

MINUTES

CORPORATE SERVICES AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY OF OTTAWA-CARLETON

CHAMPLAIN ROOM

19 SEPTEMBER 2000

3:00 P.M.

PRESENT

Chair: R. Chiarelli

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

CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

That the Corporate Services and Economic Development Committee confirm the Minutes of the 05 September 2000 meeting.

CARRIED

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No declarations were filed.

-
- Notes: 1. Underlining indicates new or amended recommendations approved by Committee.
2. Reports requiring Council consideration will be presented on 27 September 2000 in Corporate Services and Economic Development Committee Report No. 75 and In Camera Report No. 76.

REGULAR ITEMS

ENVIRONMENT AND TRANSPORTATION /
PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT APPROVALS

1. DESIGN FUNDING FOR INFRASTRUCTURE RELATED TO ***
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

- Joint Environment and Transportation Commissioner and Planning
and Development Approvals Commissioner's report dated 29 Aug 00

P. Sweet, Director, Policy and Infrastructure Planning, introduced the subject report. As background, she explained a related report {"Growth in Ottawa-Carleton, 1996-1999 and Infrastructure Plans" (referred to as the monitoring report) - dated 16 Aug 00}, had been deferred at the 12 Sep Planning and Environment Committee, now to be considered on 26 Sep. Ms. Sweet stated the monitoring report set the scene for the content of the subject report before Committee.

Ms. Sweet and C. Christensen, Senior Project Manager, Policy and Infrastructure Planning, provided an overview of the monitoring report. They stated that growth, particularly for jobs, had exceeded expectations particularly in the south and southwest ends of the Region. As a result, staff reviewed and determined additional infrastructure requirements in the Official Plan (to 2006) that had not been committed or constructed, as well as new needs for infrastructure. Ms. Christensen reported the result was approximately fourteen additional projects to be added to Table 6 in the Regional Official Plan.

Speaking to the subject report, Ms. Christensen explained it provided a response to the growth pressures. She explained the report would place the Region in the strongest position for immediate construction in that designs would be prepared and ready once Provincial and Federal infrastructure programs are known. She noted this also indicated the responsiveness of Council to deal with the growth pressures being experienced.

With respect to the report recommendations, Ms. Christensen provided a review as follows: (1) direction to staff to begin design work for prioritized projects (2) a request for movement of funds within capital accounts, and (3) provide for a delegation of authority to the Chief Administrative Officer to award engineering consultant contracts as a means to expedite the award process. In closing, Ms. Christensen reviewed the recommended projects as outlined in the report.

***NOTE: TRANSITION BOARD APPROVAL WILL BE REQUIRED FOLLOWING COUNCIL
CONSIDERATION OF THIS ITEM.

In response to a question from Councillor Meilleur, Ms. Christensen confirmed a number of the projects were in the capital budget but in the period of 2005-2009 and were subject to 100% funding. Councillor Meilleur inquired on the impact on other approved projects due to this advancement. Ms. Christensen stated there were no changes required to the 2000 or 2001 capital budgets as the funding was found in unspent existing authority where the projects were completed, with the remaining coming from development charge reserves.

Councillor Meilleur referenced the postponement of the King Edward, Laurier and Rideau projects and the severe transportation pressures. Ms. Sweet confirmed the monitoring report stated the Ontario Municipal Board directed the King Edward project be shown as a priority in Table 6. With respect to the lack of infrastructure funding, Ms. Sweet explained the monitoring report referenced this problem and the need for other solutions such as the pending Provincial / Federal infrastructure programs. She explained it was necessary to be prepared with designs should those programs become available. In addition, Ms. Sweet referenced a KPMG report entitled "Infrastructure Financing and Private Sector Partnerships" which also offered other potential opportunities for infrastructure funding.

Councillor Meilleur referenced the *possible* agreement of a bridge route and inquired if funds were available to build that infrastructure. Ms. Sweet confirmed staff had prepared a budget that indicates environmental assessment work should be budgeted immediately for bridge locations. However, she added there was no construction dollars identified and believed a funding partnership would be required.

Chair Chiarelli referenced the unprecedented growth in jobs and housing in the east end. The Chair requested some discussion on the economic development in the east vs. the west and the respective requirement for infrastructure.

R. Chartrand, Executive Director, Economic Affairs, reported the *residential* growth in the east was occurring at a faster rate than projected in the Official Plan. However, the *employment* growth was more rapid in the west end due to the high technology sector. With respect to east end business parks, Mr. Chartrand reported they were fully serviced and ready to accommodate employment, therefore, did not represent a similar pressure point as in the west. With respect to the Innes Road Environment Assessment (an east end pressure point), Mr. Chartrand confirmed authority and funding were already in place. Speaking to the west end, Mr. Chartrand stated there was a more urgent need to react quickly and significantly. He pointed out the reports were responsive and proactive in dealing with the situation, and would benefit from future Provincial / Federal infrastructure programs.

Chair Chiarelli referenced recent development projects in the east, such as the call centres and the JDS building. Mr. Chartrand acknowledged this development. However, he explained by comparison the east growth had been with the residential and servicing sectors, whereas the west growth was around the employment and business sectors.

Councillor Cantin stated a major reason for less development in the east was due to a lack of year round truck access. The Councillor referenced Innes Road and other shortfalls such as Blair Road. Councillor Cantin believed if there were better access, development would occur. In response, Ms. Sweet stated there were plans in current budgets to complete some of the sewer and water connections required. She explained the Walkley Road connection was in the Official Plan, however, referenced greenbelt / National Capital Commission constraints. Ms. Sweet agreed Innes Road was a priority and reiterated the Environmental Assessment was in process.

Councillor Cantin believed there would be less pressure on roads into the city core if there were more employment opportunities in the east. Ms. Sweet concurred and explained it was an objective to try to balance jobs and housing in the urban communities.

Councillor van den Ham expressed his initial disappointment in the report as the east end appeared to be neglected. He commented on his support for a one-city model, noting the fears of rural residents of this concept with respect to improper balance and equality. Councillor van den Ham stated further clarification had improved his comfort level, however, indicated he would be moving two motions with respect to two east end projects. The Councillor expressed his support for the report and understanding the Region must be proactive.

Councillor van den Ham believed economic development / employment growth was about moving people and goods. He stated the global issue, that is transportation improvements, needed to be addressed. The Councillor felt the improvement of transportation avenues in the east would attract the development in certain areas.

In response, Mr. Chartrand reported the primary purpose of the report was to support access to business parks, not necessarily to address the overall transportation issues as they relate to board community transportation issues. Speaking to the east, Mr. Chartrand agreed Innes Road required action, referencing the adjacent business park.

He reiterated that the Environment Assessment was underway and design funds were identified for 2001. Mr. Chartrand stated the new City Council would be required to review the projects and set the priorities for construction, noting the design work would be completed.

Councillor van den Ham reviewed two motions with respect to Innes Road and the North/South link. Speaking to the North/South link, Mr. Chartrand agreed the project was important due to the 2001 International Plowing Match and may attract Provincial funding.

Councillor Loney referenced the budgetary process and transfer of funds. He inquired if money would be used that would have to be replaced as early as 2001. Mr. Chartrand confirmed the authorities transferred were from surpluses in completed projects with the majority coming from development charge reserves. Councillor Loney noted the large budget balance for the MacKenzie King Station. M. Sheflin, A/Chief Administrative Officer, confirmed the project was under budget, however, stated there might be outstanding commitments hence the need to not use that entire surplus.

Councillor Loney referenced the LeBreton Flats transit project and inquired if funding would be in place to start work in 2001. Ms. Sweet confirmed funds would not be taken away from projects already planned, such as LeBreton Flats.

Councillor Loney stated numerous projects had been postponed over the years due to lack of funding. He referenced the funding that will be required for the actual construction once the designs were ready. Ms. Christensen referenced the KPMG study and pending Provincial / Federal infrastructure projects.

Councillor Beamish did not believe the designation and development of a business park would guarantee residential or business development in that area. He stated for geographic, historic, and circumstantial reasons, businesses chose to locate in certain areas in the Region. The Councillor pointed out that residential development attracted the service industry, such as strip malls, not the large high technology companies that brought high employment.

Speaking to the employment growth in the west, Councillor Beamish inquired why residential development was not also being addressed, as that would be a future pressure. He suggested funds be invested into a residential study in order to avoid an imbalance of job and residential growth in areas throughout the Region. Ms. Sweet explained the need for housing in the west was not as great as the immediate employment growth. Mr. Chartrand acknowledged the relationship between employment and residential growth. However, he pointed out there was also growth in other areas of the economy, not just the high technology sector and west end. Mr. Chartrand pointed out that in most households, both spouses worked, this being a key

factor in the decision where someone chose to reside. Ms. Sweet reminded Committee that the Planning and Environment Committee approved the commencement of a residential study to review the issue raised by Councillor Beamish.

Councillor Hill referenced the adequate infrastructure in the east, with the possible exception of roads. She pointed out the business sector was aware of this, however, still wished to locate in the west or in the areas the sector “clusters” existed. Councillor Hill stressed the present momentum and the need to accommodate this growth. She stated the 1997 Official Plan was out-dated, and emphasized the need to change and keep up with the current momentum. In closing, Councillor Hill commended staff on the initiative and proactive response to the situation.

Chair Chiarelli expressed concern with the discussions regarding economic development infrastructure. He stated in large part, the Region was meeting the needs of the business sectors, however, there was a perception in the community that the quality of life infrastructure needs were not being addressed. Chair Chiarelli referenced the tremendous growth pressures across the Region for hard core infrastructure. He stated this created a public fear that the growth would stifle the existing quality of life the Region enjoyed. The Chair hoped the leaders in the business community would address the need for quality of life infrastructure, noting the inability for the Region to currently deal with it due to the transition process. Chair Chiarelli explained there was not a budget making process available at the most critical time of development and growth in the Capital. As a result, the Chair believed there was a need to develop an integrated capital program in addition to a quality of life infrastructure budget. However, the transition process presently constricted this ability. In closing, Chair Chiarelli emphasized the need to address infrastructure needs in context and with the whole infrastructure picture. He challenged the business community, in particular the high technology sector, to begin discussions on the priority of quality of life infrastructure, noting it was required to attract and keep employees. Chair Chiarelli supported the report and acknowledged the need to respond to the west growth. However, he stressed the importance to also set the quality of life needs on the public agenda as a priority.

M. Sheflin, A/Chief Administrative Officer, reported Council had the ability and system to provide water and sewer as required on a user-pay basis. However, speaking to transportation, Mr. Sheflin explained there was no control or funding available. He stated the money from transportation use in fees and fuel tax revenue, and Federal income tax, were being accumulating by the upper levels of government in unprecedented surplus amounts. Mr. Sheflin pointed out none of those funds were coming back to the people who were generating the income and were not being invested into a proper transportation system.

With respect to the quality of life infrastructure, Mr. Sheflin agreed Council did not have the mandate at this time as it resides in the area municipalities. He concurred with the Chair that it was essential to maintain the Region's quality of life. In closing, Mr. Sheflin reiterated the need for the upper levels of government to reinvest the money in the areas creating the funds or the economic boom would cease to exist.

Speaking to the challenges to make budgetary decisions and the transition process, L. Russell, A/Finance Commissioner, reviewed the capital budget process involving the Transition Board. Mr. Russell reported there was currently an aggregation of the existing identified capital needs from the eleven area municipalities and the Regional Corporation. The Finance Commissioner believed the difficulty of the exercise would exist with the new Council when they attempted to prioritize and determine if the recommended budget provides for the visioning in the context of the new single city. Speaking to the quality of life infrastructure, Mr. Russell noted many of those projects were paid for through the development charges at the lower tier. However, he could not confirm if all costs were covered or not. In closing, Mr. Russell stated it would continue to be a significant challenge until there was one common body with a common vision that was able to prioritize and determine the needs across the community.

Councillor Beamish explained the quality of life infrastructure has been addressed to different extents throughout the municipalities, some better than others. He reported there were huge differences in this infrastructure among the municipalities, as some had not collected adequate development charges to fund these needs. The Councillor emphasized the need to charge adequate development charges to cover costs, or a deficit would result.

The Committee then heard from the following speakers.

Ms. Bronwen Heins, President, Kanata Research Park Corporation.

Ms. Heins stated the amount of funding within the report and the priorities to which the funding was proposed did not adequately address the problems with the high technology growth in the west.

With respect to quality of life infrastructure, Ms. Heins acknowledged the Chair's comments, however, stated the high technology community was aware of its importance and was acting. As examples, Ms. Heins referenced recent funding for quality of life facilities that were benefiting both the residents and the high tech community, such as a day care centre, soccer field, and a fitness centre and pool in the proposed hotel.

Ms. Heins agreed quality of life was key, however, stated it was first necessary to attract and maintain the businesses and employees. She stated employees of the high tech sector located in Ottawa for its quality of life and the short commuting distance.

Ms. Heins reviewed the figures with respect to the predicted growth as set out in the monitoring report. However, she disputed these figures stating the growth would be much more rapid and greater than set out in the report, reviewing many examples.

With respect to the growth in the west vs. the east, Ms. Heins stated it was beneficial for the entire city as a single entity.

Speaking to Table 6 and the priority list, Ms. Heins stated it neglected to address the high tech community growth in the Kanata North Business Park. The speaker did not agree with the selection of the Castlefrank Interchange as a priority. In addition, Ms. Heins did not support the deletion of the Carling Avenue and Terry Fox projects, stating they were two of the largest pressure points at this time. The speaker referenced the absence of a east / west light rail project, pointing out the vacant rail lines available from the east end to Arnprior. Ms. Heins stated light rail was cheaper, environmental acceptable and more attractive to use by high technology employees.

With respect to Provincial lobbying by this sector, Ms. Heins referenced communications with Queen's Park and ongoing communication. However, she stressed the need to allocate the available funding wisely.

Councillor Stewart inquired why the Castlefrank Interchange project was considered a priority. Ms. Sweet stated Castlefrank was an important requirement for two reasons (1) the construction allowed to further transit into the town center and the ability to take advantage of bus only lanes on the Queensway for a number of years; and (2) it would assist in elevating some of the pressure with the Terry Fox and Eagleson situations. B. Reid, Branch Head, Transportation Planning, added they were assuming that the Province would accept some responsibility for the Queensway widening and interchange improvements. Mr. Reid reported the Province had recently initiated a study to address needs for the Queensway west of Highway 416. Mr. Reid reviewed the beneficial qualities of the proposed projects, stating it was a well-balanced plan catering to all the needs.

Councillor Stewart referenced the comments that the high tech sector would not use the transit system, but preferred light rail. The Councillor inquired if we accepted this fact, why was there continued investment in transit. Mr. Reid reported the transit targets would be achieved through the transitway and the Queensway corridor, both important elements of the

transportation strategy. He pointed out the light rail project was in the testing stage and further consideration would be given after the results were determined. Mr. Reid confirmed the proposed transit and bus facilities would not be redundant if there was a switch to light rail, noting they were complimentary to each other.

Councillor Munter pointed out the consultant appointment to investigate the rail corridor going to the Kanata North Business Park. In addition, the Councillor noted the many components of the high technology industry that were transit users.

Councillor Loney referenced the postponement of Carling Avenue. Mr. Reid explained it was anticipated that the Ministry would eventually provide for six lanes through the greenbelt thereby alleviating some of the pressures on the Carling and Hazeldean Roads.

Mr. Dave Krajaefski, Director, Planning and Development, City of Kanata.

Mr. Krajaefski expressed his support and rationale for the following projects: the Kanata Centrum Transitway Station and Park and Ride facility, the Terry Fox Drive extensions, and the Castlefrank Interchange.

Mr. David Jeanes, Transport 2000.

Mr. Jeanes disagreed with previous comments that the high technology sector would not use the transit system. However, with respect to light rail, Mr. Jeanes stated it was the preferred transportation mode, and expressed concern it was not a listed priority. The speaker emphasized the present need and expressed disappointment with the extended length of the current pilot project. Mr. Jeanes stated there were many routes in the Region that were potentially useable at this time, however, emphasized the need to begin work now.

Chair Chiarelli thanked the delegation for his leadership and expertise around the light rail project.

Councillor Loney referenced the need for the business community to communicate with the Provincial and Federal governments regarding the need to address the growth infrastructure issue. He stated it was frustrating for Council, noting the construction funding was not available and raising taxes was not an option. The Councillor believed it was necessary to collectively convince the senior levels of government to reinvest in the community through infrastructure. Mr. Jeanes stated he would take the comments under advisement.

Corporate Services and
Economic Development Committee Minute 10
19 September 2000

In response to a question from Councillor Hunter regarding the capital authority for the light rail pilot project, Mr. Reid confirmed the figure was \$20 million. Councillor

Hunter pointed out that represented \$20 million which was not available to address the significant growth problems in the west. Mr. Jeanes reviewed the compromises made with respect to other projects, now completed, in order to see the light rail project advance. However, he noted the light rail pilot project would still take years to complete.

Mr. Dennis Eberhart, Pen Equity Management Corporation.

Mr. Eberhart provided the Committee with an update on the future expansion plans for the Kanata Centrum area. He expressed his support for the prioritization of the transitway station and park and ride facility. Mr. Eberhart reported the marketing of the area had included the pending transitway station and park and ride. He stated this has attracted great attention and was greatly needed.

Upon conclusion of the public delegations, Councillor van den Ham reviewed two motions that were approved by the Committee.

Moved by R. van den Ham

WHEREAS the Transportation Master Plan as approved by Regional Council, July 1997, (Page 54, Table 10) identifies the widening of Innes Road from two to four lanes from Orleans to Trim Road.

WHEREAS growth has greatly exceeded projections, including two new schools and one more in the planning stage at Trim and Innes.

WHEREAS the current two lanes of Innes Road between 10th Line and Trim Road is a two lane rural cross-section with no shoulders, deep ditches and unsafe conditions.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that funding for the design work for Innes Road between 10th Line and Trim Road be included in the 2001 budget and that construction be undertaken as soon as possible and not later than 2006.

CARRIED

Moved by R. van den Ham

WHEREAS the completion of the North/South (Frank Kenny Road) link in Cumberland is a critical link between Highway 417 and R.R. 174 (formerly Highway 17) and further to the Cumberland/Orleans business parks.

WHEREAS the completion of this road is critical to the success of the International Plowing Match in September 2001.

WHEREAS the City of Cumberland has completed all necessary Environmental Assessment Studies, Land Acquisitions, and final design work.

WHEREAS the City of Cumberland has spent more than ten million dollars on the construction of Phase I and has also funded and constructed the necessary water crossing structures in Phase 2.

BE IT RESOLVED that the R.O.C. request to the Ottawa Transition Board to allocate two million dollars to the 2001 budget as the city's contribution for the completion of the North/South link from Innes Road to Highway 417 conditional upon the province providing the balance (\$7 million approximately) .

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Regional Chair communicate with Premier Mike Harris on this matter and to secure the provincial funding.

CARRIED

With respect to recommendation no. 5, Councillor Hunter requested the reporting on this delegated authority to Committee be monthly rather than quarterly. The Committee approved this amendment.

Report Recommendations as amended:

That Corporate Services and Economic Development Committee recommend that Council approve:

- 1. the direction to staff to begin the design of key infrastructure projects needed to support economic development as outlined in this report;**

2. **the transfer of funds in the amounts of \$1,100,000 from Transportation and Transitway capital accounts as identified in Annex A;**
3. **the transfer of \$3,930,000 and \$2,000,000 from the Transportation and Transitway Regional Development Charge Reserve Funds, respectively;**
4. **the establishment of new project authorities as identified in Annex A;**

5. **that the Chief Administrative Officer be delegated the authority to award professional engineering consulting contracts subject to the availability of funds as identified in the departmental budgets using the expedited process for consultant selection for the projects outlined in this report, and that the reporting to Committee on this delegated authority be *monthly*;**

6. **that funding for the design work for Innes Road between 10th Line and Trim Road be included in the 2001 budget and that construction be undertaken as soon as possible and not later than 2006;**

7. (a) **that the Region of Ottawa-Carleton request the Transition Board to allocate \$2 million to the 2001 budget as the city's contribution for the completion of the North/South link from Innes Road to Highway 417 conditional upon the Province providing the balance (\$7 million approximately);**

- (b) **that the Regional Chair communicate with Premier Mike Harris on this matter and to secure Provincial funding.**

CARRIED as amended

ENVIRONMENT AND TRANSPORTATION

2. TRAIL ROAD LANDFILL SITE -
LEACHATE PRE-TREATMENT RESEARCH PROGRAM
- Director, Solid Waste Division's report dated 28 Aug 00

Councillor Cantin pointed out that both the recommended universities and engineering firms would be compensated to research the same topic.

As a historical background, P. McNally, Director, Solid Waste Division, explained that during the 1999 discussions leading up to the leachate pipeline design, the Committee heard from

various interest groups. He stated that subsequently Council directed staff to work with the private sector, government agencies, research institutions, and universities in order to draw on the expertise in the community. As a result, the Technical Advisor Committee included members from the community. In addition, the terms of reference included the review from both groups, thereby resulting in two requests for proposals being called, one for the universities and one for the private sector.

Councillor Cantin pointed out the diversity of the two groups, one being academic and the other with hands on experience in the field. He expressed concern that the results may be conflicting and inquired what would happen at this point.

M. Sheflin, Environment and Transportation Commissioner, stated Council would be required to make the decision based on the information that came forward.

That the Corporate Services and Economic Development Committee and Council approve the following research on leachate pre-treatment initiatives, for a total provision of \$466,903.01:

1. Three grant requests from the following universities to do research on the pre-treatment of leachate from the Trail Road Landfill, for a total contract provision of \$119,000:

- University of Guelph, Alfred, ON \$25,000
- Carleton University, Ottawa, ON \$46,000
- University of Ottawa, Ottawa, ON \$48,000

2. The appointment of the following consulting firms, RFP No. 00200-92535-P01, to undertake leachate pre-treatment research for a total contract provision of \$347,903.01 (which includes professional fees, disbursements and GST):

- SAIC Canada, Gloucester, ON \$106,163.26
- GPEC International Ltd., Ottawa, ON \$ 66,259.75
- Conestoga-Rovers & Associates, Ottawa, ON \$ 69,550.00
- Conestoga-Rovers & Associates, Ottawa, ON \$105,930.00

CARRIED

(D. Beamish dissented)

3. STITTSVILLE-KANATA FEEDERMAIN LINK
CONSULTANT APPOINTMENT (CONTRACT ETL00-3071)

- Environment and Transportation Commissioner's report dated 29 Aug 00

That the Corporate Services and Economic Development Committee approve the appointment of Stantec Consulting Ltd., Ottawa, to provide detailed design and construction services for Phase 2 of the Stittsville-Kanata Feedermain Link (Abbott Street extension to Terry Fox Drive) for a total contract provision of \$85,526.17.

CARRIED

CONFIDENTIAL AGENDA

LEGAL / ENVIRONMENT AND TRANSPORTATION

1. MUNICIPAL ACCESS AGREEMENTS
TELECOMMUNICATION COMPANIES AND
ENBRIDGE CONSUMERS GAS

- Deferred from Council 13 Sep 00
- Joint A/Regional Solicitor and Environment and Transportation Commissioner's report dated 11 Aug 00

The Committee agreed to receive a presentation from Mr. Brian Dorrian and Mr. Glenn Beaumont, Enbridge Consumers Gas, prior to moving In-Camera to discuss this item.

Mr. Beaumont referenced a letter from Enbridge, dated 12 Sep 00, which set out their position. He stated Enbridge did not understand why there was an insistence and urgency to go forward with an agreement at this time, noting the pending amalgamation in January 2001. Mr. Beaumont expressed their understanding that the Region wished to put in place a management system for the roads. However, he believed Enbridge was being asked an unreasonable question that they were not in a position to deal with. In closing, Mr. Beaumont expressed a desire to sit down and negotiate with Regional staff as long as that did not compromise the proceedings they had before the Ontario Energy Board and any previous negotiations.

Councillor Cantin expressed concern when companies such as Enbridge performed road cuts shortly after regional work had been completed. He noted this shorten the road life significantly

and increased work and costs to the taxpayer. The Councillor pointed out other organizations had come forward and accepted the fact that an agreement was necessary. Councillor Cantin stated he was prepared to direct staff to deny road cuts until there was some kind of agreement in place.

Mr. Beaumont explained the process in his view as follows: That being a process where the gas utilities in Ontario and the Association of Municipalities of Ontario have been in negotiations since March 99 in an attempt to create a model agreement. He reported some issues have been argued before the Ontario Energy Board (OEB) and they are now awaiting a decision. The speaker believed the Region was asking them to now turn around, negotiate the same issues that are presented to the OEB, thereby contradicting the position taken with the Board. Mr. Beaumont requested the need to wait until the OEB decision was out at which time they would be prepared to negotiate with the Region.

E. McArthur, Manager, Transportation and Property Law, acknowledged the OEB involvement. However, he pointed out there was agreement on 75% of the issues. He explained the Region was requesting Enbridge to sit down and start implementing that 75% through an agreement.

Councillor Beamish noted Mr. Beaumont stated they were now prepared to sit down and negotiate with the Region. He did not recall any indication of willingness to negotiate stated in the letter dated 12 Sep 00.

Mr. Beaumont clarified that they were prepared to negotiate those things that are related to the way Enbridge worked on Regional roads as long as they were not reopening issues that were already agreed to. He did not wish to compromise the decision that was currently before the Energy Board.

Councillor Hunter inquired about the municipal access agreements Enbridge had with the area municipalities. Mr. Dorrian confirmed there were franchise agreements under the *Municipal Franchises Act* with every lower tier municipality in Ontario in which Enbridge served gas. He explained it was a uniform agreement that provided a provision by which the costs were shared whenever relocation was required, and applies to the geographic area of each local municipality. In response to a question from Councillor Hunter, Mr. Dorrian confirmed there was not such an agreement with the Regional Municipality that applied to regional roads.

Mr. Beaumont explained it was their position that on January 1, 2001 when one city was created, the agreement that applied to local roads would apply to regional roads as well as the geographic area was the same. Mr. Dorrian referenced their confusion with respect to the need for an agreement to cover the remaining three months of 2000.

Mr. McArthur stated the Region's legal position was the opposite. He explained Enbridge presently had a legal agreement with the City of Ottawa, for example, to use city roads. Mr. McArthur stated amalgamation did not amend that agreement. He reported Enbridge have always required permission to use regional roads and they would continue to need that permission.

Mr. Beaumont referenced the legislation that stated the by-laws of the lower tier municipalities would continue to apply to the geographical area in which they had force prior to amalgamation, and noted that the geographical areas of those lower tier municipalities consist of regional roads. He believed that gave Enbridge the rights they need to serve the community until a new franchise agreement for the amalgamated city was put in place in 2001.

Chair Chiarelli inquired on the situation if there were conflict between by-laws at the regional level and the City of Ottawa level. M. Sheflin, Environment and Transportation Commissioner, stated there were no by-laws at the local level for regional roads resulting in no by-laws in place to use the arterial road system.

In response to a question from Councillor Loney regarding the willingness to negotiate, Mr. Beaumont reiterated that there was willingness with respect to the issues that have been agreed to. However, the matters they would not talk about or re-negotiate were those that were under consideration by the OEB.

The Committee then moved in camera for further discussion on the matter.

Moved by A. Loney

That Agenda Item No. 1 of the Confidential Agenda be considered by the Corporate Services and Economic Development Committee In Camera pursuant to subsection 11 (1) (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

That Corporate Services and Economic Development Committee and Council approve the following:

- 1. an extension of the interim staff authority to issue permits for all**

Telecommunication Companies to 9 March 2001;

2. **if satisfactory progress is not made in future negotiations with Enbridge Consumers Gas, that authority be delegated to the Chief Administrative Officer and the Regional Solicitor to deny any road cut permit application by Enbridge Consumers Gas, in accordance with this report.**

CARRIED as amended

2. TELECOMMUNICATION COMPANIES ***

USE OF REGIONAL ROADS - TRANSFER OF FUNDS

- Environment and Transportation Commissioner's report dated 01 Sep 00

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

1. **the transfer of funds in the amount of \$400,000 from the Resurfacing Program - 2000, Order No. 900400 to the new project Telecommunications Duct Installation, Order No. 900402 for a total budget provision of \$400,000.**
2. **the delegation of contract and expenditure approval authority with respect to this new project to the Environment and Transportation Commissioner for the provision of Regionally owned telecommunication conduit in conjunction with other works.**

CARRIED

3. MUNICIPAL ROAD ACCESS AGREEMENTS

GT GROUP TELECOM SERVICES CORP.

- A/Regional Solicitor's report dated 8 Sep 00

The Committee waived discussion of this report In Camera.

E. McArthur, Manager, Transportation and Property Law, informed Committee he was waiting to receive the agreement from GT Group Telecom Services Corp. He suggested approval should be conditional on its receipt. The Committee concurred and amended the recommendation accordingly.

***NOTE: TRANSITION BOARD APPROVAL WILL BE REQUIRED FOLLOWING COUNCIL
CONSIDERATION OF THIS ITEM.

Corporate Services and
Economic Development Committee Minute 25
19 September 2000

That the Corporate Services and Economic Development Committee and Council approve the Agreement between the Region and GT Group Telecom Services Corp. as described in this report subject to the Region of Ottawa-Carleton's receipt of the agreement from GT Group Telecom Services Corp.

CARRIED as amended

***NOTE: TRANSITION BOARD APPROVAL WILL BE REQUIRED FOLLOWING COUNCIL
CONSIDERATION OF THIS ITEM.

4. MUNICIPAL ROAD ACCESS AGREEMENTS - VIDÉOTRON
- A/Regional Solicitor's report dated 11 Sep 00

The Committee waived discussion of this report In Camera.

E. McArthur, Manager, Transportation and Property Law, explained a correction was required to the per annum costs to be paid by Vidéotron Télécom ltée. He requested the body of the report be amended to read "\$20,000" rather than the stated "\$25,000". The Committee approved the report inclusive of this amendment.

That the Corporate Services and Economic Development Committee and Council approve the Agreement between the Region and Vidéotron Télécom ltée as described in this report.

CARRIED

CONFIDENTIAL AGENDA "B"

LEGAL

1. SOLID WASTE
COMPENSATION FEE - TOWNSHIP OF OSGOODE
BY-LAW 234 OF 1992
- A/Regional Solicitor's report dated 19 Sep 00

Moved by A. Loney

That Agenda Item No. 1 of the Confidential Agenda "B" be considered by the Corporate Services and Economic Development Committee In Camera pursuant to subsection 11 (1) (e) - litigation or potential litigation affecting the Regional Corporation, including matters before administrative tribunals - of the Procedure By-Law.

CARRIED

Corporate Services and Economic Development Committee Minute 19 September 2000	27
--	----

INFORMATION PREVIOUSLY DISTRIBUTED

REGIONAL CLERK

1. DELEGATED AUTHORITY QUARTERLY REPORT
APRIL TO JUNE 2000
(As per Corporate Policy Manual Sections 4.2.4 and 4.6.7.6)
- Regional Clerk's memorandum dated 05 Sep 00

2. RECORD OF TENDER OPENINGS
FOR THE MONTH OF AUGUST 2000
(As Per Corporate Policy Manual Section 4.6.6)
- Regional Clerk's memorandum dated 01 Sep 00

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 6:05 p.m.

CO-ORDINATOR

CHAIR