

MINUTES

CORPORATE SERVICES AND
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY OF OTTAWA-CARLETON

CHAMPLAIN ROOM

07 MARCH 2000

3:00 P.M.

PRESENT

Chair: R. Chiarelli

Members: D. Beamish, R. Cantin, B. Hill, G. Hunter, P. Hume, A. Loney, M. Meilleur,
and R. van den Ham

Regrets: W. Stewart

CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

That the Corporate Services and Economic Development Committee confirm the Regular and Confidential Minutes of the 15 February 2000 meeting.

CARRIED

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No declarations of interest were filed.

Notes: 1. Underlining indicates new or amended recommendations approved by Committee.
2. Reports requiring Council consideration will be presented to Council on 22 March 2000 in Corporate Services and Economic Development Committee Report Number 57.

REGULAR ITEMS

FINANCE

1. HEALTH CARE / RESEARCH FACILITIES FINANCING POLICY
PAYMENT POLICY CHANGE - HILLEL LODGE

- Finance Commissioner's report dated 29 Feb 00

That the Corporate Services and Economic Development Committee recommend Council amend the Payment Procedure section (Section C.2) of the RMOC Health Care / Research Facilities Financing Policy by inserting the following:

C.2.(i) Should the provincial funding support for the project be provided to the project sponsor over a period greater than 1 year and that the payment of these funds would commence only upon the completion of the project, then the total approved RMOC capital grant will be paid upon the completion date of the project.

CARRIED
(B. Hill dissented)

2. VILLAGE OF RICHMOND SANITARY SEWER FLOW MONITORING
AND FLOW REMOVAL STUDY - CONSULTANT APPOINTMENT

- Planning and Development Approvals Commissioner's report dated 22 Feb 00

Councillor P. Hume asked why staff are not recommending spending the entire amount to solve the problem that currently exists in the system and as described in the report. The Planning and Development Approvals (P&DA) Commissioner, Nick Tunnacliffe, said the purpose of the study is to ascertain exactly where the problems exist to then be able to fix them. The funds are to diagnose what the problems are, not just to measure the flows. He drew Committee's attention to items listed on page 5 which refer to a number of proposed actions, right down to the individual houses and the individual connections. In response to further questions from Councillor Hume, Ms. Jennifer Phillips, Branch Head, Environmental Planning, P&DA, explained that when the system was last monitored in 1989: at that time, it was mainly the municipal part of the system that was examined. It has been determined that the problem is more likely to be on the private parts of the system, but monitors have to be put in to pinpoint the exact locations. Because of the length of time between the peak flows to the pumping station it has been determined that the problem likely has to do with weeping tile and sump pump connections and with lateral connections to houses. Ms. Phillips said all this has to be ascertained before undertaking a public education campaign to affect change.

Responding to a question from Councillor R. Cantin, Ms. Phillips said there are problems with overflows approximately every two years. She added that the problem is mainly in the spring freshet but it may also be the high water table in Richmond combined with high levels of the Jock River that creates overflow problems. Councillor Cantin wanted to know whether there is infiltration into the system from somewhere. Ms. Phillips replied that staff are looking at particular areas where the problem appears to originate. She reiterated that a number of measures were taken on the municipal part of the system and it appears the problem is coming from areas northwest and southwest of the Jock River. Councillor Cantin pointed out there is no accumulated water this spring, and there will not be a heavy run-off, so likely staff will not get a true reading. Mr. Adrian Comeau, Environment and Transportation Department (ETD) said anytime a temporary monitoring program is set up, it is at the mercy of nature in terms of what is captured. He indicated that in Richmond, the capacity of the pumping station is 160 litres per second (lps) and overflows occur when that volume is exceeded. Between 120 and 180 lps come into the pumping station in the Spring, regardless of the snow melt. Staff have observed that once every two years, flows are in excess of 160 lps. Mr. Comeau added that, even though there isn't much snow on the ground now, a lot of built-up water remains frozen in the ground and there likely will be an impact from rainfall. Over the past five years, the Region has been monitoring the pumping station. Staff are trying to establish how the total flow is distributed throughout the system by placing monitors at various locations to better isolate the problem. Having heard from Mr. Comeau that the current volume of incoming flows is in the range of 30 to 40 lps, Councillor Cantin said he felt this leaves a lot of room for capacity.

Councillor G. Hunter expressed the hope that the study results would not be skewed by the "one in one hundred years" dry weather result. He added that, while there will be melt water and high water levels in the Jock River, there is not likely to be much more surface water infiltration than happens on a daily basis. He asked if there was a way of pro-rating the results to say that a normal year is 110 lps and a bad year is 160 lps, and if the peak flow is 80 or 70 lps, then this is coming from sump pumps, ditches and other sources. In the alternative, would it be more prudent to hold off for one year until there is more of a snow pack to study in April. Mr. Comeau said he thought that by monitoring this year, even if the flow is 100 or 80 lps, staff will have an idea of where the flows originate. Another option is to gauge the flow, cut the monitoring period short and preserve funds to continue next Spring. Mr. Comeau confirmed for Councillor Hunter that the requested funding represents an upset limit rather than a fixed price contract.

Councillor B. Hill said that having lived in the Village of Richmond for over 35 years, she has a good understanding of the problem. She expressed the view that spending \$142,000.00 this year to monitor flows is not a good use of taxpayers' dollars, because this is not an average year. Councillor Hill posited that, had staff been monitoring the pumping station as they should, they would know where the flow originates. She indicated that Goulbourn Township has spent money in the past to catch the origin of the infiltration. She wondered whether staff have reviewed any of those studies.

The Councillor suggested the biggest problem is that a lot of people put their sump pump pipe into the sanitary sewer and in order to get a good look at that, staff will need to get inside people's homes.

The Regional Chair, Bob Chiarelli, asked what are the implications of not proceeding with the study this year. Ms. Phillips pointed out that only a portion of the study is for flow monitoring; a good portion recommends flow removal measures. Responding to an earlier comment from Councillor Hill, Ms. Phillips said staff have been monitoring the pumping station each year, but the system hasn't been monitored for ten years. She added that that present equipment can isolate the problem which staff believe relates to sump pumps. Another concern is that when the system overflows into the lagoon which is meant to be a conservation measure. The Region also has an agreement with Goulbourn about the lagoon only being used for the short term and in rare occurrences, therefore there is an obligation to move forward and recommend corrective measures. Chair Chiarelli asked what would be the implications of an unusually high amount of rain from April to June. Ms. Phillips replied this would also contribute to overflows ending up in the lagoon.

Councillor A. Loney wanted to know what is currently being done, or what could be done, about illegal cross-connections since it appears that sump pump connections are causing the problem. Mr. Comeau replied this is mainly an issue with local systems and various municipalities have their own programs to address the problem. He described in some detail the situation in the City of Ottawa which is the most affected, because both the storm and sanitary sewers are in one pipe. Councillor Loney asked about the situation in Richmond, specifically, is it illegal to have the weeping tiles connected. Mr. Comeau indicated Richmond's system is a separated system, but because of the high water table, many houses have sump pumps: these should be discharging either into the ground or into the storm sewer on the street if one exists. Councillor Loney said he was less inclined to spend \$142,000 for the study because it appears staff don't have a handle on how to fix the problem. He added that, if the Region isn't prepared to stop illegal cross-connections, the problem will never be resolved, no matter how many studies are done.

Councillor M. Meilleur recalled the situation of flooding in her ward several years ago, noting that, at the time, events were described as an "act of God". She asked what would be the liability of the new City of Ottawa if the same thing happened in Richmond. Mr. Don Wilson, legal counsel for the Committee, said the new City will assume the liabilities of all of the area municipalities and of the regional corporation after amalgamation and this will include liability for flooding. Councillor Meilleur asked whether the insurance companies would have a good case against the Region if, knowing what it knows, it doesn't try to address the problem. Mr. Wilson said any flooding would be the responsibility of the Regional Municipality if liability attaches to the Regional Municipality. That liability would continue notwithstanding the amalgamation and would roll into the new City. Councillor Meilleur pointed out that there may be the "act of God" argument but it would not apply if the Region knew about the problem but decided to do nothing about it.

Councillor Cantin asked whether the local municipalities have to identify flow rates going into the system and where they originate before allowing new construction. The Environment and Transportation Commissioner, M. Sheflin, said a number of studies on the sewer system have recommended a unified system in order to have total control over all aspect and to apply the proper solutions. At the moment, staff do not know the flow in every particular area and are trying to find this out on a priority basis.

Councillor Hume suggested the matter be sent back to staff to ascertain the Region's liability and to report back to Committee. He asked whether this item was time-sensitive or whether a two-week delay (to the next meeting) would be critical. Ms. Phillips replied that the consultant needs to measure both dry weather flow and the freshet; this must be done in the Spring and a two week delay would be critical.

Councillor Cantin put forward a Motion to refer the report back for two weeks. He expressed the view a delay will not make much difference, especially this year. If people are connecting their sump pumps, the thaw will be revealing: the extra flows will materialize then and the dry weather data can be collected later in the season.

Councillor Hunter said this is a serious matter which cannot end with a study: a strategy to implement solutions has to come. The Councillor posited that Goulbourn Township is getting a good deal by only paying for part of the study. He noted that it was the City of Nepean and the homeowners who bore the cost of studies and solutions when sewers were un-combined and storm sewers were put in, ending basement flooding and sanitary sewers discharging into the Ottawa River. Councillor Hunter added that if it is discovered that homeowners, through inappropriate actions, are creating the problem, they should bear a portion of the costs of repairs. He felt it was not appropriate to refer the matter back and that it was satisfactory that staff would pro-rate the results of the study, identify where problems exist and assign proportional flows.

Councillor D. Beamish said he would also not support referral, mainly because the item should be defeated, and staff should report back with a more complete plan. If sump pumps appear to be the primary cause of the problem, there should be a legal mechanism to allow the Region to get into people's home and do the appropriate testing. The Councillor also thought that, if there really is a health hazard because of overflows into the lagoon, this should be enough to address the problem. He pointed out this situation has been going on for years so there is no urgency for overflow capacity.

Councillor R. van den said he could not support referral for two weeks and he proposed the matter be referred for nine months. He pointed out there is too much missing information and no plan of attack. In addition, he felt this is a local problem, and if people's basements are backing up, they should do something about it themselves. This is not a system problem and people should not be hooked into the system in the first place. Councillor van den Ham

expressed the view that Goulbourn Township should tell its residents the back ups are caused because they are illegally connected to the sewer. Councillor Cantin agreed to consider this a “friendly amendment”.

The Committee then considered the following Motion:

Moved by R. Cantin

That the report be REFERRED back to staff for a period of nine months for re-consideration in time for the 2001 spring season.

CARRIED, as amended

YEAS: D. Beamish, R. Cantin, B. Hill, A. Loney, R. van den Ham 5

NAYS: P. Hume, G. Hunter, M. Meilleur 3

SOCIAL SERVICES

3. UNDER ONE ROOF - FUNDING REQUEST

- Social Services Commissioner’s report dated 31 Jan 00

Councillor R. van den Ham expressed his support for the concept of agencies working together to reduce costs. He requested staff comment on the feasibility of the proposal. The Social Services Commissioner, D. Stewart, said staff have evaluated this proposal from a number of perspectives, and from the point of view of the partners and their fiscal health, feel the plan is sustainable and the projections are sound. The proponents are known to the Department as bona fide agencies operating in the community for a number of years. With respect to the physical plant, staff will have to employ due diligence to ensure that the engineering pre-work undertaken attests to its worthiness. Mr. Stewart said the proponents have had professionals review this aspect, and everything is satisfactory at this time.

Councillor van den Ham made reference to savings in the order of \$600,000 accruing to the agencies over 15 years and to the fact these funds will be available for increased service levels. He said he would like to see a portion of those funds be returned to the taxpayers of Ottawa-Carleton, perhaps \$10,000 per year, given that the Region will be providing \$240,000. He posited this could be done by proportionately reducing the funding each participating agency gets by \$10,000 per year.

The Regional Chair, Bob Chiarelli, asked that the Finance Commissioner provide additional details about the financial viability of the proposal and how it represents a good deal for both the agencies and the Region. Mr. LeBelle indicated his staff have reviewed the business case for this particular project and found it to be one of the most solid they have seen. There were concerns about whether or not the agencies themselves could withstand the charges attributed

to them as partners, however staff are now comfortable this is the case. Mr. LeBelle clarified the total contribution requested is \$720,000, \$480,000 of which is an interest-free loan and \$240,000 is a grant.

Councillor M. Meilleur pointed out that the community will “get its money back” in the form of additional staff and increased service from the agencies. The Councillor said she has been encouraging this approach and is working with other agencies to do the same: for these reasons she was pleased to support the recommendation before Committee.

Councillor R. Cantin asked how the loan will be secured. Commissioner Stewart replied that the Region will hold a mortgage against the title of the property for the duration of the loan. The proponents are in agreement with this option. Councillor Cantin expressed the hope that the partner agencies will not be instituting services that are fully dependent on increased funding, making it difficult for the Region to “expect to get funds from the new city.

Councillor G. Hunter stated that any funding taken from overhead and put into service delivery is good for the residents of Ottawa-Carleton. The Councillor mentioned that the Region has a history of helping agencies in the manner proposed by staff, citing a recent example of such assistance and inquiring about the status of that loan. Commissioner Stewart said the last information was that the building has not yet been sold: the Region has a mortgage against the title of that property and will eventually receive the funds it has invested. Councillor Hunter wanted to know whether assurance has been given that there is no cross-involvement between buyer and seller. Commissioner Stewart assured the Committee that this is a straight business proposition.

At this point, Chair Chiarelli called upon representatives from the partnership group to make a presentation to Committee.

Linda George, President, Citizens’ Advocacy of Ottawa-Carleton, began by saying the partner agencies are financially strong organizations because of good management. The group’s presence before Committee is a result of inspiration and not of desperation. The agencies have a combined history of 110 years of providing service to the community. Ms. George said Citizen Advocacy of Ottawa-Carleton has, for the past 26 years, provided support to people with disabilities to maximize their capacity to live independently and as integrated members of the community.

Peter Findlay, Vice President, Family Service Centre Board, said the agency has been operating for 85 years. It provides counselling to families and individuals, peer counselling programs for seniors, support services for caregivers, family life education, advocacy and planning co-ordination. The Regional Co-ordinating Committee to End Violence Against Women (RCCEVAW), and the Sexual Assault Network are currently housed in The Family Service Centre, and will be relocated in the new site.

Ms. George continued by saying that the need for the agencies' services are expanding in the community due to the increasing population and its diversity. As well the cost of providing service continues to grow. Social Service agencies have also experienced a significant funding squeeze over the past few years, and the combination of these factors has driven agencies to find creative and collaborative options to enhance service delivery in the community. The partner agencies identified accommodation costs as the second largest and most volatile of expenditures. The project will provide an opportunity to come together in a shared space, owned by the agencies and custom-designed. Ms. George said the Trillium Foundation has provided a grant to cover project management costs. She said stabilizing accommodation or occupancy costs will provide immediate and long-term economies as well as a business-like environment in which to operate. Another benefit will be that agencies will be able to focus resources, both human and financial, on providing service to meet existing and expanding needs of clients.

Mr. Findlay provided an update on financial expectations and projections. He noted that 55% of the space in the proposed building is firmly committed. Another 40% has conditional commitment and the partners are confident that conditions will work themselves out as work progresses and there are strong expressions of interest for the remaining 5%. There are indications that the proposed rental revenues are solid. There has also been third party verification of comparable rental market rates since the first draft of the proposal. The planning assumption is that comparable available space on the rental market in the year 2000 would be \$19.00 per square foot and this is the comparative base used in the proposal.

Mr. Findlay said the partners have also had third party verification that the actual purchase price of the building is appropriate for the subject property. The major impact of the financial update is that the net savings over 15 years, using the starting point of \$19.00 per square foot for comparable rental space, is now slightly over \$2 million. A second observation is that the cost benefit starts to accrue from day one.

Ms. George concluded the presentation by saying that regional support for this initiative will be a dramatic indication of Council's commitment to the provision of quality service in the community. It will also demonstrate Council's leadership role and be of great support to the agencies when they approach other funding sources. Ms. George said that, other than the financial benefits alluded to, the agencies will enjoy efficiencies in space allocation and in client accessibility. As well, the organizations will be able to work enhanced service synergies.

Councillor A. Loney wanted to know about the discontinuation of the proposed use, and whether the Region would recover all or some of its public funding if the building were sold. Commissioner Stewart replied that a legal agreement will be developed to cover the conveyance of funds. If the building is sold five years from now, all the funds will be returned, but if the sale happens in 15 to 18 years, the Region might receive less, given that there has been constructive use of the public investment. Councillor Loney asked why the non-profit agencies would not be party to proceeds if the building were sold at some time in the future.

Commissioner Stewart said the report reflects the pattern whereby funds have been conveyed to other voluntary and non-profit organizations, particularly child care centres. The Region has phased-in any return on investment in the event a building is sold or not used for its original purpose. Should the Committee's instructions to staff be that this not be done, staff would acquiesce.

Councillor Loney wanted to know what would happen to its residual share of the building should one of the agencies cease operation: would it automatically go to the other partners or would they have to buy up that agency's share. Dr. Tim Simboli, Executive Director, the Family Service Centre replied that the legal agreement is in the construction phase at this stage and a number of options are being explored. He added that the project will work better with member agencies as opposed to renter agencies, and that he could foresee a situation where the partners would try to replace the one that is leaving.

Councillor Loney said his concern was that, in the early years, the loss of a substantial partner could result in the financial projections not being as good as outlined in the proposal. As for the subsequent years, it would simply be a matter of ensuring the building remains for the use of non-profit agencies that benefit the area. He encouraged the proponents to look at any means possible to ensure this is the case. Should the agencies no longer be able to function, their assets would continue to benefit the community. The partner agencies could also make the entry of a newer agency a lot easier, since it likely would not have the asset base that they have.

That the Corporate Services and Economic Development Committee recommend Council approve a maximum expenditure of \$720,000 from the Region Wide Capital Reserve Fund to provide a capital grant [\$240,000] and an interest free loan [\$480,000] to assist the Under One Roof co-location project with acquiring an appropriate property.

CARRIED

(B. Hill and

R. van den Ham dissented)

INFORMATION PREVIOUSLY DISTRIBUTED

CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE

1. REGION OF OTTAWA-CARLETON INVOLVEMENT IN THE ONTARIO TIMESHIP 2000 MILLENNIUM EXHIBITION
- Chief Administrative Officer's memorandum dated 01 Mar 00

FINANCE

2. REPORT ON PETTY CASH AND CHANGE FUNDS - 1999
(AS PER CORPORATE POLICY MANUAL, CHAPTER 4, ANNEX 4A)
- Finance Commissioner's memorandum dated 21 Feb 00

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 4:05 p.m.

NEXT MEETING

21 March 2000

CO-ORDINATOR

CHAIR