

## MINUTES

### CORPORATE SERVICES AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

### REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY OF OTTAWA-CARLETON

### CHAMPLAIN ROOM

15 FEBRUARY 2000

3:00 P.M.

#### PRESENT

Chair: R. Chiarelli

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

Regrets: G. Hunter

#### CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

**That the Corporate Services and Economic Development Committee confirm the Regular and Confidential Minutes of the 01 February 2000 meeting.**

CARRIED

#### DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No declarations of interest were filed.

#### REGULAR ITEMS

##### FINANCE

1. TILE DRAINAGE DEBENTURES  
- Finance Commissioner's report dated 20 Jan 00

---

Notes: 1. Underlining indicates new or amended recommendations approved by Committee.  
2. Reports requiring Council consideration will be presented to Council on 23 February 2000 in Corporate Services and Economic Development Committee Report Number 56.

**That the Corporate Services and Economic Development Committee and Council receive this report for information**

RECEIVED

2. STATEMENT OF REMUNERATION, BENEFITS AND EXPENSES PAID TO COUNCILLORS AND COUNCIL APPOINTEES FOR 1999  
- Finance Commissioner's report dated 05 Feb 00

**That the Corporate Services and Economic Development Committee and Council receive this report for information**

RECEIVED

3. 2000 INTERIM FINANCING REQUISITIONS BY-LAWS  
- Finance Commissioner's report dated 03 Feb 00

**That the Corporate Services and Economic Development Committee recommend Council approve:**

1. **Interim Levy requisitions to be paid by each area municipality to the Region on the dates set out in Annex A, subject to the finalization of interim tax bill due dates by each area municipality;**
2. **The requisitioned amounts for Regional Purposes be set at 50% of the previous year rating by-law as shown in Annex B;**
3. **That the appropriate interim financing requisition by-laws be prepared for enactment by Council.**

CARRIED

FINANCE / PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT APPROVALS

4. PURCHASE OF PERMANENT GENERATORS OTTAWA-CARLETON CENTRE AND HOMES FOR THE AGED  
- Joint Finance Commissioner and Planning and Development Approvals Commissioner's report dated 01 Feb 00

Councillor Cantin referenced the request for a capital transfer of \$1.5 million and the \$892,690 purchase price for the generators. He inquired if installation was going to cost the remaining

\$607,000. R. Ennor, Director, Property Services, confirmed the balance of the cost was for installation and design work, however, pointed out they had not yet obtained firm prices on that work. He stated the purpose of the report was to authorize the transfer of capital funds and authorize staff to exercise the options to purchase the generators in accordance with the tender.

Mr. Ennor confirmed \$301,444 had already been paid for the rental of the generators and the remaining \$1.5 million represented the installation and residual purchase price. He added it was an amount within the Year 2000 budget, and the recommendation represented a transfer to the Property Services budget. Councillor Cantin expressed concern with the proposed installation price and lack of detail of required expenditures. The Councillor moved deferral of the report until the next meeting.

Councillor Stewart inquired if deferral would present a problem, noting the requirement to purchase the generators by 8 March to be able to apply the rental payments against the total purchase price. After further discussion, it was agreed the report could be deferred to return to Committee on 7 March, however, with the caveat it would be waived onto the Council agenda of 8 March.

Councillor Stewart referenced the sub-standard generators located at the Homes for the Aged and the Ottawa-Carleton Centre. She wondered why staff did not originally plan to purchase the generators at the outset and avoid a rental agreement. Mr. Ennor explained the original contract was for a large number of generators for a variety of sites. The contract provided the option to buy or lease, with the advantage to charge some lease costs against the purchase price. Therefore, flexibility was available depending on the circumstances.

G. Geddes, Director, Year 2000 Program, explained the original contingency plan for the three Homes for the Aged were actually evacuation plans; the generators in place were sized to maintain a small portion of the building during an evacuation procedure. He stated this proved to be impractical during the ice storm and the contingency plans were redesigned and upgraded to maintain operation of the Homes. Further to a question from Councillor Stewart, Mr. Geddes explained in some cases the original generators would be supplemented and in other cases they would be replaced.

Councillor Stewart referenced the balance of \$4.1 million remaining in the account. She inquired if there were other outstanding purposes related to Y2K that the money would be required. Mr. Geddes referenced a process which identified the remaining costs in the program. He reported he did not anticipate other significant expenses at this time. Mr. Geddes stated there was a projected surplus of \$2.8 million, however, noted the pending leap year (29 February).

Councillor Beamish inquired about the anticipated costs of the generators, rental and purchase, and the installation costs. D. McCaslin, Manager, Real Estate Services, explained the cost for the recommended four generators was approximately \$591,246. With respect to installation costs, Mr. McCaslin stated the Ottawa-Carleton Centre was the only location staff had a reasonable figure at this time. He believed the estimate was \$300,000 with outstanding issues around where the unit would be installed (roof vs. garage).

Councillor Beamish requested a breakdown of costs and specifications on the generators. Mr. McCaslin stated time would allow staff to estimate the Homes for the Aged installations more closely.

Further to an additional question from Councillor Beamish, Mr. McCaslin believed the life span for the generators, subject to proper maintenance, was between 20-30 years. With respect to the generators to be removed, Mr. McCaslin stated it was best to relocate them elsewhere as the resale price would not realize their actual value.

Councillor Beamish referenced the original generator in the Ottawa-Carleton Centre and the areas it did or did not support, as outlined in the report. Mr. Geddes explained a portion of the facilities listed in the report were on back up generators. He added a great deal of information was learned through the Y2K project and contingency planning which evolved. Mr. Geddes indicated one alternative considered was costing to wire additional portions of the building unto the existing generator. However, it was revealed to be more cost effective to have one generator that would power the entire facility. Councillor Beamish requested more detail on the services \ areas listed within the report with respect to the Ottawa-Carleton Centre.

Mr. Ennor explained it was a matter of degree, noting when the power went off in the building, minimum power and emergency lighting was used throughout the complex. He stated if there was any sustained loss of power, there was potential for problems as certain areas did not have adequate back up. Councillor Beamish indicated the services listed in the report were essential to emergency services and an emergency situation. He expressed surprise there was not sufficient back up power at this time.

With respect to the former Year 2000 problem, Councillor Beamish pointed out many municipalities and businesses invested in back up generators. He suggested there may be a surplus of generators and wondered about the option of taking advantage of that market. Mr. Ennor agreed that may be an option, however, it represented a risk as they had a guaranteed price with the current supplier and were able to apply the rental payments toward the purchase price.

On a separate but related matter, Councillor Cantin referenced the December 9<sup>th</sup> computer virus attack. The Councillor expressed concern that there was no firewall between the 24 Hour Call Centre and the main computers, and that some of the main equipment was open to the outside. Councillor Cantin inquired if such areas had since been protected. Mr. Geddes agreed to investigate and respond back.

Moved by R. Cantin

**That the report be DEFERRED until the next meeting to provide for more information.**

CARRIED

(R. van den Ham dissented)

Report Recommendations

**That the Corporate Services and Economic Development Committee and Council:**

- 1. approve the transfer of capital authority in the amount of \$1,525,000 from the Year 2000 Program capital budget to a new capital account in the Property Services Division, to cover the installation and residual purchase price of rental generators at the Ottawa-Carleton Centre and the three Homes for the Aged;**
- 2. authorize staff to exercise the options to purchase generators from Cummins Ontario Inc. in accordance with tender 0285-39-T1/98 for the Ottawa-Carleton Centre and the three Homes for the Aged.**

DEFERRED (to 7 March)

PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT APPROVALS

5. LEASE PROPOSAL, 137 MURRAY STREET, OTTAWA  
- Planning and Development Approvals Commissioner's  
report dated 10 Jan 00

Moved by M. Meilleur

**That the Corporate Services and Economic Development Committee, in accordance with Council direction, approve a ten year lease agreement with Claude Lauzon Construction for 180.84 square feet of the Murray Street road allowance abutting 137 Murray Street, City of Ottawa, representing a revenue of \$3,750 for the first five years, excluding GST.**

CARRIED as amended  
(P. Hume and  
R. van den Ham dissented)

MISCELLANEOUS

6. 9-1-1 MANAGEMENT BOARD - CIVIC ADDRESSING  
RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE SUB-COMMITTEE  
- Board Co-ordinator, 9-1-1 Management Board, report dated 08 Feb 00

**That the Corporate Services and Economic Development Committee and Council:**

1. **Receive the draft report of the Sub-committee on Civic Addressing attached as Annex A and that a public consultation program be undertaken by the Planning Department on civic addressing, including the issues identified at Annex A;**
2. **Approve that Council convey a strong message to the Transition Board of the importance and urgency of resolving the issue of civic addressing, particularly in view of the municipal restructuring effective 1 January 2001 and that the Transition Board order the various planning departments to begin the process of resolving the identified problems, including the duplication of street names;**
3. **Approve that this report be circulated to local area municipalities for information;**
4. **Approve that a comprehensive by-law be drafted and enacted to deal with the issue of civic addressing, including street names, street numbering and discontinuous street names.**

CARRIED

INFORMATION PREVIOUSLY DISTRIBUTED

REGIONAL CLERK

1. ATTENDANCE AT 2000 RURAL ONTARIO MUNICIPAL ASSOCIATION AND ONTARIO GOOD ROADS ASSOCIATION COMBINED CONFERENCES  

---

- Regional Clerk's memorandum dated 07 Feb 00

OTHER BUSINESS

MINISTRY OF MUNICIPAL AFFAIRS AND HOUSING

CORRESPONDENCE DATED 10 FEBRUARY 2000

TERMS OF REFERENCE AND REGULATIONS FOR THE TRANSITION BOARDS  
REGULATION 100/2000

- Verbal report from the A/Regional Solicitor

E. Johnston, A/Regional Solicitor, reported the latest Regulation (No. 100/2000) was received Friday, 11 February. He stated a briefing session was being arranged for all members of Council to be held during the week of February 21<sup>st</sup> at which time more information would be available.

Speaking to the background, Mr. Johnston reported the *Fewer Municipal Politicians Act, 1999* contains a Schedule E (*The City of Ottawa Act, 1999*) which will create the new City of Ottawa. He stated, to date, three Regulations have been issued, as follows:

1. Regulation 6/2000 - Re: Filing election papers - notwithstanding wards have not yet been established.
2. Regulation 11/2000 - Re: Establishment of the Transition Board and provision for a Chair and certain legislation that will apply.
3. Regulation 100/2000 - Powers and Duties of the Transition Board.

Mr. Johnston pointed out the actual powers and responsibilities (true authority) are contained in the Regulation, not in the supplementary documentation.

The A/Regional Solicitor provided a brief background on Sections 1 - 3 of Regulation 100/2000. He explained further information on those Sections would be provided at the briefing session. With respect to Section 4, Mr. Johnston stated it contained significant detail, represented a prohibition section and listed a number of actions old municipalities could not do for the balance of 2000. The A/Regional Solicitor reviewed each of the actions which were prohibited.

Mr. Johnston stated the restrictions around Section 4 could only be remedied by the following: (1) in accordance with guidelines that may be issued by the Transition Board or (2) with the approval of the Transition Board. He did not expect the Board to issue guidelines in the near future, and consequently left the Corporation with the remedial provision of having to obtain the Transition Board's approval. In closing, Mr. Johnston stated the normal conduct of business by the Corporation was significantly prescribed during 2000 and recommended that decisions that appear to be caught by Section 4 be made subject to approval of the Transition Board.

In response to a question from Councillor Hume, Mr. Johnston explained if an unbudgeted capital matter arose during the year, approval must be sought from the Transition Board, or recommendation to the Board that it be included in the 2001 budget.

In response to questions from Councillor Loney, Mr. Johnston confirmed the OC Transpo Commission and Police Board were subject to the Regulation. With respect to Section 4 (1) (d), Mr. Johnston believed the old municipality was able to dismiss an employee, however, could not hire a new employee, promote or change the job classification of an existing employee or appoint a person to a position without the permission of the Transition Board.

Chair Chiarelli inquired about the provisions in the Regulations to date with respect to the authority of the Transition Board to set the 2001 budget. Mr. Johnston believed they were to recommend the budget for 2001 and forecast recommendations for two subsequent years thereafter.



The Chair referenced possible future Regulations with respect to election expenses, amounts of contributions, etc. The A/Regional Solicitor reported he did not have any actual knowledge of pending Regulations in this area, however believed it may be under consideration. He noted the consultation process around the Regulations has been minimal.

Councillor Meilleur requested clarification around Section 4 (1) (h) with respect to the capital expenditures and necessary approval by the Transition Board. Mr. Johnston explained it was his understanding (h) placed a prohibition on using money for purposes that were *not planned* in the 1999 and 2000 budgets. Councillor Meilleur referenced the “fast tracked” budget process in order to approve a 2000 budget prior to 31 December 1999 to avoid complications with spending in 2000.

Mr. Johnston explained the Regulations and legislation provided an overview function to the Transition Board. They could in fact review the entire budget and make decisions on that basis if they felt it was not in keeping with the proper financial management for the new city. Councillor Meilleur stated her community was concerned with the power of the non-elected Board. She hoped there would be sufficient public consultation by the Board as she expected her community to be vocal in expressing their concerns.

Chair Chiarelli inquired if there had been discussions with the Transition Board with respect to a process for obtaining approvals and decision making. He stated decisions had to be made around the process on what requires Transition Board approval, what is the status of an item if there is a different interpretation on the requirement of Board approval, etc. The Chair emphasized it was necessary to quickly tighten up the communication and flow of information between the Corporation and the Transition Board to ensure a working relationship.

M. Beckstead, Chief Administrative Officer, reported he and the municipal CAO's were working with various groups of the twelve municipalities (such as Finance, Clerk's, etc.) to attempt to put together information that would allow for a smoother transition. He stated he presented a submission to the Transition Board at their meeting on Monday, 14 February. However, at that time he did not have the benefit of the legal advice around Regulation 100/2000 or the prohibition clauses. Mr. Beckstead pointed out he repeatedly stated during his presentation that the Corporation expected to conduct business as usual since the 2000 budget had been approved and the Council was still responsible. He stated neither the Board nor their legal advisor expressed concern with these comments or the intention to proceed in this manner.

The Chief Administrative Officer concurred that a process would have to be developed and approved by Committee and Council with respect to obtaining approvals required by the Transition Board in order to allow the Corporation to conduct its necessary business.

Chair Chiarelli referenced the urgency around obtaining clarification with respect to a decision-making protocol which was fair to all twelve municipal Councils. He stated this should be

confirmed in writing by the Transition Board, and provide for an efficient process to allow business to continue. Councillor Hume directed the Chief Administrative Officer and A/Regional Solicitor to undertake to meet with the Transition Board Chair and Transition Board Solicitor to obtain clarification and understanding around the Regulation, specifically Section 4.

Councillor Cantin inquired when the Regulation took effect. Mr. Johnston stated Regulation 100/2000 took effect when filed on 10 February.

The Committee continued further discussion around Section 4 (1) (h) specifically with respect to capital budget expenditures and Transition Board approval. Mr. Johnston stated one difficulty was trying to interpret the Regulation and apply it to different scenarios. He stated the general premise was that the Transition Board had to issue guidelines that should remedy the situation, however, he did not know when or what the guidelines would be. Mr. Johnston stated in the mean time, out of an abundance of caution, he recommended actions outlined in Section 4 be subject to approval of the Transition Board.

Chair Chiarelli emphasized the need for a clear understanding of the budgetary issues and the noted October 8, 1999 date. Councillor Hume stated the need to be able to continue to govern and provide the services the Corporation delivered.

Councillor Beamish suggested the Transition Board would be reasonable and noted the obvious need to continue serving the community and carry on necessary planned business. He believed the Regulation was necessary to eliminate the violations that have occurred with past amalgamations and would continue to occur without limitations.

Chair Chiarelli acknowledged Councillor Beamish's comments, however, re-stated the need for a protocol and clear understanding of the prohibition Section.

Councillor Loney referenced the proposed briefing date. He suggested it was more appropriate to hold the briefing after staff had the opportunity to obtain as much clarification as possible around the issues and questions.

CONFIDENTIAL AGENDA

Councillor Hume moved into the position of Acting Chair for the remainder of the meeting.

Moved by A. Loney

**That the Corporate Services and Economic Development Committee Move In Camera pursuant to Subsection 11 (1) (e) litigation or potential litigation affecting the Regional Corporation, including matters before administrative tribunals, and (f) the receiving of advice that is subject to solicitor-client privilege, including communications necessary for that purpose, of the Procedure By-law.**

CARRIED

Moved by A. Loney

**That the Corporate Services and Economic Development Committee move Out of Camera and resume in Open Session.**

CARRIED

PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT APPROVALS \ LEGAL

1. ASHCROFT DEVELOPMENT INC.  
PAYMENT OF CONTRIBUTION TO CAVE CREEK SANITARY SEWER
  - Joint Planning and Development Approvals Commissioner and A/Regional Solicitor's report dated 09 Feb 00
  - Letter dated 14 Feb 00 from the General Manager, Ottawa Hydro

Moved by D. Beamish

**That the Corporate Services and Economic Development Committee approve that the Region not accept the offer to settle of Ashcroft Development Inc. and Clyde Avenue Holdings Limited of 27 January 2000.**

CARRIED as amended

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 4:35 p.m.

NEXT MEETING

07 March 2000

---

CO-ORDINATOR

---

CHAIR