

## MINUTES

### CORPORATE SERVICES AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

### THE REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY OF OTTAWA-CARLETON

### CHAMPLAIN ROOM

17 JUNE 1997

3:00 P.M.

#### PRESENT

Chair: P. Clark

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

#### CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

**That the Corporate Services and Economic Development Committee confirm the Regular and Confidential Minutes of the 03 June 1997 meeting.**

CARRIED

#### REGULAR ITEMS

#### ENVIRONMENT AND TRANSPORTATION

##### *ENVIRONMENT*

1. PLAZA BRIDGE WATERMAIN REPLACEMENT  
DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION SERVICES  
CONTRACT CA9352, CONTRACT AWARD  
- Environment and Transportation Commissioner's report dated 09 May 97

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

---

Notes: 1. Underlining indicates new or amended recommendations approved by Committee.  
2. Reports requiring Council consideration will be presented to Council on 25 June 1997 in Corporate Services and Economic Development Committee Report Number 65.

1. **The establishment of the Plaza Bridge Watermain Replacement, Project No. 922-41926;**
2. **The transfer of \$1,200,000 from the Water Capital Reserve Fund to the Plaza Bridge Watermain Replacement, Project No. 922-41926;**
3. **The appointment of McNeely Engineering Consultants Limited (Orleans), to provide detailed design and construction services for the Plaza Bridge Watermains, for a contract provision of \$105,900.**

CARRIED

2. ROBERT O. PICKARD ENVIRONMENTAL CENTRE  
FIXDMACS SCADA UPGRADE CONTRACT NO. CS-7844  
- Environment and Transportation Commissioner's report dated 26 May 97

**That the Corporate Services and Economic Development Committee approve the award of Contract No. CS-7844 for the Robert O. Pickard Centre FIXDMACS SCADA Upgrade, to CH2M Gore & Storrie Ltd., North York, Ontario, for a total contract provision of \$155,621.**

CARRIED

3. ORLÉANS SOUTH FEEDERMAIN  
CITY OF GLOUCESTER / TOWNSHIP OF CUMBERLAND  
CONSULTANT APPOINTMENT, CONTRACT NO. CA-9344  
- Environment and Transportation Commissioner's report dated 09 May

**That the Corporate Services and Economic Development Committee approve the appointment of McNeely Engineering Consultants Limited, Orléans, to undertake the next phase, that being the detailed design for the Orléans South Feedermain Project, for a contract provision of \$220,250.**

CARRIED

4. CONTRACT AWARD FOR MAINTENANCE OF  
INTERGRAPH COMPUTER EQUIPMENT

- Environment and Transportation Commissioner's report dated 02 June 97

**That the Corporate Services and Economic Development Committee approve the purchase of the maintenance of computer equipment from Intergraph Canada Limited, Mississauga, for a total contract provision of \$174,800.**

CARRIED

HEALTH

5. 1996 SETTLEMENT - LOCAL HEALTH AGENCIES

- Medical Officer of Health report dated 28 May 97

**That the Corporate Services and Economic Development Committee recommend Council approve the 1996 Local Health Agencies Settlement submissions to the Ministry of Health.**

CARRIED

MISCELLANEOUS

6. MID-TERM REVIEW OF COUNCIL OPERATIONS  
REPORT FROM THE CITIZENS' PANEL

- Committee Co-ordinator's report dated 11 June 97

- Citizens' Review Panel on Council Remuneration dated 17 Jun 97 issued separately

Moved by Councillor Loney

**That the Corporate Services and Economic Development Committee approve the consideration of Item No. 6, Mid-Term Review of Council Operations - Report from the Citizens' Panel, to be considered by Committee at today's meeting.**

CARRIED

The Chair, Mr. Lionel W. Beauchamp, and Members of the Citizens' Review Panel on Council Remuneration, Mr. Richard Baird and Mr. Phil Sweetnam, provided a presentation to the Committee on their final report.

As a point of background, Mr. Beauchamp reported he had been a member of the 1994 Citizens' Panel.

Mr. Beauchamp acknowledged the recommendations would not be unanimously received, however, stated the panel was comfortable with the report as they believed it reflected the actual working of Regional Government as well as respected the taxpayers view point. Mr. Beauchamp thanked Shane Kennedy and Lilanne Frederick, Regional Clerk's Department, for their effort and support throughout the exercise.

Speaking to process, Mr. Beauchamp stated the Panel received a significant amount of data, fifteen response from the questionnaire provided to Councillors, met with seventeen Councillors and the Chair, met with ten Councillors' Assistants, and received fourteen public submissions. Mr. Beauchamp stated the only area the Panel expressed disappointment was the lack of public participation in the process. However, he suggested that during the 1994 review, public participation was greater which provided a sense of the public's view on the matter.

Mr. Beauchamp reviewed the twelve recommendations as outlined in their report dated 17 Jun 97.

Speaking to Recommendation No. 12, Councillor Stewart inquired what the Panel recommended was the best time to hold Committee meetings in order to accommodate the public. Mr. Beauchamp stated there were concerns raised and the Panel wanted to ensure Council was aware and reviewed the option of later meetings.

Councillor Hunter referenced Recommendation No. 9 and the increase to the salary portion of the annual office budget. Mr. Beauchamp explained some Councillors reported they were understaffed and required additional help, in particular during certain times of the year. He noted the Panel believed the financing equal to one-half person would accommodate this request.

Speaking to Recommendation No. 3, Councillor Cullen referenced the one-third non-taxable allowance. Mr. Braid explained Recommendation No. 1 included the tax free allowance, therefore, the salary increase to \$45,000 - \$50,000 also included the tax free allowance. Councillor Hunter pointed out Council had the ability to eliminate this. Mr. Beauchamp stated the Panel discussed this ability, but did not believe it was their position to comment on it.

Councillor Hunter moved the report be deferred until the next Committee meeting to allow for review and receipt of public opinions with final consideration at Council on 9 Jul 97.

Councillor Loney moved that the report be forwarded to Council without any committee recommendation or position taken. This motion was later withdrawn as the report recommendation requested Committee receive the report and it be forwarded to Council for consideration.

Chair Clark noted the item was advertised in the newspaper on the weekend and there were no delegations present.

Moved by Councillor Hunter

**That the Citizens' Review Panel report on Council Remuneration be tabled until the next Corporate Services and Economic Development Committee of 3 Jul 97 to be forwarded to the Council meeting of 9 Jul 97.**

LOST

YEAS: M. Bellemare, P. Hume, G. Hunter, B. McGarry .... 4

NAYS: B. Hill, A. Loney, W. Stewart, R. van den Ham, P. Clark .... 5

Councillor Loney stated when the procedure for the review was determined, it was recommended that the Members Services Committee would merely act as a facilitating body to bring the report to Committee with the recommendations going to full Council for consideration. He believed it was appropriate for the matter to go forward to Council for deliberation without a Committee position as the recommendations were those of the Panel.

In response to a question from Councillor Stewart regarding the public written submissions, M.J. Woollam, Regional Clerk, confirmed they were part of the public record.

Councillor Hunter expressed his appreciation to the Panel for their efforts and recommendations. Speaking to Recommendation No. 12, meeting times, the Councillor expressed support and endorsement for not conflicting with normal office hours. He noted most area municipalities held their Committee meetings in the evenings when a majority of the working population could attend.

Chair Clark, on behalf of the Committee, thanked the members for their participation and public spiritness in serving on the Panel and in preparation of the report.

**That the Corporate Services and Economic Development Committee receive and forward to Council for its consideration the following recommendations:**

1. That the annual remuneration of a Councillor be increased from \$40,000 to an amount from within the range of \$45,000 to \$50,000. The Panel believes that an amount from this range is realistic and reasonable in light of existing economic circumstances, the level of complexity and range of issues being dealt with, and the importance of attracting candidates from all segments of the Ottawa-Carleton community.
2. That a Councillor who is appointed as Chair of a Standing Committee receive additional remuneration of \$6,000 per annum to reflect the extra responsibilities associated with this position. (The current amount is \$5,682.30.)
3. That in the event the *Municipal Act* is amended to remove the provision for a one-third non-taxable allowance for a member of Council, the remuneration payable to a member be increased so as to yield the equivalent amount of after-tax income as would have been the case before the amendment, with the calculation to be based on the entitlement for a single person without dependants.
4. That the remuneration paid to the Regional Chair be increased from \$110,136 to an amount within the range of \$115,136 to \$120,136 and be subject to the same upward adjustment formula as in #3 above if the *Municipal Act* is amended to remove the one-third non-taxable allowance provision.
5. That no changes be made to the current policy for severance allowance for members of Council.
6. That given the difficulty of determining at this time how provincially imposed changes will affect the role and operation of Council during the coming term, Regional Council should, at the mid-point of the 1997-2000 term, mandate a further independent review of remuneration and support arrangements to evaluate if further changes are required. This new Panel would report to Council in time to allow its recommendations to be considered for implementation before the term of office commencing in December 2000.
7. That the rate of compensation paid to a Councillor's Assistant continue at the Pay Grade 10 level at this time. If Council determines in the future that there is a need for further review, such can be undertaken with the benefit of technical advice from Regional staff, taking into account the duties and responsibilities intended to be performed through this position.

8. That severance pay for a Councillor's Assistant be calculated on the same basis as that for members of Council, and be subject to the same limitations in terms of eligibility.
9. That the salary portion of the annual office budget for each Councillor's office be increased by \$13,000 from \$37,072 to \$50,072 in order to create the capacity for the office to retain additional staff assistance as may be required from time to time during the course of the year. These funds can only be used to hire a replacement for the Councillor's Assistant during an absence (at the PG 10 rate) or to provide clerical office staff (at the PG 3 rate).
10. That an annual allowance of \$2,500.00 be made available to each Councillor's office exclusively for translation costs.
11. That the Chair's Office budget remain unchanged at \$587,000.
12. That meeting times be considered again by the new Council at the start of the next term in December 1997 with a view to ensuring that the times which are used provide accessibility to persons who work during regular hours and who may wish to participate in or attend at such meetings.

RECEIVED

(P. Hume and G. Hunter dissented)

#### PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT APPROVALS

7. CUMBERLAND TRANSITWAY AND BLACKBURN HAMLET  
BYPASS EXTENSION (NAVAN TO TRIM ROADS)  
ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT, CONSULTANT APPOINTMENT  
- Planning and Development Approvals Commissioner's report dated 02 June 97

**That the Corporate Services and Economic Development Committee approve the appointment of Delcan Corporation, Ottawa, to undertake an environmental assessment for the Cumberland Transitway and Blackburn Hamlet Bypass Extension (Navan Road to Trim Road) for a total contract provision of \$570,000.**

CARRIED

8. SALE OF SURPLUS PROPERTY  
1122 ALENMEDE CRESCENT  
CITY OF OTTAWA

- Planning and Development Approvals Commissioner's report dated 30 May 97

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

1. **Declare the property described as part of the west part of Lot 22, Plan M177, municipally known as 1122 Alenmede Crescent, City of Ottawa, surplus to Regional needs;**
2. **Approve the sale of the said surplus property to Delwin and Debbie Hoelke for the amount of \$107,000.00 pursuant to an agreement of Purchase and Sale that has been received.**

CARRIED

9. LAND ACQUISITION - 1007 CONNAUGHT AVENUE  
WEST TRANSITWAY EXTENSION  
PROPERTY OWNER: ROBERT JOHN HARRIS

- Planning and Development Approvals Commissioner's report dated 07 May 97

**That the Corporate Services and Economic Development Committee approve the acquisition of 1007 Connaught Avenue, City of Ottawa, from Robert John Harris for the future construction of the West Transitway Extension, for a consideration of \$125,500.00, plus GST.**

CARRIED

PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT APPROVALS / SOCIAL SERVICES

10. TENDER AWARD 9999-00104-T1/97 FOR  
RENOVATIONS AT 111 LISGAR STREET TO  
ACCOMMODATE A CHILD CARE CENTRE

- Joint Planning and Development Approvals Commissioner and  
Social Services Commissioner's report dated 29 May 97

**That the Corporate Services and Economic Development Committee approve the award of Tender 9999-00104-T1/97 to renovate space at 111 Lisgar Street to accommodate a Child Care Centre to Kearney Constructors, Manotick, Ontario for a total contract provision of \$285,476.00.**

CARRIED



REGIONAL CHAIR

11. 1997 CORPORATE SERVICES AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT  
COMMITTEE - JULY MEETING AND SUMMER MEETING SCHEDULE  
- Committee Chair's report dated 06 June 97

**That the Corporate Services and Economic Development Committee approve the date and time of the July meeting as Thursday, 3 July 1997 commencing at 9:00 a.m.**

CARRIED

REGIONAL CLERK / CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER

12. COUNCIL RESOLUTION RE: CANADA POST ADMAIL  
MOTION NO. 130 - 28 MAY 1997 COUNCIL MEETING  
- Joint Regional Clerk and Acting Director, Information and  
Public Affairs report dated 09 June 97

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

- 1. That the Regional Municipality of Ottawa-Carleton convey to Canada Post Corporation the importance of maintaining unaddressed admail as an affordable method of communicating with the residents of Ottawa-Carleton;**
- 2. That Canada Post be asked to include a special provision in its unaddressed admail policy that ensures all households will continue to receive unaddressed admail originating from all levels of government.**

CARRIED

COUNCILLORS' ITEMS

13. NAME CHANGE FOR WARD R18  
- Councillor Hume's report dated 12 June 97

Councillor Hume reported that in early 1995, as a result of the public consultation exercise undertaken by the Regional Clerk, ten names were submitted for Ward R18. However, he noted only one name was recommended twice and no preferred name was strongly endorsed. The Councillor stated he undertook a historic review of the ward, its size and

name which resulted in the revelation that in 1967 to 1979 an area with almost exactly the same boundaries was named Alta Vista, the name subsequently recommended and approved by Council. Councillor Hume continued to explain that after Council approval, he received expressions of concern from the Canterbury community association in that the ward name should recognize the major communities the ward was comprised of. Councillor Hume requested Committee reconsider the matter.

Moved by P. Hume

**That the Corporate Services and Economic Development Committee approve the suspension of the rules of procedure to reconsider his report and the ward name for Ward R18.**

LOST

YEAS: M. Bellemare, P. Hume, W. Stewart, R. van den Ham .... 4  
NAYS: B. Hill, G. Hunter, A. Loney, P. Clark .... 4

-----  
Report Recommendation

**That the Corporate Services and Economic Development Committee recommend Council approve the following ward name change:**

**From: Alta Vista                      To: Alta Vista, Canterbury, Riverview**

REPORT RECOMMENDATION  
NOT CONSIDERED AS THE  
MOTION FOR  
RECONSIDERATION LOST

ADDITIONAL ITEMS: NOS. 14 AND 15

14. RMOC CONVENTION CENTRE REVIEW  
PROGRESS REPORT - FOR INFORMATION

- Planning and Development Approvals Commissioner's report dated 17 Jun 97
- Coopers and Lybrand Consulting report entitled "Convention Centre Project Analysis" 17 Jun 97 issued separately

Moved by Councillor Loney

**That the Corporate Services and Economic Development Committee approve the addition of Item No. 14, RMOC Convention Centre Review - Progress Report - For Information, to be considered by Committee at today's meeting.**

CARRIED

A presentation was provided to the Committee by Mr. Michael Bourque and Mr. Scott Patterson, Coopers and Lybrand Consulting. Mr. Bourque stated Coopers and Lybrand were engaged to review the convention centre analysis completed to date.

The following are key points highlighted throughout the presentation:

- The trade show and convention business has been under growth, approximately 8% over fifteen years, including the amount of square footage.
- The supply for meeting and convention space in Ottawa is quite low when compared to other cities. With the addition of the proposed convention centre, position would move to eighth place.
- *Market Demand Highlights include:*
  - Market has recovered substantially
  - Strong case for a new convention facility in the downtown core
  - Even most conservative projections support a go-forward strategy
  - Ottawa well positioned to capitalize on key industry trends
- *Economic Impact*
  - Well planned and marketed convention centre could realize growth in the 100% range from current levels
  - Results of the KPMG study were analysed and continue to provide a reasonable economic projection
  - Based on the assumption of 105% growth, an additional 896 visitor-related jobs would be created, plus an additional 870 facility operation jobs.
  - There would be incremental tax revenue of between \$8 and \$20 million per year.
  - There is a strong business case for investment by senior levels of government.
- *Financing Considerations*
  - Common practice in the US and Canada to support financing and ongoing operations with a tax on hotel, food and beverage, auto rental and other related visitor services.
  - Numerous innovations introduced to reduce the costs through Public-Private partnership.

- *Lessons for Ottawa*
  - Ottawa lost its market position among tier two cities in Canada
  - Trend will continue over time as competing cities expand their facilities
  - Ottawa need to add at least 100,000 square feet to recapture its market position.
  - Where new facilities were well planned and marketed, they have been successful.
  - Convention centre should be built as a “smart building” given Ottawa’s growing importance as a “technopolis”.

Councillor McGarry referenced the location being in the downtown core. Mr. Bourque stated they prepared their report assuming the convention centre would be in the core of the city. Mr. Patterson noted it was true for all newly constructed centres. He stated a secondary goal was the revitalization of the downtown core.

Chair Clark noted the project analysis could be used as the basis to commence discussions with senior levels of government and the hospitality industry. N. Tunnacliffe, Planning and Development Approvals Commissioner, concurred. He stated it would depend on the responses received as to when a report would return to Committee.

Councillor Cullen inquired if the consultants endorsed a hotel room tax. Mr. Bourque stated they were asked to comment on the financing consideration models. He stated that other cities had funded centres through a tax aimed at visitors rather than residents. The Councillor stated since the other levels of the government were the primary benefactors to tax revenues, they should contribute to both the construction and the operations.

Councillor Hunter referenced the hotel tax and inquired if the consultants had taken a position. Mr. Bourque stated many of the centres had been assisted in the costs of the construction through the hotel tax and many other innovative examples as outlined in the report.

Speaking to the Region’s financial commitment to the project, Mr. Patterson stated they were not mandated to review that component. He suggested that was to be considered in the next phase along with determining the partnerships, which proposal, and other elements. Councillor Hunter expressed disappointment this information was not available. He noted the construction of the centre would only represent a small increase on the comparative chart. Mr. Bourque stated their study confirmed the investment was worth it and that even the most conservative effort was better than status quo.

Councillor Hunter referenced the addition of 400 additional hotel rooms being proposed. Mr. Bourque stated 400 was put forward by KPMG in their study and in reviewing that number in various forums, it was decided 400 rooms, in terms of a four star hotel, was adequate.

Chair Clark pointed out the tax revenues would be increased by \$8 - \$20 million per year and concurred all benefiting parties should contribute, including the hospitality industry. He stated the Coopers and Lybrand analysis confirmed it was worth proceeding to other levels of government and the private sector for participation and contribution.

Councillor Hume inquired on and reviewed the financing structures and models used for other centres and noted the innovation and creativity used.

In response to a question from Councillor Loney on the next step, Mr. Tunnacliffe stated financial options and partnerships needed to be examined.

**That the Corporate Services and Economic Development Committee and Council receive for information the report from Coopers and Lybrand on the proposed Convention Centre.**

RECEIVED

15. GOVERNANCE REVIEW  
- Regional Solicitor's report dated 17 Jun 97

Moved by Councillor Loney

**That the Corporate Services and Economic Development Committee approve the addition of Item No. 15, Governance Review, to be considered by Committee at today's meeting.**

CARRIED

Councillor Hume moved a motion the report on Governance Review be forwarded to Council for consideration at its meeting of 25 Jun 97 without a committee recommendation or position. He noted other members of Council wished to make amendments to the draft motion. Chair Clark explained the report was an attempt to bring all Council motions regarding the governance issue together for the 25 Jun Council meeting, and to facilitate the discussion around the terms of reference and proper

functioning of the Government Review Panel. The Hume motion was subsequently withdrawn.

Councillor Hunter noted 2.3.5 was an understatement and did not adequately identify the Greater-Ottawa model of governance. He suggested it needed further identification and clarification.

In reference to 1.3, Councillor Hunter did not support the payment of an honorarium to the Selection Panel, but agreed expenses could be covered.

Speaking to 2.1.5, Councillor Hunter stated residency in Ottawa-Carleton on the OCGRP was essential in order to achieve a locally driven solution.

Councillor Hunter further referenced 2.3.2, Terms of Reference, and the option that a single municipal government Council would not exceed 18 members plus a head of Council. The Councillor questioned the rationale to place an unnecessary limiting number such as 18 at this point in time rather than leaving the option open for the Panel to discuss.

Councillor Hunter referenced 3, Ratification, and the triple majority process. The Councillor noted the triple majority could be known as a double veto and put the chance of a local option at risk. He suggested that because there were multiple choices of governance, that in the event of a failure to achieve a triple majority in the first try, that the OCGRP may be re-conveyed to put forward a second option. Councillor Hunter stated it was a matter of coming to a consensus on the multiple options taking into consideration the fact there were three different parties with three different stated positions. In closing, the Councillor suggested if it was not achieved on the first try, there was an obligation to attempt a second try for majority with the bulk of time spent on working on the financial details, a more difficult task.

D. Cameron, Regional Solicitor, explained the Ratification process referenced a period of time in which there could be any number of votes on recommendations that came forward. He stated the timeline was included in an attempt to provide some rules. The Solicitor noted by this stage of the process (1998), they would be dealing with Bill 26 and the exact terms of the formula in the resolution would not be so vital. Secondly, Mr. Cameron noted the criteria the panel "shall have regard" did not in anyway limit the Panel.

Councillor McGarry referenced 2.1.4 and expressed surprise that members of the Selection Panel (OCSP) would be eligible for appointment to the Review Panel (OCGRP). Mr. Cameron stated the persons nominated for the selection panel were qualified as leaders in their fields and should not be limited. Councillor McGarry, with no disrespect to the individuals, did not agree they should be eligible.

In reference to 2.1.3, Councillor Cullen noted that Council rejected the proposed amendment to the legislation that called for 5 members to be appointed to the OCGRP. In

addition, the Councillor did not support the appointment of non-citizens, and noted the draft motion did not take into consideration the need to reflect the linguistic duality, distribution of population and the geographic diversity of the Ottawa-Carleton Region. In response, Mr. Cameron stated there was discussion there may be qualified individuals now living outside the Region and did not believe the rules should be so restrictive. In closing, Councillor Cullen expressed concern with departing from what has already been agreed to by the other partners, such as a panel comprised of 12 members.

Councillor van den Ham focused on 2.3.4, a single municipal government within the urban area and between one and four municipalities in the rural area. He stated it was his understanding that the rural population should have the option to either be including in the Region, or not. Mr. Cameron stated that option was intended to describe the City of Ottawa proposal, however, noted the samples 1 to 5 were only set out for the Review Panel to have regard to them. He confirmed in no way did they limit the Panel to what they may recommend.

Councillor Bellemare referenced 1.4 and the need that all decisions shall be made by unanimous vote. The Councillor inquired where this derived. Chair Clark stated it came from the Mayors' Forum and stated with 3 members, consensus could likely be achieved. He noted the OCGRP would not be binding to unanimous vote.

The Committee then considered the following motions.

Moved by G. Hunter

**1.3 That Recommendation No. 1.3 as follows be deleted.**

(Members of the Selection Panel shall be paid such honorarium as the Regional Council shall establish, following the completion of their duties hereunder.)

CARRIED

Moved by B. McGarry

**2.1.4 That Recommendation No. 2.1.4 as follows be deleted.**

Members of the Selection Panel are eligible for appointment to the OCGRP.

CARRIED

(A. Loney dissented)

Moved by G. Hunter

**2.1.5 That Recommendation No. 2.1.5 as follows be deleted.**

Residency in Ottawa-Carleton, while important, is not a condition of appointment to the OCGRP.

CARRIED

Moved by G. Hunter

**That 2.3.2 be amended to eliminate reference to the size of Council.**

LOST

YEAS: B. Hill, G. Hunter, R. van den Ham .... 3

NAYS: M. Bellemare, P. Hume, A. Loney, W. Stewart, P. Clark .... 5

Moved by G. Hunter

**That 2.3.5 be amended as follows to identify the “Greater-Ottawa” (GO) model of governance.**

**2.3.5 eleven area municipalities and up to four special purpose bodies as set out in the area municipal “Greater-Ottawa: A Partnership for the Future” Report (the GO model);**

CARRIED as amended

Moved by G. Hunter

**That 2.3.6 be added as follows to identify any other viable model.**

**2.3.6 any other viable model.**

CARRIED



Moved by G. Hunter

**That 3, Ratification, be amended to specify the availability of more than once chance to reach a triple majority.**

LOST

YEAS: B. Hill, G. Hunter, R. van den Ham .... 3

NAYS: M. Bellemare, P. Hume, A. Loney, B. McGarry, W. Stewart, P. Clark ....6

Moved by G. Hunter

**That 2.3.3 (viii) be added as follows.**

**2.3.3 (viii) application of the Cumming formula to protect municipal assets.**

CARRIED

Councillor Hume stated the members of the OCGRP would be required to make a large time commitment in this very important function. The Councillor suggested remuneration be recommended by the OCSP to Council.

Moved by P. Hume

**That 2.1 be amended by adding an additional point as follows.**

**2.1.6. The Members and Chair of the OCGRP shall be paid such honorarium as recommended by the GRSP and approved by Regional Council.**

CARRIED as amended

YEAS: P. Hume, G. Hunter, A. Loney, B. McGarry, W. Stewart .... 5

NAYS: M. Bellemare, B. Hill, R. van den Ham, P. Clark .... 4

Moved by P. Hume

**That 2.1.3 be amended as follows to provide a range of not less than 5 members and not more than 9.**

**2.1.3 The OCGRP shall be comprised of not less than 5 members and not more than 9 members, of whom one member shall be chosen by the Review Panel to be its Chair.**

CARRIED as amended

The Committee then approved the report recommendation as amended.

To facilitate discussion of this matter at Regional Council, the Corporate Services and Economic Development Committee is asked to consider and recommend that Council approve the attached draft Resolution at Annex A, which attempts to incorporate Council's past positions within the structural review process of Bill 26.

***DRAFT RESOLUTION (ANNEX A)***

**WHEREAS on 11 December, 1996, the Regional Council endorsed the principle of a review of governance in Ottawa-Carleton by the following motion:**

**That Council:**

**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 Neighbourhoods, 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; and**

**WHEREAS the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing by letter to Regional Chair Peter Clark, continues to encourage "all parties to persevere and to complete the development of a locally designed municipal government review process"; and**

**WHEREAS the broad approval of the general intent and direction of the McGarry motion (Regional Council Motion No. 68) has shown that there is a basis for a locally designed process and a local solution to the current need for a review of governance in Ottawa-Carleton; and**

**WHEREAS, while Ottawa-Carleton municipalities, expect that the triple majority/commissioner system of governmental review and reorganization as outlined in Bill 26 will be made available to Ottawa-Carleton by the enactment of Bill 141, they wish to proceed with the municipal restructuring process by establishing and determining the composition of a citizens panel and by determining the panel's guidelines, criteria and time frame to govern its review and report now in anticipation of the pending legislation.**

**NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that a municipal governance review process be instituted in Ottawa-Carleton as follows:**

**1. Governance Review Selection Panel**

**That an Ottawa-Carleton Governance Review Selection Panel (GRSP) be hereby created as follows:**

**1.1 The Selection Panel shall consist of 3 members:**

- one member appointed by the Regional Council
- one member appointed by the Council of the City of Ottawa
- one member appointed by the Councils of all of the area municipalities other than Ottawa.

**1.2 Members of the Selection Panel shall be reimbursed by The Regional Treasurer for all expenses reasonably incurred in carrying out their duties.**

**1.3 That Recommendation No. 1.3 as follows be deleted.**

(Members of the Selection Panel shall be paid such honorarium as the Regional Council shall establish, following the completion of their duties hereunder.)

**1.4 On or before 1 September, 1997, the Selection Panel shall appoint the members of the Review Panel created under section 2, and in so doing the Selection Panel:**

- shall establish its own methods of process and procedure
- shall make all decisions by unanimous vote

- may make its appointments from applications forwarded to the Panel, from municipal nominations or from any other source
- shall have regard to the criteria set forth in this resolution for the membership qualifications and responsibilities of the Review Panel to ensure the appointment of a panel capable of making recommendations to guide and control the long-term future development and government of Ottawa-Carleton.

## **2. Ottawa-Carleton Governance Review Panel**

### **2.1 Appointment and Organization**

That an Ottawa-Carleton Governance Review Panel (OCGRP) is hereby established having regard to criteria and composition set out below.

1. Criteria for appointment to the OCGRP shall include familiarity with both the diversity of Ottawa-Carleton and its municipal government structure and issues and an ability to contribute knowledge or experience in one or more of the following areas; Legal, Finance, Organizational Change, Human Resources, Municipal Services, Public Administration.
2. Persons who presently hold a municipal elected office, who are members of a local board, or who are employees of a municipal corporation or local board are ineligible for appointment to the OCGRP.
3. The OCGRP shall be comprised of not less than 5 members and not more than 9 members, of whom one member shall be chosen by the Review Panel to be its Chair.
4. That Recommendation No. 2.1.4 as follows be deleted.  
Members of the Selection Panel are eligible for appointment to the OCGRP.
5. That Recommendation No. 2.1.5 as follows be deleted.  
Residency in Ottawa-Carleton, while important, is not a condition of appointment to the OCGRP.
6. The Members and Chair of the OCGRP shall be paid such honorarium as recommended by the GRSP and approved by Regional Council.

## **2.2 Duties**

**The OCGRP shall:**

- 1. hold such hearings as may be appropriate concerning models of government suitable for Ottawa-Carleton for the immediate and long-term future;**
- 2. undertake such research concerning governance and service delivery as it deems appropriate;**
- 3. report with its recommendations to the Regional Council and the Councils of the area municipalities not later than twelve months after its first organizational meeting; and**
- 4. submit from time to time its expenditures and accounts for costs incurred to the Regional Treasurer for payment, which costs shall be shared pro rata by the Region and the area municipalities.**

## **2.3 Terms of Reference**

**The OCGRP, in reaching its recommendation, shall have regard to both the municipal governance models and the criteria for the distribution of service delivery responsibilities set out below:**

- 1. status quo;**
- 2. a single municipal government comprising all of Ottawa-Carleton with suitable provisions for a ward system for a Council not exceeding 18 members plus a head of Council;**
- 3. a revised two-tier municipal government system having the following characteristics:**
  - (a) a Regional Council to be directly elected on a regional ward system and a directly elected Regional Chair;**
  - (b) restructured area municipalities;**
  - (c) reallocation of service delivery responsibilities between upper-tier and lower-tier based on the following criteria:**

- (i) accountability;
- (ii) economies of scale;
- (iii) controlling spillovers
- (iv) maintenance of uniform service standards;
- (v) reduction in the number and use of special purpose bodies;
- (vi) income redistribution activities on a wide area base;
- (vii) consideration of local preferences; and
- (viii) application of the Cumming formula to protect municipal assets.

- 4. a single municipal government within the urban area of Ottawa-Carleton and between one and four municipalities in the rural area of Ottawa-Carleton.
- 5. eleven area municipalities and up to four special purpose bodies as set out in the area municipal "Greater-Ottawa: A Partnership for the Future" Report (the GO model); and
- 6. any other viable model.

3. Ratification

The process of ratification of the OCGRP recommendation shall be as follows:

- 1. The Regional and area municipal Councils shall, not later than two months following the delivery of the Report, consider for approval the recommendations of the OCGRP subject to the following conditions;
  - (a) its Report shall be binding upon the Regional Municipality and all area municipalities if such recommendations are approved by the Regional Council and by a majority of the area municipal Councils which represent a majority of the residents of Ottawa-Carleton in accordance with the requirements for a prescribed degree of support of section 25.2(2)(b) of The Municipal Act, as amended; and
  - (b) the Review Panel Report shall be of no force and effect if such recommendations are not approved as provided in paragraph 3.1.(a) above.

**4. Administration and Support**

- 1. Expenses of the OCGRP shall be paid by The Regional Treasurer on approval of the Chief Administrative Officer.**
- 2. The Regional Clerk shall be the Secretary of the Selection Panel and the Review Panel and shall provide all necessary administrative support.**

**5. Notice**

**This motion shall be circulated to all area municipalities and to the members of the Selection Panel for their information and guidance.**

CARRIED as amended  
(G. Hunter dissented)

**INFORMATION PREVIOUSLY DISTRIBUTED**

**CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER**

1. Delegated Authority Monthly Report - May 1997  
(As per Corporate Policy Manual Section 4.6.7.4)  
- Chief Administrative Officer's memorandum dated 05 June 97

**ENVIRONMENT AND TRANSPORTATION DEPARTMENT**

2. Emergency Installation of Gas Flare at the Digester Facility  
Contract Nos. CS-6124, CS-6125, CS-6126, CS-6129 and CE-6153  
(In Accordance with Corporate Policy Manual Section 4.6.9)  
- Environment and Transportation Engineering Division Director's memorandum dated 02 May 97

CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION DISTRIBUTED

LEGAL

1. TENDER AWARD 9999-00104-T1/97 FOR  
RENOVATIONS AT 111 LISGAR STREET TO  
ACCOMMODATE A CHILD CARE CENTRE  
(Reference Item No. 10 of Regular Agenda)  
- Regional Solicitor's legal opinion dated 11 Jun 97

CONFIDENTIAL AGENDA

The Committee waived discussion on the following confidential report and approved the staff recommendation without an In Camera session.

LEGAL

1. PROPERTY SETTLEMENT - EXPROPRIATION  
HUNT CLUB ROAD EXTENSION RIVERSIDE DRIVE  
RIDEAU RIVER BRIDGE  
- Deputy Regional Solicitor's report dated 11 June 97

**That the Corporate Services and Economic Development Committee approve the payment of \$365,000.00 to the property owner, St. Mary's Cement, in full settlement of compensation for certain lands required for the Hunt Club Road expropriation.**

CARRIED

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 5:15 p.m.

---

CO-ORDINATOR

---

CHAIR