

MINUTES

CORPORATE SERVICES AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY OF OTTAWA-CARLETON

CHAMPLAIN ROOM

05 JANUARY 1999

4:10 P.M.

PRESENT

Chair: R. Chiarelli

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

CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

That the Corporate Services and Economic Development Committee confirm the Regular and Confidential Minutes of the 01 December 1998 meeting.

CARRIED

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No declarations of interest were filed.

REGULAR ITEMS

CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER

1. 1999 ASSOCIATION OF MUNICIPALITIES OF ONTARIO
COUNTIES AND REGIONS CONFERENCE - OCTOBER 1999
- Chief Administrative Officer's report dated 23 Dec 98

That the Corporate Services and Economic Development Committee recommend Council approve a request from the Regional Caucus of the Association of Municipalities of Ontario (AMO) to host their October 1999 Counties and Regions Conference in Ottawa-Carleton.

CARRIED

Notes: 1. Underlining indicates new or amended recommendations approved by Committee.
2. Reports requiring Council consideration will be presented to Council on 13 January 1999 in Corporate Services and Economic Development Committee Report Number 29.

ENVIRONMENT AND TRANSPORTATION

2. MUNSTER HAMLET - WASTEWATER TREATMENT FACILITY - PIPELINE ROUTE SELECTION - CONSULTANT CONTRACT CA9498 - MODIFICATION
- Environment and Transportation Commissioner's report dated 01 Dec 98

J. Miller, Director, Engineering Division, explained the report recommendations would finalize the administration for the pipeline routing procedure for the Munster Hamlet project. He stated Recommendation No. 1 was for consultant services to determine the actual pipeline route. Recommendation No. 2 referenced the increased level of effort required by the independent consultant, Conestoga-Rovers and Associates (CRA), due to the higher than anticipated level of work required under the technical and public consultation components.

Councillor van den Ham suggested the consultant should have been aware of the high level of public consultation due to the unique nature of the issues. He expressed concern with the increase of \$72,400 in consulting fees (Recommendation No. 2).

Mr. Miller explained the independent consultant was retained to review new technologies and processes, and carry out a work program on the wastewater treatment alternatives in Munster Hamlet. He added the consultant went through extensive work, in particular in the area of public consultation, and staff believed the services were well provided and the request was justified.

Councillor Stewart noted CRA designed the public consultation process and should have anticipated the large amount of time involved. She did not support the increase in fees.

In response to a question from Councillor Cantin, Mr. Miller reiterated that further effort than what was originally expected was necessary, noting some issues and additional expenditures were not in the consultant's control, specifically the public consultation component. With respect to the technical aspects, Mr. Miller referenced the number of detailed questions from the proponents which required responses and could not have been contemplated at the beginning of the process.

Councillor Beamish expressed concern with the time lapse between when the increase in expenditures were determined and the time the request / report appeared before the Committee. Mr. Miller indicated staff were previously aware of the additional requirement, however, due to meeting cancellations in December, the holiday period, and the need for complete assessment information, this was the first available opportunity to report.

Councillor Hill acknowledged CRA did an excellent job, however, expressed concern with the request for additional fees. She agreed they should have been aware of the scope and could not support the request.

Mr. Anthony Crutcher, CRA, addressed the Committee. Mr. Crutcher noted they did not tender on the work, but were requested on an independent basis. He stated a considerable amount of research was completed prior to providing their cost and to obtain an appreciation of the values and issues involved. However, Mr. Crutcher explained as the program developed, it became apparent it was not going to meet all the needs, and additional work would be required, in particular with respect to the public consultation process which provided valuable input. With regard to staff's involvement and the additional requirements, Mr. Crutcher indicated CRA was working on an independent basis and made the decision to complete the additional work as necessary. Mr. Crutcher concluded by stating the request for proposals during the environmental assessment process was extremely unusual and unique, which resulted in an inordinate amount of time with the proponents through evaluation, clarification, etc.

Councillor Hunter also referenced the number of proposals that required evaluation and the uniqueness of the program. He stated he was not surprised there was additional work and costs involved. Councillor Hunter concurred with Councillor Beamish's concern regarding the importance to report to Committee in a timely manner. He suggested there was a need for procedure to allow for interim reporting on variations to contracts and the costs involved.

Councillor Loney suggested Committee did not have a choice with regard to the additional expenditures in that the work was required and completed. However, he agreed with the need for a process with respect to approval for contracts variations, as it presently leaves Committee with little opportunity to approve whether the work should be continued or not. The Councillor suggested earlier notice to Committee was required to ensure documentation and identification of modifications to the original scope. He directed staff to report on a proposed process to handle contract variations and timely reporting to Committee.

In response to a question from Councillor Stewart, Mr. Crutcher agreed at the time they provided their fee, they were aware of the keen interest from the proponents, some more active than others. However, he explained they did not anticipate the extensive work required due to the proposal method used during the environment assessment, and their inability to forecast how the proponents would deal with this unique process.

Councillor Meilleur referenced Recommendation No. 1, the appointment of CRA for the route selection process. Mr. Marc, Manager, Planning and Environment Law, reviewed through the lengthy environmental assessment process, it was discovered the preferred alternative technology was a pipeline. However, the additional step previously not anticipated was the determination of which route should be used. Councillor Meilleur expressed her support for the report.

Councillor Hunter referenced the following report, Munster Hamlet, Project Implementation Plan. Mr. Miller explained it was inevitably necessary to select which route would be used, regardless whether the construction of the pipeline was tendered in accordance with the Corporate Policy Manual or whether staff were directed to negotiate with one of the two proponents, that being Thorburn Penny Limited or Oliver, Manigone, McCalla & Associates (OMM)/Taggart Construction Limited. Mr. Miller did not recommend any negotiations until the route was selected, and noted the significant advantages to determining which route would be used.

Mr. Marc pointed out that in order to complete the Environmental Assessment Addendum process and Official Plan Amendment, it was a requirement to evaluate all reasonable alternatives for the pipeline route.

Councillor Cantin inquired about the proposed routes and their acceptability to the public concern and budget. Mr. Miller stated they were aware of some concern with one of the routes and stressed a thorough analysis and involvement of the public was being proposed to address those concerns. He noted the proponents proposals were the basis of negotiation, not a firm price.

In speaking to the following report and questions from Councillor Cantin, Mr. Marc reiterated that the overriding features were that it was not a tender, but a class environmental assessment under the *Environmental Assessment Act* which required all reasonable alternatives to be examined. With respect to the policy decision on the tendering process for the construction of the pipeline, Mr. Marc explained that in order to preserve the integrity of the Region's tendering process, a public call for tenders should be conducted.

Mr. Marc reported that CRA had agreed they were not interested in the design portion and their role as an independent consultant would be compromised if they were retained for the design work. However, he further explained in order to maintain an open, transparent process, there was a need for an independent consultant (CRA and not one of the proponents) to choose the route.

The Committee then moved into extensive debate on which of the Munster Hamlet reports to first vote on.

Mr. Marc stated the reports should be considered as presented in the agenda. He pointed out the Project Implementation Plan report did not recommend to call tenders *at this time*, but the intention was to complete the process with CRA, choose a route, and once the route had been selected, then design and tender in accordance with the Corporate Policy Manual guidelines.

Moved by Councillor Beamish

That Committee consider and vote on Agenda Item No. 3, Munster Hamlet - Project Implementation Plan, prior to voting on Agenda Item No. 2, Munster Hamlet - Pipeline Route Selection - Consultant Contract Modification.

LOST

YEAS: D. Beamish, B. Hill, A. Loney, W. Stewart ... 4

NAYS: R. Cantin, P. Hume, G. Hunter, M. Meilleur, R. van den Ham, R. Chiarelli 6

With respect to timing, Mr. Marc noted an Official Plan Amendment would be required with the chance of an appeal to this amendment. If so, a hearing would not be held until late fall of 1999 with construction commencing in 2000. However, he believed if the amendment did not involve an appeal, there would be a faster time line to the project.

Chair Chiarelli inquired on the increase in consultant fees. Mr. Marc confirmed the contract was not a fixed price contract, but a rate applied to the amount of time required, and CRA was instructed to take all necessary steps to arrive at a preferred alternative, however, did play an independent role.

Chair Chiarelli suggested the Region, given the nature of the project, was indeed responsible to pay for the increase in consultant fees.

The Committee then considered the report recommendations independently.

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

- 1. Modification of Contract CA9498 with Conestoga-Rovers and Associates Ltd. (CRA), Nepean, for the provision of engineering services to conduct a Route Selection Process for the transfer of wastewater from the Munster Hamlet facility to the Regional sewer collection system, for an additional contract authority of \$120,171;**

2. **An increase in fees in the amount of \$72,400 to allow for greater than anticipated effort on the part of the consultant, CRA, in completing the Wastewater Treatment Alternatives Evaluation Report.**

This request for additional contract authority in the amount of \$192,571 brings the revised total authority for Contract CA9498 to \$462,571.

CARRIED
(D. Beamish, B. Hill, and
W. Stewart dissented)

3. MUNSTER HAMLET - WASTEWATER TREATMENT FACILITY - PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION PLAN
- Environment and Transportation Commissioner's report dated 02 Dec 98

Councillor Loney declared a conflict of interest in that an immediate family member was employed with the firm of Oliver, Mangione, McCalla & Associates, one of the proponents. The Councillor left the table and did not participate in discussion on the item.

On a point of clarification, Chair Chiarelli stated Council had agreed to use the pipeline alternative and it would eventually be necessary to choose a route. The Chair further explained this report dealt with the option for staff to follow a public tender call on the construction of the pipeline, as recommended in the staff report, or negotiation with one of the proponents.

Councillor Cantin moved a Motion to defer the decision on the tender process until the environmental assessment was complete.

J. Miller, Director, Engineering Division, reiterated it was a unique process to receive proposals during an environmental assessment procedure. He stated the proposal document was intended to identify a new and innovative treatment technology as an alternate to upgrade the Munster Hamlet lagoon. With regard to the present status of the project, Mr. Miller stated the preferred alternative was a pumping station and pipeline from Munster Hamlet to the central sewage system with eventual treatment at the Robert O. Pickard Environmental Centre. He noted the route selection was the subject of a separate assignment and a number of routes were possible. Mr. Miller concluded by stating it was the fairest approach for the local construction industry, and in the best interest of the Corporation, to proceed on the basis of preparing a detailed design for the pipeline once the route was selected and publicly tender the construction work.

Chair Chiarelli believed the proponents had the understanding in submitting their proposal, that if their technology or proposal was accepted, there would be a negotiated contract with that proponent.

Mr. Miller stated staff recognize the considerable effort and time extended by the two proponents offering pipeline alternatives. However, he added it was staff's view it was appropriate to test the entire market in fairness to the construction industry as the RFP document did give the impression an on-site treatment was being sought. T. Marc, Manager, Planning and Environment Law, stressed the staff recommendation was based on fairness as the phrase used in the RFP was "wastewater treatment facility" and implied on-site treatment. He added this may have excluded many construction companies from considering the project that were in fact capable of the pipeline construction.

In response to a question from Councillor Meilleur, Mr. Marc confirmed that if the alternative of snow fluent, for example, had been selected over pipeline, then staff would negotiate with that proponent. However, this negotiation would have occurred as that technology was a proprietary technology that only that proponent could offer. Mr. Marc noted the pipeline construction was not a proprietary technology and could be completed by a number of local companies.

Mr. Anthony Crutcher, Constego-Rovers and Associates (CRA), explained as the designer of the Request for Proposal, they solicited on-site, innovative technology, although standard technology had to be reviewed as it was a requirement under the environmental assessment process.

In reference to conditions in which the environmental assessment and Official Plan Amendment could be waived, Mr. Marc reviewed the issues involved. However, he did not believe under the circumstances the Minister would grant an exemption. Speaking to the haulage in the interim, Mr. Miller commented on the cost and stated they were on a fast track process, however, noted the Official Plan Amendment. Mr. Marc reassured Committee that staff would take advantage of every opportunity to abridge time.

Chair Chiarelli acknowledged the difficulty in the decision to be made and understood the rationale of the staff recommendation. However, he believed the proponents that provided the solution of the pipeline were being penalized by the report recommendation. In addition, those that responded to the RFP had done so as though they were responding with the opportunity to be chosen to negotiate a contract.

Mr. Crutcher, in response to a question from Councillor Hill regarding the route, confirmed either proposal provided a *technically* feasible route, however, indicated there were numerous other issues to be evaluated, such as social, environmental, and public acceptably.

Mr. Jim Taggart, Taggart Construction Limited, and Mr. Carl Dubé, Oliver, Mangione, McCalla & Associates (OMM), addressed the Committee. Mr. Taggart reviewed the RFP document and stated they were under the impression the successful proponent would

enter into negotiations with the Region. He reported that further to discussions with CRA and staff, it was agreed that Thorburn Penny, OMM and Taggart Construction would join together to form one proponent (team). As a result, staff would only be negotiating with one proponent.

Mr. Taggart stated on-site treatment was their first consideration. However, upon review, it was determined the pipeline was the most economical and publicly supported method. The speaker stated if staff were directed to negotiate with the team, a design could be started in parallel with the route selection process and result in considerable time and cost savings.

Councillor Stewart inquired if they were present at the on-site meeting. Mr. Dubé stated he had attended and it was decided at that time that their technology was innovative and to proceed with the RFP.

Councillor Hunter also referenced the on-site meeting. Mr. Taggart stated they had reviewed all possible routes and explained their proposal. Mr. Dubé noted they had acknowledged the environmental assessment and review was not yet complete, however, stated they were under the assumption staff would begin negotiation based on their proposal, with the possibility that the route may change.

Moved by R. Cantin

That a decision on whether to tender the construction of a pipeline and related works (including design of the system) be deferred until the Environmental Assessment process has been completed.

MOTION WITHDRAWN

Councillor Hunter moved a similar motion as that withdrawn by Councillor Cantin.

Chair Chiarelli believed it was an issue of fairness and interpretation of whether there was an implied commitment to negotiate. He suggested that by deferring the issue there would be other circumstances that would impact on the fairness and decision of the nature of the contract. The Chair stated he would not support deferral or the staff recommendation.

Councillor Meilleur inquired what the situation would be if a contract satisfactory to all parties could not be negotiated. Mr. Marc suggested the Committee direct that any decisions or negotiations come back to Committee and Council for consideration.

Councillor Stewart expressed concern with the urgency of time and her support for a parallel track of design and negotiation. Mr. Miller emphasized staff recognized the time issues and indicated they had commenced work on the initial route selection and obtained membership for the Public Liaison Committee. Councillor Stewart stated she did not support deferral or a public call for tender.

Mr. Crutcher objected to the suggestion that the design work commence prior to the selection of the route. He believed this would be an error in the process and hamper the transparency of the project and objectivity required.

Councillor Hunter commented that very little on the design could be completed prior to the route being selected with little time actually saved, noting such things as soil conditions, length, cost, capacity constraints. The Councillor urged the Committee to defer the issue until the addendum had been filed.

Councillor van den Ham expressed his support for the staff recommendation. He stated the fairest option was to complete the evaluation, determine the route and engage in a public call for tender on the construction. Speaking to the time it had taken for the process, the Councillor reminded it was Council that discontinued the original process in order to review other possible technologies.

Councillor Hill expressed concern with the time involved and high cost of haulage. She stated she would support negotiation with the proponent.

Moved by G. Hunter

That a decision on whether to tender the construction of a pipeline and related works (including design of the system) be deferred until the addendum has been filed.

LOST

YEAS: P. Hume, G. Hunter, R. van den Ham 3

NAYS: D. Beamish, R. Cantin, B. Hill, M. Meilleur, W. Stewart, R. Chiarelli ... 6

The Committee then considered the staff recommendation as follows.

That the Corporate Services and Economic Development Committee and Council approve that the construction of the pipeline and related works required to transfer Munster Hamlet wastewater to the Regional Wastewater Collection system be tendered in accordance with Section 4.5 of the Corporate Policy Manual.

LOST

YEAS: P. Hume, R. van den Ham 2
NAYS: D. Beamish, R. Cantin, B. Hill, G. Hunter, M. Meilleur, W. Stewart
R. Chiarelli 7

Councillor Hume requested clarification and stated there were five potential routes, three contained in the proponent's proposal and two were not. The Councillor inquired if one of the two routes *not* being proposed by the proponent ended up being the selected route, would staff enter into negotiations with the proponent for design and construction for that route. Councillor Beamish stated that was the intention in order to move the project forward.

Moved by D. Beamish

That the Corporate Services and Economic Development Committee recommend Council approve staff enter into negotiations with the two pipeline proponents, now acting as one (Thorburn Penny Limited / Oliver, Mangione, McCalla & Associates / Taggart Construction Limited) upon filing of the addendum to the Environmental Study Report, and that any contract negotiated be awarded by the Corporate Services and Economic Development Committee and Council.

CARRIED
(P. Hume dissented)

FINANCE

4. CASH INVESTMENTS AND LOANS RECEIVABLE
(AS AT 6 NOVEMBER 1998)
- Finance Commissioner's report dated 26 Nov 98

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

RECEIVED

5. TILE DRAINAGE DEBENTURES
- Finance Commissioner's report dated 26 Nov 98

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

RECEIVED

6. 1998 REPORT ON THE CLOSING OF CAPITAL PROJECTS
- Finance Commissioner's report dated 08 Dec 98

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

RECEIVED

7. 1999 INSURANCE RENEWAL
- Finance Commissioner's report dated 21 Dec 98

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

RECEIVED

8. CHANGES TO RESERVE FUNDS
- Finance Commissioner's report dated 10 Dec 98

Councillor Loney expressed concern with Recommendation No. 3, the consolidation of the Child Care Capital Grant and Child Care Contingency Reserve Funds into the Child Care Reserve Fund. The Councillor referenced the minimal amount of new spaces now offered by the Province and implications if this would only be viewed as capital.

J. LeBelle, Finance Commissioner, explained they did not believe it was necessary to have two separate reserve funds. He stated the consolidation into one would still provide Council with the opportunity to use funds in that reserve for whatever child care purpose that may arise. Mr. LeBelle added a purpose of the consolidations was to provide Council with the maximum amount of flexibility possible. He reported that each reserve fund had a by-law containing specific limitations as to what Council could use the fund for; the one fund would minimize the rules around the use of those funds, providing it was for child care purposes.

Councillor Loney referenced the OC Transpo capital program for bus replacement and other issues around OC Transpo finances. Mr. LeBelle stated OC Transpo had not been considered in the subject report as it was more of a housekeeping matter with respect to some of the Regions reserve funds. However, Mr. LeBelle indicated that in 1999, staff would review, from a policy perspective, the entire notion around transit, the transportation system and the urban transit system. Mr. Sheflin added the matter was included in the draft report from KPGM and Council would be addressing the issue in the future.

Councillor Cantin inquired on the outstanding balances for each of the accounts before they were consolidated. Mr. LeBelle stated the balances were contained in the regular information reporting, however, agreed to provide Council with specifics regarding the reserve funds to be consolidated.

Councillor Hunter reviewed a ruling regarding obligations municipalities had with respect to annual revenues and deficits, and the notion around property tax stabilization. He referenced the Child Care Capital Reserve Fund and agreed the funds should remain separate.

In response to a question from Councillor Hume, Mr. LeBelle reiterated the consolidates were for efficiency purposes and provided more flexibility on how Council dealt with the funds. However, the Commissioner stated if Committee was uncomfortable with the consolidation of the Child Care funds, staff were able to continue to account for the funds separately.

The Committee then considered Recommendation No. 3 independently.

3. the consolidation of the Child Care Capital Grant and Child Care Contingency Reserve Funds into the Child Care Reserve Fund;

LOST

YEAS: R. Cantin, P. Hume, R. van den Ham 3
NAYS: B. Hill, G. Hunter, A. Loney, M. Meilleur 4

The staff recommendation to be presented to Council as amended by Committee.

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

- 1. the consolidation of the Sewer Depreciation, Sewer Levy Contingency, Sewer Surcharge Contingency and Sewer Maintenance Reserve Funds into the Sewer Reserve Fund;**

2. **the consolidation of the Transportation Equipment Replacement, Landfill Equipment Replacement and Environmental Services Equipment Replacement Reserve Funds into the Corporate Fleet Equipment Replacement Reserve Fund;**
3. **That Recommendation No. 3, as follows, not be approved and be deleted from the staff recommendation: The consolidation of the Child Care Capital Grant and Child Care Contingency Reserve Funds into the Child Care Reserve Fund;**
4. **the creation of the Regional Police Service Vehicle and Equipment Replacement Reserve Fund;**
5. **the creation of the Computer Hardware/Software Replacement Reserve Fund;**
6. **the closing of the Debenture Currency Exchange Reserve Fund;**
7. **the enactment or repealing of the necessary by-laws.**

CARRIED as amended

HEALTH

9. **1997 SETTLEMENT - LOCAL HEALTH AGENCIES
1998 SETTLEMENT - AIDS PROGRAM
- Medical Officer of Health report dated 20 Nov 98**

Councillor Cantin referenced the Settlement Forms and, in consultation with Dr. Dunkley, Deputy Medical Officer of Health, noted a correction that was to be made to the figure under "Total Supplies and Expenses." (amended to read (\$1,976)).

Councillor van den Ham suggested the Region charge the Province rent for applicable regional facilities as it was a justified expense. Dr. Dunkley stated in essence the Region was operating the program on behalf of the Province and did indeed charge the cost of the program back to the Province, including rent and administrative overhead.

That the Corporate Services and Economic Development Committee recommend Council approve the 1997 Local Health Agencies and the 1998 AIDS Program Settlement submission to the Ministry of Health.

CARRIED

PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT APPROVALS

10. SALE OF SURPLUS LAND
44 MAIN STREET, OTTAWA
- Planning and Development Approvals Commissioner's report dated 13 Dec 98

That the Corporate Services and Economic Development Committee approve the sale of part of Lot 3, Plan No. 61, City of Ottawa, municipally known as 44 Main Street, City of Ottawa to 1029972 Ontario Limited for the amount of \$105,000.00 pursuant to an Agreement of Purchase and Sale that has been received.

CARRIED

11. HIGHWAY 417/CASTLEFRANK OVERPASS AND
INTERCHANGE ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT STUDY
CONSULTANT APPOINTMENT
- Planning and Development Approvals Commissioner's report dated 7 Dec 98

Councillor McGoldrick-Larsen inquired how the priority list for Environmental Assessments to be completed was created and the work plan involved. As the appropriate staff were not available to respond, the question was taken as an inquiry.

That the Corporate Services and Economic Development Committee and Council approve the appointment of Morrison Hershfield Limited to undertake the Highway 417/ Castlefrank Overpass & Interchange Environmental Assessment Study, for a total expenditure of \$145,000.

CARRIED

REGIONAL CLERK

12. ONTARIO GOOD ROADS ASSOCIATION
1999 CONFERENCE
- Regional Clerk's report dated 14 Dec 98

In response to a question from Councillor Hume, M.J. Woollam, Regional Clerk, confirmed at the present time there was enough funds in the 1999 Conference budget for two individuals to attend. Councillor Hume noted there would not be any expenses incurred for the AMO Counties and Regions Conference as it would be held in Ottawa.

Moved by W. Stewart

That the Corporate Services and Economic Development Committee approve the attendance of both Councillor Cantin and Councillor McGoldrick-Larsen at the Ontario Good Roads Association 1999 Annual Conference, to be held 21 - 24 February 1999 in Toronto, Ontario.

CARRIED as amended

13. APPOINTMENTS: OTTAWA CONGRESS CENTRE BOARD OF DIRECTORS
- Regional Clerk's report dated 23 Dec 98

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

- 1. The re-appointment of Mr. Lawrence Michael Malloy to the Ottawa Congress Centre Board of Directors for a three year term effective 1 January 1999 to expire on 31 December 2001.**
- 2. The appointment of Mr. Michael Teeter to the Ottawa Congress Centre Board of Directors for a three year term effective 1 January 1999 to expire on 31 December 2001.**

CARRIED

INFORMATION PREVIOUSLY DISTRIBUTED

ENVIRONMENT AND TRANSPORTATION

1. SCADA Upgrade Project Status
- A/Environment and Transportation Deputy Commissioner's memorandum dated 24 Nov 98

In light of Councillor Stewart not receiving this report until the prior day, she requested it be placed on the next Committee agenda to allow for an opportunity for questions, if necessary.

FINANCE

2. Delegated Authority Quarterly Report - July to September 1998
(As Per *Corporate Policy Manual* Section 1.6.1)
- Finance Commissioner's report dated 11 Dec 98

REGIONAL CLERK

3. Record of Tender Openings for the Month of November 1998
(As per *Corporate Policy Manual* Section 4.6.6)
- Regional Clerk's memorandum dated 03 Dec 98
4. Contracts Approved by the Chief Administrative Officer Under Special Delegated Authority as per *Corporate Policy Manual* Section 4.6.7.5 (During the Period of 1 December to 24 December 1998)

- Regional Clerk's memorandum dated 29 Dec 98

OTHER BUSINESS

Councillor Meilleur referenced a report entitled "Award of Consultant Contract - Comprehensive Review of Legal Services" which had been approved by the Chief Administrative Officer. She inquired about the purpose of the contract and process followed. M. Beckstead, Chief Administrative Officer, explained as part of business as usual it was necessary to review various areas of the Corporation. He noted the objective was similar to other corporate reviews and would specifically look at the legal services to ensure they were provided in the most cost efficient manner.

Councillor Meilleur wished to ensure it was not the intention to discontinue the Legal Department, as this would result in the problem of unavailability of legal advice or at a much higher cost.

G. Ford, Director, Supply Management Services Division, reviewed the process followed; the advertisement of the Request for Proposal, evaluation of submissions and interviews from a short list. He indicated the decision to retain HDP Group Inc. Ottawa, was made by the Selection Committee based on best value and lowest cost. J. Barbeau, Director, Corporate Programs and Administration, pointed out the Legal Department had not been reviewed in 20 years, emphasizing it was routine business, to determine if efficiencies could be made, and noted the additional responsibility of land ambulance.

In response to an inquiry from Councillor Hill, E. Johnston, A/Regional Solicitor, stated he would supply the Committee members with the figure paid for outside legal counsel.

Councillor Hunter referenced the appointment of HDP Group Inc. Ms. Barbeau stated they were located in Ottawa, however, had offices across Canada. She added they provided an excellent submission and had extensive knowledge in the legal environment.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 7:05 p.m.

NEXT MEETING

19 January 1999

CO-ORDINATOR

CHAIR