decreases and/or program eliminations due to the non revenue-neutral scenario inherited from the Province as a result of new program responsibilities.**
- c) **Be it further resolved that the Chair and the C.A.O. continue to communicate to the Provincial Govt. the magnitude and urgency of this situation on behalf of all Ottawa- Carleton taxpayers.**

CARRIED

3. RESPONSE TO COUNCIL MOTION ON 1998 DRAFT BUDGET ESTIMATES
- Director General's report issued at the meeting

Director General S. Kanellakos provided some background on events that have taken place since the 1998 Budget was tabled at the last Board meeting. He made reference to the three recommendations made by the Region's Corporate Services and Economic Development Committee and subsequently endorsed by Council on 11 March 1998.

S. Kanellakos outlined a public consultation process which would include an open house and public meeting on 16 April, and a Board meeting on 20 April to receive public delegations and approve the budget. Mr. Kanellakos noted staff would also be available for ward meetings with any regional councillors interested in having one. A targeted mailing is proposed to reach business improvement associations, neighborhood watch associations, community associations, chambers of commerce and community organizations across the Region, to ensure people are aware of the meetings and some of the issues being discussed. Information would also be available through e-mail, the Regional Police website and the Finance Department. Mr. Kanellakos asked that the Board approve the public consultation process as outlined in the report.

Chair Vice indicated that he and Regional Chair Chiarelli met recently and agreed to have senior Police Services staff meet with senior Regional staff in the first week of April to discuss the options available in dealing with the budget shortfall. Chair Vice also expressed his own willingness to meet with the Region's Corporate Services and Economic Development (CS&ED) Committee.

In response to queries from Councillor Legendre, S. Kanellakos confirmed there will be a simultaneous process; while the Board is consulting with the public, staff will review options and prepare recommendations for the Board's consideration at its 20 April meeting.

Councillor Legendre stated there was nothing new in the report in terms of a response to Council's direction. He reminded the Board that Regional Council asked for proposals that would not cause a tax increase. He had expected the staff report to contain some proposals which the Board could then put out for public consultation. He expressed concern about hearing public delegations and approving the budget on the same day that proposals are identified, as it would make it difficult to engage in meaningful discussion.

Chair Vice shared the Councillor's concern about approving the budget on April 20th and suggested that meeting be reserved for hearing public delegations only, with the budget to be considered and approved by the Board at its regular meeting on April 27th. Addressing the timing of the proposed options, he explained that he and Chair Chiarelli agreed it would be preferable to wait until meetings were held with senior Regional staff in order to bring forward the full range of options.

Mr. Kanellakos noted there are other opportunities aside from the reduction of expenditures. The Council motion allows maximum flexibility in terms of coming up with solutions, therefore, staff felt that bringing only the expenditure side of the options to the table might unfairly influence the public's views. In response to a question from Councillor Legendre, it was confirmed the Board will receive some solid proposals for its meeting on April 20th and will deal with them on the 27th. The councillor expressed his disappointment at not having more substantive information on the current agenda in response to the Council motion.

Since Police Service staff will be meeting with senior Regional staff the first week of April, Councillor Kreling wondered if staff would have a problem in providing information on options in time for the 16 April meeting. Mr. Kanellakos confirmed the information flowing out of the meeting with Regional staff could be available for the public meeting on the 16th. Councillor Kreling believed that the extensive consultation process outlined will give interested parties ample opportunity to come forward. He supported the schedule and requested that all suggestions that come forward be included in the report, even if they are not initially supported by the Region, to allow the Board an opportunity to consider all issues.

Member Boudreau asked Mr. Kanellakos whether it would be possible to have the options distributed to the Board prior to the meeting on April 16th. Mr. Kanellakos confirmed it would be done.

Member Buckingham questioned the purpose and logistics of a meeting with the CS&ED Committee. She was concerned that councillors might misunderstand the extent of their involvement in the Police Service budget. She recognized it is a significant concern to them but maintained the Board is ultimately responsible. Chair Vice agreed it is the Board's responsibility to deal with the budget but believed the Board also has a responsibility to meet with members of Regional Council to hear their concerns and suggestions.

Councillor Kreling believed councillors recognize the CS&ED Committee has no direct approval authority. They view the meeting as an opportunity to discuss issues and provide suggestions. He believed the interest of the Committee, this year more than previously, is to stay on top of all parts of the Region's budget. He emphasized the budget the Ottawa-Carleton Regional Police Services Board recommends to Council will arise from the April 27th Board meeting.

In response to further questions, W. Fedec, Board Secretary, stated preliminary discussions have been held with the Regional Clerk and the Coordinator of the CS&ED Committee regarding a possible date for the Board to meet with the Committee. It is proposed that the Board attend the scheduled Budget meeting of the CS&ED Committee on April 21st, at 9:00 a.m.. She clarified the meeting would be the first item of the day and the purpose would be to receive input and hear the priorities of the members.

Councillor Legendre noted the recently amended *Police Act* changed the authority of Council and unfortunately this year the sequence of events has been such that the law hasn't been given a chance to work. Whereas in the past Council could say "yes" or "no" to the overall budget amount as presented by the Board, now the *Police Act* allows Council to present the Police Services Board with an envelope within which the Budget must stay. Council hasn't done that this year. He believed the intent of the meeting with the CS&ED Committee was to make up for the lack of communication from the province which has caused the budget process to be so late. He also noted that the later it gets, the corrective measures available will become fewer and more severe. He felt this is an exceptional year requiring exceptional measures. He put forward a motion proposing that the Board agree to review the Police budget for 1998 in a joint meeting with the Corporate Services and Economic Development Committee.

Member Baskerville believed it was important that it be clearly understood a joint meeting would be only for the information of councillors and that no votes would be taken to amend the budget. He maintained the purpose of the meeting is to share information and put forward ideas. Member Buckingham put forward an alternative motion to reflect that intent.

Councillor Legendre expressed his support of the public consultation process outlined in the report but indicated he would be dissenting on receiving the report because of his disappointment with it as a response to Council's motion.

Moved by H. Kreling

That the Ottawa-Carleton Police Services Board receive this report and approve the proposed public consultation process.

CARRIED

(J. Legendre dissented on receiving the report)

Moved by E. Buckingham

That the Ottawa-Carleton Regional Police Services Board attend the Corporate Services and Economic Development Committee meeting on 21 April 1998 to discuss the police services board budget, share information and listen to their suggestions.

CARRIED