

MINUTES

CORPORATE SERVICES AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

THE REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY OF OTTAWA-CARLETON

CHAMPLAIN ROOM

09 DEC 1996

1:30 P.M.

PRESENT

Chair: P. Clark

Members: B. Hill, P. Hume, G. Hunter, A. Loney, B. McGarry, W. Stewart,
R. van den Ham

ABSENT

M. Bellemare

CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER

1. REVIEW OF GOVERNANCE IN OTTAWA-CARLETON
(Tabled at Corporate Services and Economic Development Committee meeting of 19 Nov 96)
 - Regional Chair's report dated 03 Dec 96
 - Chief Administrative Officer's report dated 13 Nov 96 previously issued

Chair Clark introduced the report and explained the need for clarification of the Region's position. He noted the issue derived from the Provincial government's efforts toward disentanglement between the municipal level and the Provincial level, along with the reduction of funding transferred to the municipalities. Chair Clark explained it was necessary to deliver cost effective service, to minimize the taxpayer burden, and make the service arrangement as efficient as possible.

Chair Clark explained his report dated 3 Dec 96 requested Committee's approval of the guiding principles in the Governance report and the endorsement of the request for the appointment of a mediator.

Notes: 1. Underlining indicates new or amended recommendations approved by Committee.
2. Reports requiring Council consideration will be presented to Council on 11 Dec 1996 in Corporate Services and Economic Development Committee Report Number 50, WITH THE EXCEPTION OF ITEM NOS. 2 AND 3 WHICH WILL BE CONSIDERED BY COUNCIL AT A FUTURE MEETING.

Councillor Legendre inquired what authority the Chief Administrative Officer had to prepare the report. M. Beckstead, Chief Administrative Officer, referenced the 11 September 96 Council resolutions which requested staff review and report on the issues. Councillor Legendre acknowledged there were resolutions approved at the 11 September 96 meeting, however then referenced the Committee minutes. The Councillor pointed out the request for assurance that staff, when preparing the review, would seek instruction from Council with respect to political governance before issuing a report. Mr. Beckstead responded that the general direction of Council on the review of services and the issues surrounding governance and loss of provincial grants pointed to a review of the entire issue. Councillor Legendre believed the Chief Administrative Officer was restricted with regard to coming forward with governance models for the Region as a whole and Council guidance was to be sought first.

Mr. Beckstead provided a presentation to the Committee. (*Reference: Documentation from Slide Presentation on file with the Committee Co-ordinator.*)

Councillor van den Ham requested clarification on the recommendation to endorse the request for the appointment of a mediator and the 1997 date. Mr. Beckstead confirmed the understanding was to implement the change, if legislated, in time for the 1997 election.

Councillor Cullen referenced Recommendation No. 7 which was that the Region assume responsibility for all sewers. The Councillor expressed concern with co-ordinating activities with local municipalities as local sewers were under local roads. Councillor Cullen inquired if road cuts would be required to perform sewer work. M. Sheflin, Environment and Transportation Commissioner, explained they expected the same close co-operation experienced now with the many utilities, both public and private. Mr. Sheflin stated it would not represent a change from the co-ordination presently arranged.

Councillor Cullen inquired what was expected to come from the Province with regard to assisted social housing. M. Cappe, Housing Manager, Planning and Development Approvals Department, reported there were attempts in the community to co-ordinate some of the problems regarding access to social housing. Ms. Cappe described a community based initiative of a one window/centralized access to social housing which was proving successful. Councillor Cullen reported it was an issue/function flagged in past reports that could be regionalized.

Councillor Holmes inquired if assuming responsibility for all Regional rights-of-way included the sidewalks on Regional roads. Mr. Sheflin responded it was decided to leave the sidewalks under local control, however, noted that if the area municipalities wished it transferred, the Region would probably accept it.

The Committee heard from the following public delegations:

Mr. John Harkness, Professional Engineer. Mr. Harkness stated the Review of Governance in Ottawa-Carleton report consisted inaccuracies and that the taxpayer needed to be aware of the consequences of the proposed changes. He questioned why the argument to keep some services local could not also be applied to the transfer of sewers and hydro commissions. He believed a one-tier government would remove competition and lead to inefficiencies.

In speaking to the summary on page 62 of the main report, he explained the arguments were unsatisfactory and self serving. He pointed out the report provided no evidence that a one-tier government was less costly and felt the recommendations should not be supported. With regard to education, he agreed schools should be funded entirely by the provincial government, however, the savings should not be used for other municipal purposes which would result in a tax increase.

Mr. Harkness stated larger municipalities had significant revenues and reserves from local sewers and believed local sewers did not meet the criteria laid out in the report to become a regional responsibility. Mr. Harkness suggested that lateral sewers into individual properties were best left to local agencies as they provided the approval, inspection and cross into private properties. He believed the take over of local sewers would lead to further entanglement and would be very costly.

Mr. Harkness pointed out services such as libraries, fire protection and parks were being left locally as there was no financial benefit, whereas the regionalization of electrical services would provide profit for the Region. In closing, Mr. Harkness stated the report was prepared to allow Regional Government to acquire more financial resources which would weaken the financial structure of the local municipalities. This would lead to increased taxes which the provincial government stated should not occur to compensate for reduction in funds.

In response to a question from Councillor Hunter regarding the impact of the cost to municipalities who maintained their sewers vs. those that had not, Mr. Harkness explained the municipalities who maintained their infrastructure would unfairly pay significantly.

Chair Clark reported the provincial government would off-set other responsibilities at the same time as taking over school funding, therefore, no savings would be attained. Secondly, Clark Chair clarified there was never anticipation of reserve funds or their requirement from the municipalities, as no one was aware the municipalities were building reserve funds on new sewer systems.

*Mr. Brian Coburn, Mayor, Township of Cumberland,
and representing ten other area municipal Mayors*

Mayor Coburn pointed out the goal for Ottawa-Carleton was to provide the best model of governance that was efficient, affordable and accessible. He requested that discussion on this matter be deferred until the Mayors' Report on governance came forward early in 1997. He noted that proposals had been put forward by the City of Ottawa and the Region, and requested the public be given the opportunity to judge for themselves the merits of all three proposals through meaningful public consultation. Mayor Coburn suggested a provincial mediator was not necessary at this time, pointing out it could still be done at a later date.

Mayor Coburn, speaking on behalf of Cumberland, continued by saying he hoped the model finally chosen would allow time to methodically, logically and responsibly determine the service realignments, the divesting of assets and the appropriate staff requirements for that model. He stated that rushing to implement the model in time for the 1997 elections may result in regrettable decisions being taken. Mayor Coburn referenced a letter from Mayor Dwight Eastman, Township of West Carleton, and cited a consultation done in that Township earlier in the year which illustrated the importance of giving residents the opportunity to comment on the orientation their municipality would take regarding future growth. Mayor Coburn indicated many residents were concerned about the type of governance they would have in the future. He believed it would be more meaningful if several models were presented for consultation before proceeding to choose the appropriate one.

Councillor Hume indicated that the Region had been developing their report for over a year and the Mayors even longer. The Councillor inquired about the substance of what was completed to date and expressed concern with waiting longer and not taking advantage of the window of opportunity now present.

Mayor Coburn expressed concern that Council would want to disqualify an option and process that may have a chance of being a model the residents would prefer. He emphasized the financial operation and essential services the residents depended on. Mayor Coburn agreed there was a window of opportunity to set a new governance structure, but did not agree something of this magnitude should be rushed through for the 1997 election. He pointed out their report would be complete by April 1997, and noted they did not have the resources, time or direction to work under a tighter deadline. He emphasized their request was not a means to frustrate the process, and he was as anxious to resolve the issue once and for all.

Councillor Hunter referenced the poll taken by the Region and the responses. Mayor Coburn suggested the responses and poll results would be different and could provide better direction if the residents had three models to consider.

Councillor Cullen pointed out the agenda being pursued was determined by the Province and referenced their special legislature session called for January to March to implement the decision of the government after reviewing the Who Does What Recommendations. He emphasized the studies and reports were a result of the Province's initiatives.

Mayor Coburn reiterated that his position was that a structure be in place with no more debate by the summer of 1997 for implementation in time for 2000, giving three years to sort through financial issues, processes, etc.

In response to a question from Councillor Davis, Mayor Coburn stated there may be another alternative besides the City of Ottawa and the Region's proposals to achieve even more savings and confirmed there would be a firm proposal from the Mayors for the public to respond to in the new year. He emphasized the goal was to achieve the best model of governance and service delivery for the residents of Ottawa-Carleton.

Councillor Davis stated she believed she was as close to her constituents as her counterpart at the local municipalities.

Councillor Merv Sullivan, City of Nepean

Mr. Sullivan comments focused on the process pertaining to the report. He stated people were confused and disappointed by a Regional Government wanting to change its mandate, and the fact the Corporation would put forward a proposal to the Province as the Region's position prior to full discussion.

He suggested there must be full public consultation prior to the implementation of the major changes proposed by the report and anything short of this would make a mockery of the process. He believed public opinion polls should not be used as public consultation.

Speaking to the issue of bringing in a mediator, Mr. Sullivan asked what that person would have to negotiate. He stated the only reason to bring in a mediator would be to impose the Region's view or a variation thereof. He believed time was needed for other proposals to be put forward and that the report be deferred until full deliberation had taken place.

Councillor Hunter asked for clarification on what he meant by “the report forwarded to the Provincial Government as the Region’s position”. Mary Jo Woollam, Regional Clerk, clarified the issue and stated subsequent to a letter being sent, the local MPP’s were informed of the date the Committee would be discussing the issue. Chair Clark explained the Region had not yet taken a position and pointed out if the guiding principles were adopted, it was still not considered to be taking a position.

In response to a question from Councillor Hume regarding public consultation, Mr. Sullivan explained the public did not feel changes were imminent in the governance model for the Region and they wanted to be consulted before any changes were made. Councillor Hume explained his ward requested action and stated the report was sent to all community associations.

Councillor Hume expressed concern with wanting more time and questioned why other models had not already been developed, as the issue had been discussed for sometime. Mr. Sullivan believed the idea of change had, to a large extent, been fuelled by the models put forth by the City of Ottawa and the Region.

Councillor Loney explained for public participation to take place, accurate information was very important. Councillor Loney referenced an article written by Mr. Sullivan in “The Clarion” and expressed concern with the inaccuracy of the information. Mr. Sullivan explained the reason that type of reporting existed was because the Region had not consulted and had not presented the model/report clearly.

Councillor Cullen pointed out the Region’s report basically reaffirmed issues that went through tremendous public consultation process with the Kirby Commission. Councillor Cullen agreed consultation was necessary and stated he looked forward to townhall meetings with Mr. Sullivan in the New Year, as it was important for residents to hear from both their directly elected representatives.

In response to a question from Councillor Stewart regarding if the current model was working, Mr. Sullivan believed it was, but stated if the level or type of responsibilities changed, it may not. He explained he did not believe there was an urgency to change the governance model prior to the year 2000. Councillor Stewart strongly disagreed from the consultation she had done in her ward.

Chair Clark clarified public opinion polls were not considered to be consultation, and the reason for requesting a mediator was not to impose the “Region’s” proposal, but to help facilitate discussions to achieve the best governance model for Ottawa-Carleton as requested by the Province to achieve savings.

The Chair concurred with Councillor Loney and pleaded the need for accurate information. He stated it was difficult to facilitate a process if the local municipalities withdraw and refused to consult. Mr. Sullivan felt the Region owed it to the local municipalities to give them the opportunity to develop their own proposal.

Mr. Jeff Beedell, RMOC Representative, Rideau Valley Conservation Authority and Co-chair, Public Advisory Committee on the Confederation of Stormwater Management

Mr. Beedell addressed three points in support of Conservation Authorities. Firstly, he referenced efficiency and effectiveness. Mr. Beedell reported that Regional staff and members of the three Conservation Authorities had addressed the transfer of planning review functions, operational streamline of water resources and other bi-lateral conservation issues in order to give accountable and cost effective service to tax payers, the development industry and the environment. He noted the report recognized the progress and on-going development of an improved service delivery model. Mr. Beedell stated Regional staff should be congratulated for overcoming the challenges in achieving a co-operative service and believed the Planning and Environment Committee would be looking more closely at some of the successes in re-organizing services.

Mr. Beedell stated Conservative Authorities were essential to health issues such as water sheds and the achievement through a co-operative watershed approach tied in with towns, villages and rural townships. He reported the Province had acknowledged Conservation Authorities as an unique body and Mr. Crombie stated in his visited to the Region on 15 Nov 96, that watershed management was a 21st century event and Conservation Authorities could assist municipalities to save re-invention of new institutions. Mr. Beedell reported the Conservation Authorities supported this statement and believed in the re-modelling of governance, however, suggested they not be caught up in the momentum of all the changes.

Secondly, Mr. Beedell referenced public accountability. He emphasized the Conservation Authorities were fully accountable to elective representatives. He reported the Region appointed members to the Rideau Valley Conservation Authority, Mississippi Valley Conservation Authority, and the South Nation River Conservation Authority to represent the Region on the work and the direction the Authorities took. He noted the Regional Councillors and local Councillors, through its appointed members, were fully in charge of budgets, staff activities, and environmental policies.

Thirdly, Mr. Beedell spoke on funding leverage. He noted Conservation Authorities had always tried to develop partnerships with organizations to achieve their work objectives. To this success, Mr. Beedell reported that Ottawa-Carleton Conservation Authorities were in many cases able to match the municipalities contributions with at least another

dollar raised elsewhere. In closing, Mr. Beedell referenced the hybrid nature of the Conservation Authorities which allowed for the productive partnerships resulting in benefits to the community. He requested the Region on behalf of the Conservation Authorities to lobby the Provincial Government to respect their organization and preserve their existence.

*Ms. Marianne Wilkinson, President, Kanata Beaverbrook Community Association
and Ottawa-Carleton Council of Women*

Ms. Wilkinson stated there was no true public consultation on the report and suggested the Decima Research poll was not widely circulated as the groups she represented were not consulted. She suggested the public opinion poll was an inadequate form of consultation and questioned which community groups were consulted. In referencing previous studies and reports, Ms. Wilkinson noted the public consultation occurred prior to the release of the report.

Speaking to accountability, Ms. Wilkinson stated there was a need for greater accountability and did not believe centralized services would achieve this, as it was best attained closer to the taxpayer.

Ms. Wilkinson referenced the formation of the City of Kanata and stated it was concluded by agreement and by pressuring the Provincial Government. She stated the elected officials were responsible to work with all levels of government to achieve the best outcome.

In speaking to planning issues, Ms. Wilkinson said there were concerns from the community associations and expressed content the implement stage would be local, but believed it could create confusion if one level was creating the plan and another level implementing it. Ms. Wilkinson stated there were advantages of a two-tier system with regard to economic development.

Ms. Wilkinson summarized the cost for the formation of the City of Kanata was greater even though there were greater efficiencies. She emphasized the community should be given the opportunity to do proper research regarding the proposed new structure. Ms. Wilkinson explained she was not opposed to change or changing municipal boundaries, but emphasized the issues needed to be reviewed extremely close before implementation.

In response to a question from Councillor Hunter, Ms. Wilkinson explained economies of scales were achieved, but only until a certain level. She added that in a two-tier service, taxpayers receiving higher service levels never go down, however, those receiving lower services go up. Councillor Hunter reference the effect of the solid waste unification collection cost for the City of Ottawa as an example.

Councillor Hunter concurred with Ms. Wilkinson's comments on the planning issues. Ms. Wilkinson further explained if there was no longer a local official plan, everything would have to be approved by the Province. She explained local official plans had necessary details pertaining to certain areas, and it was best for the Region to approve the plans as people had better access to the approval process.

In response to a question from Councillor Hunter regarding the length of time it took to settle the Carleton County asset issues, Ms. Wilkinson stated it was a long and complicated process. Councillor Hunter referenced the formation of the Region and that process which was brought on by the Province without sufficient consultation.

M. Cappe, Manager, Housing, Planning and Approvals Department, explained the Province was in the process of changing the approvals process through the new *Planning Act*. She explained the Regional Official Plan and amendments would not require approval by the Provincial Government under the new Act. In speaking to economic development, Ms. Cappe stated the main advantage was the elimination of duplication and requirement for the applicants to go through the same process of amending a local and regional plan for certain types for large scale economic development. Ms. Cappe believed the Region would be in a good position to approve local development. Ms. Wilkinson expressed concern with the same level of government creating the official plan and approving it.

Councillor van den Ham stated the report did indicate public consultation and negotiations would happen on several of the issues. Ms. Wilkinson explained if that was the intention, then the committee should receive the report and set a period of three to four months for deliberations. Councillor van den Ham stated the principles outlined in the report should be approved at this time, as the public was looking for leadership.

Councillor Hume referenced several Regional initiatives which briefed the public on the issue and questioned what other type of public consultation was requested. Ms. Wilkinson explained it took time to consult and suggested other options to consider included discussions with local councils, community meetings, and public consultation meetings.

Mr. Chris Bradshaw

Mr. Bradshaw stated there was a need to set the groundwork to build partnerships with neighbourhood organizations vis-à-vis future growth, and that it was important to recognize the neighbourhood scale would be a significant factor. In reference, Mr. Bradshaw stated the report spoke to responsibilities as if they could be completely handled by one level or another. He suggested a closer look would show there was a role for several levels, as exemplified by the police service, a regional responsibility yet supported by community police offices.

Mr. Bradshaw stated the Region should be the only tier of formal municipality in Ottawa-Carleton in the future, with neighbourhoods being able to opt in to provide services on a fee-for-service basis. He suggested the Council would consist of a 1:3 neighbourhood ratio, and boundaries should never pass through existing communities.

In closing, Mr. Bradshaw stated the Region should be looking at expansion of regional boundaries to take in the entire commuter shed without necessarily imposing the entire tax burden of regional government on adjoining municipalities.

Mr. Graham Kirby

Mr. Kirby stated the recommendations of the report were consistent with the Kirby Report of 1992. He suggested the principles of responsiveness and equity, and the responsibility for libraries and for certain fire services, should be added.

Mr. Kirby indicated that recent polls reflected there was a greater need for change, and he believed this trend would continue. In reference to the Kirby Report, he reported it recommended a number of amalgamations, and proposed there be a referendum in Ottawa/Vanier with further polls in Gloucester/Cumberland and in Kanata/Goulbourn. However, these recommendations were ignored and would still be ignored if the Province was not seriously taking steps toward change. He suggested the formula in Ottawa-Carleton could be 1 per 30,000 population, thereby creating a Council of 20 members; a ratio that was practical and would still provide responsive representation.

Mr. Kirby expressed the conviction other forces would lead to having one city within the next 10 years. He stated the question was whether this was better achieved in two steps or one, and suggested that costs and efficiencies would be improved by moving in one step. He cited the example of the City of London currently under a one-tier structure and noted the per household tax was \$1,900 compared to \$2,600 in Ottawa-Carleton.

Mr. Kirby believed there were many areas that called for the involvement of rural township residents such as recreation services, culture, on-street parking. He stated rural residents wanted broader services such as solid waste and hydro, without caring who provided it. He believed there could still be the same kind of responsiveness at the community level even with one-tier government.

Mr. Willy Bagnell

Mr. Bagnell cited a recent letter from the Ottawa-Carleton Board of Trade to Premier Harris, putting forward the position that members overwhelmingly supported a system of one-tier local government (96% in favour). He added that, of those who supported it, 70% favoured a single municipality in Ottawa-Carleton. The Board of Trade urged the Premier to continue his government's pact to restructure local government, and stated the time was now, but, at worse, *for* the year 2000. As the local Mayors and the Regional Chair support the need to end the status quo, but could not agree on the approach to be taken, the Premier was requested to appoint a provincial mediator or commissioner to examine various proposed solutions, hear the concerns of rural municipalities, then recommend one final solution to Cabinet for implementation. The letter concluded by stating the taxpayers could not afford to wait another five years for change to be considered, nor could they afford to support some 90 elected officials at all levels, and the multiplicity of services that existed in a region of 720,000 people, 11 municipalities and one Region.

Mr. Bagnell stated some of the report recommendations were heading in the right direction, however certain persons refused to accept the fact there were efficiencies of scale that could be achieved. He put forward the view a single city with 650,000 population within an urban area was not a large city. In summary, Mr. Bagnell stated having a sense of community spirit did not revolve around governments setting certain neighbourhoods, rather were formed through residents having a community of interests.

Councillor Stewart referenced the request to delay for further public consultation. Mr. Bagnell stated the issue had been debated at a high level for a number of years and that it was time to move forward. He believed the present opportunity was the best ever had to become more effective and efficient.

In closing, Mr. Bagnell stated there were some recommendations in the Governance Report the Board of Trade supported, however, there were some they did not.

Mr. Albert Bouwers

Mr. Bouwers noted he was speaking on behalf of himself, not the Township of Osgoode. He stated presently the rural municipalities as a whole were well run and residents were satisfied. However, if not a continued option, he agreed with one level of local government that would provide central services such as police protection, water, sewers, roads, garbage collection, transportation, recycling, elections, assessment of taxes, welfare, economic development, public health, home for the aged, housing, etc. He believed these services were best provided through one central government so there was a single service provided no matter where the individual resided. In summary, Mr. Bouwers stated it was necessary to stay in touch with residents at a grass root level and suggested the use of area offices. He emphasized the greatest concern was that the taxpayer receive the best service through an open and approachable government, which was provided on a fair and equitable basis no matter what structure.

Chair Clark concurred with Mr. Bouwers closing comments and agreed it was necessary to consider what the neighbourhood responsibilities would be through communities associations, etc. In speaking to the model of three cities, Mr. Bouwers expressed concern for the rural municipalities and suggested one system would be better serving.

Councillor van den Ham referenced the option of the four rural municipalities forming one or amalgamating to their abutting counties. Mr. Bouwers, in speaking to the previous Mayo Report, noted it recommended a county be formed with a ring around Ottawa in terms of the rural municipalities. However, he explained this would be much more difficult now due to the Region-wide policing and garbage collection. He also noted the services for those residents did not gravitate out, but gravitated inward. Mr. Bouwers expressed concern with the growth occurring outside the Regional boundaries because of the expenses associated with development inside the Region. He believed this should be addressed as the Region was paying indirectly for highway and support systems required throughout the Region for those residents to travel to Ottawa.

Councillor van den Ham pointed out that without provincial transfers, there was not enough assessment among the rural municipalities to stand alone, except through the increase of taxes to support the community. Mr. Bouwers did not believe the residents or abutting counties would support this concept unless the total picture was explained. He reiterated that the Region was presently indirectly supporting some services as most people were employed in the urban areas.

Ms. Amy Kempster, Federation of Citizens Association (FCA)

Ms. Kempster expressed concern there was little public consultation, and suggested a public forum be held in January to allow time to study the report and express views properly, with a mediator appointed later, if necessary. Although the FCA had not decided on a formal position in the short time frame, Ms. Kempster explained that in the past, the FCA supported the concept of the Region being more integrated and united.

Ms. Kempster stated there were pros and cons to the report, and emphasized there was strong support for neighbourhood based issues. She stated the need to protect the question of how neighbourhoods had an input.

Ms. Amy Kempster

Ms. Kempster continued to speak to the Committee, however, was representing herself and not the FCA in her comments.

In speaking to the Ottawa Official Plan, Ms. Kempster reported she followed the process from beginning to end and expressed concern that the Regional Official Plan might supersede the Ottawa Plan. She stated there were components of the Ottawa Plan which she believed were more forward thinking and protective of the environment. In addition, the Ottawa Plan allowed for inclusion of secondary policy plans and thirdly, neighbourhood plans. Ms. Kempster hoped if there was only a Regional Plan, consideration would be given for secondary plans for cities and neighbourhoods.

Further to comments made by an early speaker, Ms. Kempster agreed the Region should look beyond the Region boundaries to the commuting shed. She stated they were using Regional services and therefore, need to be accountable for some of the cost.

In closing, Ms. Kempster stated there was a need for a cross provincial co-ordination body to allow for more co-operation and co-ordination between the two sides of the Ottawa River to resolve problems in planning for the National Capital Area.

Mr. Frank Spink

Mr. Spink noted he did not have the opportunity to consult with associates, therefore, his comments reflected his views only.

Mr. Spink stated there was a wide perception that Regional staff were trying to force a change that met their own definition and desire and was not necessarily in the best interests of the citizens. He suggested the public needed to be educated as the Region's message or intentions had not been well explained or received to date. Mr. Spink expressed concern the report was narrow in its scope. He acknowledged it reviewed three options, however, did not compare to other options used elsewhere in the Province, such as Toronto and Vancouver. He questioned if enough attention had been given to the alternatives, therefore, suggesting more consultation.

Speaking to a one-tier government, Mr. Spink stated the public were worried a large government was not the right answer. He believed those in rural municipalities were inadequately represented as the numbers favoured urban municipalities, and hoped the Committee understood there were rural constituents that felt they were less of a priority under the current structure. In relation, he expressed the problem with municipalities outside the greenbelt if consideration was given to the amalgamation of municipalities inside the greenbelt, and he questioned the viability of detaching outside municipalities and annexing them to adjacent existing counties.

With regard to public consultation, Mr. Spink suggested formation of ad hoc committees with public representatives such as those used in the Fair Tax Commission and Issues surrounding the new directly elected Regional Councillors' and past Regional reform.

Mr. Spink then spoke to the issue of a centralized taxation function and suggested the initiative be set aside until the future structure was determined, as it could also further complicate the process of disentanglement.

Speaking to the elimination of special purpose bodies, Mr. Spink stated the majority of people were concerned with this proposal. He believed they should remain as separate entities and not departments of any government.

In closing, Mr. Spink stated that efficiencies were rarely ever significantly achieved when governments moved into larger single purpose units, however, he had not seen a solid argument for either direction. Mr. Spink strongly recommended remaining with the present structure, with changes, if necessary, to be implemented for the election in 2000.

Mr. Clarence Dungey

Mr. Dungey stated the Region should look at unified libraries services across Ottawa-Carleton and suggested the service not be treated any differently from other services considered in the report.

Speaking to possible structural change, Mr. Dungey stated it would be necessary to meet with unions to collectively reach a decision on the new jurisdiction. His position was that one-tier government was inevitable, as displayed with the merger of large corporations in order to provide cheaper services. Mr. Dungey expressed support the Region was considering the idea of one-tier government and agreed it was important to invite a mediator at this time. Speaking from experience, Mr. Dungey acknowledged they may not utilize a mediator at this time, however, stated that if one was appointed, the process would move more quickly.

In closing, Mr. Dungey believed best results would be achieved collectively and if unsuccessful, through mediation. He stressed the decisions should not be left to the Provincial Government alone or the results would be undesirable.

Chair Clark concurred with Mr. Dungey's assessment of what the Provincial Government might do. He reported the government announced last week that transfers to the municipalities in the amount of \$756 million would be gone by the end of 1997.

Mr. Chris Jalkotzy

Mr. Jalkotzy supported a one-tier level of government, but believed a mechanism was needed to support local community boards' initiatives and services delivered generally through volunteer agencies and organizations. He commented on the governance models and status for Calgary, Winnipeg and Paris.

Mr. Jalkotzy believed the Region should move to a one-tier system, but proceed over three years. He stated local communities should put forward representatives to sit on local management facilities and develop other effective partnerships through local schools, etc. Speaking to the planning initiative, Mr. Jalkotzy stated the zoning for neighbour plans should be the responsibility of the local community/neighbourhood.

Mr. Jalkotzy pointed out employees at local municipalities often did a variety of functions and stated it was important to remember that individual services such as welfare be delivered at the local level so the service was better monitored.

Speaking to public consultation, Mr. Jalkotzy proposed the option of a deliberated poll, so residents were aware of the questions prior and had time to develop their responses. He suggested this would be more accurate than polls resulting from snap shot results. Mr. Jalkotzy referenced the Kirby Commission's idea of a referendum to identify public support on amalgamation of local councils. In light of other options, Mr. Jalkotzy believed the amalgamation of three cities would not be successful, and expressed support for a one-tier system or maintaining the present structure.

Chair Clark expressed concern with deciding on one-tier, but taking three years to achieve it. The Chair suggested the time frame would only lead to unproductive on-going debate, instead of moving forward.

At the conclusion of the public delegations, the Committee moved to debate the report.

Councillor Hume believed it was important to specifically itemize the guiding principles in Recommendation No. 1 and moved an amendment to that effect.

Moved by P. Hume

That Recommendation No. 1 of the Regional Chair's report dated 03 Dec 96 be amended to specifically itemize the guiding principles.

CARRIED

(B. Hill and G. Hunter dissented)

Councillor Holmes expressed concern that there were conflicting messages coming from the report, that being to stream line Regional Council and government and the other, to ask for a mediator to move to one-tier. Chair Clark clarified the mediator was to settle the conflicts involved.

Councillor Holmes believed it was important that the report include information on local planning and recreation bodies so it was also considered and discussed while the mediator was available. She emphasized if one-tier was discussed, some comfort must be given to local municipalities that there would also be discussion about local planning bodies. She noted it would be beneficial to receive information on the pros and cons on the models used elsewhere.

Councillor Holmes referenced Recommendation No. 11 of the "Review of Governance in Ottawa-Carleton" report which dealt with Regional Road Disentanglement. She inquired if that included parking control officers, and requested sidewalks on Regional roads be included in the list that the Region will assume. The Councillor did not agree or believe it was fair to assume the parking revenue but not the sidewalks taking into consideration the need for maintenance and control.

Councillor Loney moved a motion, as outlined below, to include sidewalks on regional roads in this recommendation. He concurred it should be included with the Regional Road Disentanglement component to be considered by the mediator and Province.

Councillor Hunter expressed concern in that the amendment did not allow for a stream line of services. He noted sidewalks was one component that was currently a unified service whether it be on a local or regional road. He stated the amendment separated things further which would have an effect on the area municipalities. He expressed the same concern with regard to parking control officers.

Councillor Loney suggested the possibility of co-operating with the area municipalities in providing the maintenance. He referenced, under the current situation, Baseline Road and the necessity to speak to the City of Ottawa and City of Nepean regarding where sidewalks and lighting would go. He did not believe it was right that a significant component of construction and improvement to a road could be held up due to a lack of funding from a municipality. Councillor Loney believed it was not further dividing the issue, but could be solved through co-operation.

Moved by A. Loney

That Recommendation No. 11 of the Review of Governance in Ottawa-Carleton Report be amended as follows:

- **RMOC assume all responsibility for all aspects of the Regional road system including parking, parking revenues, sidewalks and street lighting;**
(page 14 of Executive Summary)
(page 18 of Complete Report)
- b) **Regional Road Disentanglement**
 - **the RMOC assume all responsibility over all aspects of the ownership and operation of the regional road system including parking, sidewalks and street lighting in accordance with the recommendation contained in the Regional Road System Disentanglement Report located at Appendix "B".**
(page 15 of Executive Summary)
(page 19 of Complete Report)

CARRIED
(Amendment only)
(B. Hill and G. Hunter dissented)

The Committee then turned their attention to Recommendation No. 1, the guiding principles.

Councillor Hunter agreed with a majority of the guiding principles except the statement “Seeking Efficiencies *Through Economies of Scale*”. He noted there were as many examples of economies of scale as there were diseconomies of scale, such as proven through curbside collection of garbage. The Councillor explained he agreed with many of the principles as they provided a strong case for continued local, accessible and accountable government. Councillor Hunter referenced the survey and pointed out people stated that if the Region had only one level of government, their own municipal situation would be the same or worst off as they would be a lower priority.

Councillor Hunter believed the residents of local municipalities were satisfied to pay extra to have an accessible and accountable municipality. He stated if the residents were willing to pay the extra cost, it should be their choice. Councillor Hunter did not approve with the Region stepping in and taking over services that were currently being provided by the municipality, to the satisfaction of the residents. He suggested it may be a different scenario if the area municipality requested the Region, and was agreeable to all parties, to assume a service. He believed the proposed approach was against the spirit of local government which would not obtain co-operation of the area municipalities or residents. In speaking to the business cases, Councillor Hunter stated the analysis was not adequate to support the assumption of the services. In closing and with regard to public consultation, Councillor Hunter concurred with a number of the public delegations in that there was insufficient consultation and requested the Committee not to support the report.

Chair Clark pointed out his staff report requested approval of the guiding principles only, leaving the complete Governance Report open for discussion and consideration by a mediator, Province and public.

Councillor Stewart expressed her support for a one-tier level of government. She did not believe it was premature to take a decision at this time and pointed out that it was not even the Region’s decision to make, as they were only providing advice and forwarding a position to the Province. Councillor Stewart stated she has reviewed the report with her community associations and had received support for a simpler, more accountable government. Councillor Stewart explained she felt strongly about her position because the current situation was not working and declining. The Councillor noted there was an opportunity which should be taken to improve the situation. With regard to a mediator, she believed the Province had already decided to send one and emphasized it was time to act. In closing, Councillor Stewart referenced numerous events and documentation in the past few years where it was announced change was to occur and municipalities were encouraged to act accordingly. Councillor Stewart emphasized the need for the Region to take a leadership role as confirmed by past successes, such as service delivery and a triple A credit rating.

Councillor Hume referenced the numerous studies and reports produced in the past and reviewed recommendations in each. He stated it was a body of evidence that could not be ignored and referenced past recommendations that had been implemented and were successful. He did not agree the status quo was appropriate. With regard to the solid waste transition, the Councillor stated residents were now receiving better service and the savings would eventually be obtained. Councillor Hume emphasized that with the limit of one staff person and minimal budget, he was accessible and served his constituents well. The Councillor concurred with Councillor Stewart in recommending one-tier and the appointment of a mediator in the near future. He stated the current political climate was permanently harmed and was not healthy for the taxpayer, political representatives or governance. He emphasized the need for a mediator to settle the issues as soon as possible with any change implemented in time for the 1997 election.

Councillor Loney agreed in the past the residents were relatively well served in Ottawa-Carleton by an evolving system, but pointed out it could only go so far. In referencing the last Regional reform and changes made two years ago, Councillor Loney stated they represented substantial movement towards an eventual one-tier government. The Councillor believed if there was not agreement on substantial change to the present two-tier system, they would certainly receive one-tier and in a short time frame. Councillor Loney expressed distress that the Mayors did not have a proposal together at this time and that the co-operation from certain municipalities had ceased. He noted that only sent a message to Queen's Park that a common ground or decision could not be met, and it was necessary they make the decisions. He believed there were benefits to all if the transition and implementation was done sensibly and correctly. Councillor Loney pointed out the discussion and recommendations from the Regional Chair were only to approve the guiding principles and endorse the appointment of a mediator. With regard to the complete report and consultation, he stated it would continue to be discussed and suggested a public forum could be considered for January.

Speaking to the guiding principles, Councillor Hill agreed she would support them but pointed out they only represented "motherhood" statements and questioned her ability to deliver. However, Councillor Hill emphasized she did not support one-tier government. With regard to the distribution of hydro, Councillor Hill noted it would be necessary to pay a great deal for the assets involved which was only a small component of the issue. In closing, the Councillor expressed concern with the transfer of taxation management to the Region and the loss of interest and revenue for the area municipalities, leaving them non-viable.

Councillor van den Ham reported there was no specific plan or model from the Mayors as they believed the Province was not going to consider restructuring for Ottawa-Carleton at this time. As a result of this belief, Councillor van den Ham explained the local municipalities began to review possible amalgamations among their own, not realizing the

time constraints and the possibility the Province would consider substantial restructuring with regard to the Region. When the Regional report was issued, the area municipalities reacted and brought forward their request to defer until their option was fully developed.

Councillor van den Ham referenced the rural municipalities, and stated that whether a modified two-tier or one-tier structure was decided on, it would be a losing situation for the rural areas. He believed the only benefit would be tax savings under a one-tier structure because of the commercial assessment in the urban areas. He agreed it was necessary to accept changes were going to be made and the need to try to benefit everyone.

With regard to the guiding principles, Councillor van den Ham requested an amendment to recognize the rural situation as outlined below. He emphasized the need to remember the importance of their culture and contribution.

Moved by R. van den Ham

That the fifth guiding principle be amended to include the words “and the Regional Rural Area” after “Communities of Interest”.

CARRIED

With regard to the appointment of a mediator, Councillor van den Ham agreed it was necessary. In addition, he agreed a decision should be made by 1997, however, stated the implementation of the new structure to be in place for 1997 was too soon. He recommended it was more appropriate to have a decision on the governance model by 1997, but with implementation to be discussed and resolved over the next three years and in place for the 2000 election. He concurred that the window of opportunity existed now, however, believed there was an option to create further windows in the future. In closing, Councillor van den Ham emphasized the need to seek the co-operation of the area municipalities and reminded the Committee there may be many transitions and changes to collectively deal with.

Chair Clark explained the need for a mediator was to negotiate the options of transition of services, or not. He concurred with Councillor Hume that it was not healthy to have the discontent felt for an additional four years. Chair Clark acknowledged that change was uncomfortable and difficult, and referenced many issues of the current society that created this discomfort. However, he believed to delay the issue would only contribute to further distortion and misleading information. The Chair reminded Committee the issue was about service and not politics. Chair Clark stated reform was about where they wanted to be in the future and agreed the past had worked and served well.

Chair Clark stated it was an issue that required focus, a decision and settlement. He believed Ottawa-Carleton was in a global market and the growth in terms of jobs was in export markets that required attention and application. The Chair stated he was not looking for a particular answer from the mediator and did not particularly feel comfortable with a one-tier structure. He emphasized the need to solve the problem through negotiation and get on with other important issues.

Councillor van den Ham agreed the proposal may be viable. However, he did not think it was inappropriate to allow the Mayors two months to bring their proposal forward and have the mediator review and discuss all options, with the end result being the best form of governance for the taxpayers. Councillor van den Ham agreed it may be necessary to work quickly for some reasons, however also stated time would be required to work through the discussions, plans, and public awareness to achieve a successful end result.

Chair Clark pointed out that even if a mediator was appointed, there may still be a time lapse of three months.

The Committee then considered the report recommendations as follows:

That the Corporate Services and Economic Development Committee recommend Council:

- 1. Approve the guiding principles in the report of the Chief Administrative Officer, Review of Governance in Ottawa-Carleton dated 13 November 1996, namely:**
 - **Promoting Accountability;**
 - **Seeking Efficiencies Through Economies of Scale;**
 - **Controlling Spillover of Services;**
 - **Ensuring a Uniform Quality and Quantity of Services;**
 - **Addressing Local Concerns and Recognizing the Importance of Preserving Neighborhoods, Communities of Interest, and the Regional Rural Area;**

- **Increasing Financial Viability of Municipal Government;**
- **Increasing Accessibility of Municipal Government; and**
- **Reducing the Cost of Government.**

CARRIED as amended
(G. Hunter dissented)

2. **Endorse the request by the Chair to The Honourable Al Leach, Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing, for the appointment of a provincial mediator to assist the Regional Municipality and the area municipalities to determine a mediated solution to municipal restructuring and service delivery changes in Ottawa-Carleton in time for the 1997 municipal elections.**

CARRIED

YEAS: P. Hume, A. Loney, B. McGarry, W. Stewart, P. Clark ... 5
NAYS: B. Hill, G. Hunter, R. van den Ham ... 3

Councillor Hume suggested that due to the present environment and the need for Council endorsement of the request for a mediator, the item be discussed at the next Council meeting.

Moved by P. Hume

That the Corporate Services and Economic Development Committee agree to waive Item No. 1 of the Agenda, "Review of Governance in Ottawa-Carleton" to be considered by Regional Council at their meeting of 11 December 1996.

CARRIED

YEAS: P. Hume, A. Loney, B. McGarry, W. Stewart, R. van den Ham,
P. Clark ...6
NAYS: B. Hill, G. Hunter ...2

FINANCE

2. RATIONALIZING RESPONSIBILITY FOR PROPERTY TAX BILLING AND COLLECTION ADMINISTRATION ("PROPERTY TAXATION") IN OTTAWA-CARLETON
(Tabled at Corporate Services and Economic Development Committee meeting of 03 Dec 96)
 - Finance Commissioner's report dated 03 Dec 96
 - Extract of Minute from 03 Dec 96 Corporate Services and Economic Development Committee meeting

Ms. Karen Tippett, Treasurer, City of Gloucester, reported the local municipal Councils agreed that the Chief Administrative Officers would jointly study a number of municipal services including tax billing. She further reported the City of Gloucester declined to continue participation as they believed the Regional Council resolutions from the 10 Jul 96 meeting changed the process in that the studies were solely Regional initiatives with Regional staff reporting to Regional Council. Ms. Tippett suggested the information was gathered in bad faith under the premises of it being for the Chief Administrative Officers' study, but was actually used as a component of the Regional report. Ms. Tippett believed other alternative options for tax collection were not presented.

Ms. Tippett noted the solicitors for the City of Gloucester agreed the proposed centralization of tax billing could not happen under the current legislation.

In terms of the analysis of the report, Ms. Tippett stated no empirical evidence proved 15-20% of the existing total costs would be saved through regionalization and expressed concern with the method of comparisons with various municipalities. Although she could not comment on the operation and tax environment for Calgary, Winnipeg or Mississauga, Ms. Tippett believed they should not be used as an equal comparison to Ottawa-Carleton for the following reasons. Firstly, unpaid taxes in Ottawa-Carleton are high due to the economic situation which resulted in the cost for tax billing to be higher. Secondly, the collection of grants-in-lieu of taxes were significantly higher in Ottawa-Carleton than other municipalities. And lastly, as the area municipalities are organized differently, there may be other functions and activities included in positions which may differ among municipalities. The savings may not be as large as some of those duties and costs would remain necessary in the area municipalities. In addition, Ms. Tippett explained the water billing function should not be included in the comparison, as it was a simpler process and adaptable to automation, whereas the assessment basis for taxation was more complex. She pointed out taxation was more personal, therefore requiring a more one-on-one staff involvement and participation from all levels of staff and Council.

In speaking to regionalization of the service, Ms. Tippett pointed out two issues that were not properly addressed in the report which could affect the savings; the duties that could remain at the local level, and salaries received by regional staff compared to local municipalities.

In conclusion, Ms. Tippett noted the transition and implementation costs had not been quantified and questioned how long it would be to recover those costs. She stated the City of Gloucester disagreed with regionalizing tax billing and collection, as there was no confirmation savings would occur and the current level of service would be maintained.

Chair Clark pointed out many levels of staff were involved with the water billing process. He expressed concern with the suggestion the information was sought for one purpose and used for another one. He stated the information was sought under the Chief Administrative Officers review, however, as a number of municipalities withdrew from the process, the report had to be completed by the Region and may be missing some organization and information.

In response to a question from Chair Clark regarding why the cost per bill for municipalities in Ottawa-Carleton was more than double than the City of Mississauga, Ms. Tippett explained Mississauga could have a very health economy and very low level of unpaid taxes, resulting in lesser collection efforts.

Councillor Hume inquired when the City of Gloucester paid the Region their component of taxes and Ms. Tippett replied she believed it was eight times a year. Councillor Hume questioned whether the collection process was being duplicated for both unpaid taxes and unpaid water billings. Ms. Tippett stated she did not know how the Region proposed to perform the two duties, however, noted they were not the same process. In response to comments regarding the complexity of assessment, Councillor Hume believed the Region would be responsible for assessments in the future, and staff would be knowledgeable in all areas.

In response to a question from Councillor Hume regarding other options, Ms. Tippett stated they included a central agency rather than the Region that would conduct the collection possibly on a contractual basis.

Councillor Loney inquired if the reason for not knowing the details of the report and comparisons used was because the City did not participate in the process. Ms. Tippett suggested that none of the municipalities had an opportunity to participate, as it was conducted by Regional staff.

J. LeBelle, Finance Commissioner, pointed out the contrary in that a comprehensive questionnaire was distributed and eight out of the eleven municipalities responded with concerns of the depth and scope of the questions. Mr. LeBelle explained this was used as the basis for the current experience in Ottawa-Carleton. He stated that subsequent to this, the data was reviewed and sent back to the involved area municipalities to confirm if the data was being used properly. In addition, Mr. LeBelle explained they met with the area municipal Treasurers prior to tabling the report and no indication was given at that time the information was misrepresented. He confirmed that all were invited, however only eight attended.

In response to a series of questions from Councillor Hume regarding the transition plan, Mr. LeBelle confirmed the restatement of mill rates and agreements on appropriate arrangements with each area municipality was among a long list of items to be discussed. He stated the 15-20% savings represented the overall impact on the taxpayer. Chair Clark and Councillor Hume suggested that was the minimum that would be achieved.

Councillor van den Ham referenced the reduction in revenue to the municipalities and if that would be addressed in a fair and understanding manner. Mr. LeBelle confirmed that was a key item to be addressed during the transition period.

In closing, Chair Clark pointed out the Region had been subsidizing municipalities to some extent as the taxes were paid on a delayed basis. He believed too much was being spent on a per customer basis for this type of billing and savings were to be had.

The Committee then considered the report recommendations.

That the Corporate Services and Economic Development Committee approve in principle the following:

- 1. That the RMOC assume full responsibility for property taxation;**
- 2. That the Area Municipalities be requested to approve the transfer of this responsibility conditional upon being recognized as a prescribed service under the double majority legislation provisions of *The Savings and Restructuring Act, 1996*;**
- 3. That, (if necessary), the Province be requested to amend existing legislation to allow for the transfer of this responsibility;**

- 4. That staff, in co-operation with the Area Municipalities, develop a transition plan to ensure an effective transfer of responsibility.**

CARRIED
(G. Hunter dissented)

3. RESPONSE TO COUNCIL MOTION #198 -
REGION-WIDE LIBRARY SYSTEM
(Tabled at Corporate Services and Economic Development Committee
meeting of 19 Nov 96)
- Chief Administrative Officer's report dated 5 Nov 96
- Extract of Minute from 19 Nov 96 Corporate Services and
Economic Development Committee meeting

The Committee heard from the following public delegations:

Ms. Elizabeth Buckingham, Chair, Forum of Public Libraries of Ottawa-Carleton. Ms. Buckingham reviewed the composition of the Public Libraries of Ottawa-Carleton Forum which consisted of representatives from the eleven public municipally based libraries in Ottawa-Carleton.

Ms. Buckingham reported the Forum was established to investigate areas for potential co-operation and co-ordination between the libraries, a number of areas which had been discovered and developed. In addition, she stated they monitor initiatives, trends and reports with implications for library service for Ottawa-Carleton area residents.

In speaking to the Review of Governance in Ottawa-Carleton report, Ms. Buckingham pointed out factual errors in the report, offered the following corrections and requested clarification.

- With regard to the composition of the Board for municipalities whose population was less than 100,000: A public library board shall be composed of at least five and no more than nine members appointed by the municipal council.
- With regard to the composition of the Board for municipalities whose population is over 100,000: A public library board ... shall be composed of at least nine and no more than fifteen members appointed by the municipal council; two shall be persons recommended by the board of education's and two shall be a person recommended by the separate school board (or the reverse if a separate school electors are the majority).

- In all cases, the appointing council shall not appoint more of its own members to a board than the number that is one less than a majority of the board.
- For municipal public library boards, there are no requirements for Reeves or Mayors to be appointed to the board.
- Members of the public library boards in the Ottawa-Carleton area do not receive remuneration for their work as board members.

Ms. Buckingham referenced page 152 of the Governance report where it was properly identified there was no solid rationale for regional provision of library services and that each of the area municipalities should be left to determine the type, quantity and quality of service desired. However, she then referenced page 153, which stated there was no reason why each municipality should fund separate library boards and ... that the RMOC should examine the issue of library boards in greater detail. Ms. Buckingham believed the two statements were contradictory to each other and requested clarification.

In closing, Ms. Buckingham recommended that all future studies of library services should properly involve library staff and their boards along with sufficient public consultation.

Chair Clark pointed out as clarification that the report recommendation was that libraries remain under local control.

Councillor Legendre suggested it might be appropriate to consider reviewing the reference function of the Ottawa Public Library and if there would be support from the Forum for a limited imposition of the Region in this area. In response, Ms. Buckingham confirmed the Forum had recently discussed the issue, but explained it had not yet taken a position on whether the Ottawa Public Library should provide reference service on a Regional basis.

Mr. Terry Murphy and Mr. Tom Foulkes, Nepean Public Library Board. Mr. Foulkes believed small was still beautiful and that amalgamation of libraries would not serve well. He emphasized that area wide co-operation was a necessity and stated that was the reason for the establishment of the Forum. Mr. Foulkes recognized the need for a metropolitan or region-wide reference library and agreed that the concept should be explored further.

Speaking to the purpose of libraries, Mr. Foulkes stated they were involved in service delivery and should be governed through volunteer boards of trustees. In addition, they were separate corporations governed by local boards and not by committees of Council, and were a hybrid providing leisure services as well as acting as a primary educational system to general public thereby occupying unique position in municipalities. In closing, Mr. Foulkes stated library governance structures should be at arms-length from the political decision-making process, and the area municipalities should be able to determine quality and quantity desired by their communities. With regard to the Nepean Public Library, Mr. Foulkes stated the trustees were volunteers, with no compensation. In addition, recent surveys indicated 98% of the population were satisfied with the service, and the message received was to increase taxes before reducing service. In closing, Mr. Foulkes referenced the incorrect information contained in the Governance report.

Mr. Murphy stated that each community should provide services applicable to its own population. As an example of the reflection of different needs and priorities of two municipalities, Mr. Murphy indicated Nepean funded library services at \$33.85 per capita while Gloucester funded at \$25.75 per capita. He believed it was evident that the current system was responsive to local needs and was the hallmark of local government.

Mr. Foulkes suggested that replacing local libraries with one mega-regional system would not be beneficial in terms of service delivery as one size does not fit all. Mr. Murphy reiterated that the Nepean Board understood the need for co-operation in which the Forum addressed. He believed there was considerable merit in having the main branch of the Ottawa Public Library provide a region-wide reference service.

In closing, Mr. Murphy reviewed the composition of the Nepean Public Library Board and emphasized the citizens of Nepean were extremely satisfied with the service.

Councillor Hume pointed out the report did recommend that library services and education were the proper responsibilities of the area municipalities and the education authorities.

Councillor Loney agreed that Nepean was well served with the current library system, but expressed concern with non-resident fees which currently prevented access to libraries for many and which had become a budgetary issue. In response, Mr. Murphy agreed it would create a difficult problem to cease non-resident fees at this point. Councillor Loney pointed out that prior to the 1984 legislation, Nepean was on record as trying to obtain special legislation to abolish library boards and transfer complete control to the

City. The Councillor further explained this initiative was abandoned because the 1984 legislation gave budgetary discretion to the Council should they chose to exercise it. In closing, Councillor Loney noted the library boards were creatures of the municipality and agreed that any discussion of change belonged with the local Council and their library board.

Councillor Legendre referenced the need for a major reference library to serve all of the Region, and he encouraged the Nepean representatives to speak to their colleagues from other libraries regarding this necessity. Councillor Legendre suggested a reference library should be considered to receive regional funding.

Ms. Alayne McGregor, Vice-Chair, Ottawa Public Library Board. Ms. McGregor reviewed the Ottawa Public Library's history, composition, mandate and statistics. Speaking to the Governance report, Ms. McGregor referenced pages 152 and 153 and the contradictory statements as pointed out by previous speakers.

Ms. McGregor concurred with earlier comments regarding the responsibility of the libraries remaining with the local municipalities and that each should have the right to determine the type, quality and quantity of the service. She requested that future studies include involvement from library staff, Boards, public and the respective municipalities.

With regard to the Ottawa Public Library, Ms. McGregor stated they believed there was a role for some type of cross municipal boundary co-ordination to access in supporting and strengthening municipal library service in Ottawa-Carleton. She noted this included an area-wide reference and information service, equitable access, and information infrastructure. In summary, Ms. McGregor expressed their support that the library function remain local, requested consultation on future changes, and suggested one possibility for regional interest would be in a proposed main reference library.

Councillor Loney referenced the user fees and reiterated that they were an impediment to region wide service and for citizens located outside the Regional boundaries. Ms. McGregor suggested the option of cross boarder agreements between the libraries, but acknowledged it would require funding and referenced the difficult budget process experienced by the City of Ottawa in debating the 1997 budget.

The Committee acknowledged the corrections and amendments brought forward by the public delegations and received the report for information.

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

RECEIVED

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 7:05 p.m.

CO-ORDINATOR

CHAIR