

Meeting No. 11
Date: March 22nd, 2011
Time: 7:00 p.m.
Location: Sydenham

Present: **Mayor** **Gary Davison**
 Deputy Mayor **Mark Tinlin**
 Councillors, **John McDougall**
 Allan McPhail
 Cam Naish
 Bill Robinson
 Del Stowe
 Ron Vandewal
 Larry York

Staff: **Wayne Orr, Chief Administrative Officer**
 Lindsay Mills, Planning Coordinator
 Rick Chesebrough, Fire Chief
 Deb Bracken, Treasurer
 Mark Segsworth, Public Works Manager
 Suzanne Rummell, Deputy Treasurer
 Ashley Brown, Recreation Coordinator
 Alan Revill, Chief Building Official
 Brian Kirk, Area Supervisor

1. Call to Order

The Mayor called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

2. Declaration of Pecuniary Interest.

There were no declarations of pecuniary interest.

3. Delegations - nil

4. Business Items

Rick Chesebrough spoke to Council and advised them of the tragedy of two volunteer fire fighters fatalities in Listowel and that he would be attending the funeral on behalf of South Frontenac and the Mutual Aid group.

Wayne Orr provided the agenda for the evening. The capital budget distributed to Council is for review prior to the March 29th meeting. The Management Team was present as this is a township budget and all members of the management team were requested to attend at the CAO's direction and that Mark Segsworth would be presenting the Public Works Budget.

Mark Segsworth initiated his presentation by providing a \$1.3 million reduction to the construction budget that would bring spending levels back to approximately 2007 levels and a \$250,000.00 reduction in overhead costs. This means a 1.55 million dollar in savings and will be reflected in further versions of the budget.

Mark Segsworth provided a 2011 Operating Budget highlight document to Council. He reviewed the contents of this document.

Councillor Vandewal asked for clarification on where the general overhead savings had gone from the previous year. It was pointed out that this was netted out in the total roads budget and used to offset other expenditures or loss of income.

In response to Mark Segsworth's comments, Councillor Vandewal indicated a need to advocate at the provincial level as well as politically with local municipalities to develop a multi-year plan and served a notice of motion to Council to bring this forward.

Councillor Robinson pointed out those sections of Road 38, scheduled in the future for construction, lie a bog and that this area is always unstable and difficult if not impossible to address.

Mark Segsworth offered solutions that appeared to work in other similar situations. The bridge tender that has been previously issued is work planned for 2012 however the design needs to be done in 2011.

Councillor McDougall raised from the County Council meeting, the Watson Report from the County funded roads strategy and indicated that there may be opportunity for funding in partnership with the County.

Mark Segsworth commented that he did not feel any additional level of government was necessary to gain cooperation from other municipalities or the province.

Councillor McPhail supported the idea of working collaboratively with others.

Wayne Orr advised Council that the Watson Report will be presented in further detail to Council.

Councillor Robinson pointed out that it is not likely that the township will receive additional funding from either the City of Kingston or the other levels of government.

Councillor Vandewal commented that the feel from the general tone of the meeting was that Council already appears not interested in working with the county.

It was pointed out to Council that we do need to keep a long term view in mind and that future generations should not be challenged with future costs that have not been funded appropriately in the present.

Mark Segsworth reviewed with council the different funding strategies where investment is tagged as a percentage of the expenditures. It was reiterated that these challenges are not going away and that a long term plan is necessary.

Councillor Vandewal questioned whether it seemed like some roads routinely show up on the five year plan for road construction and questioned the cost effectiveness of continually resurfacing these roads,

Mark Segsworth clarified that while the name of the road may appear to be repeated, that the section of road being addressed has not been duplicated over the past four years that he has been with the township.

Councillor Robinson stated that the township cannot afford to go in debt and questioned the ongoing use of consultants.

Councillor Stowe pointed out that there is a need to invest or the challenges will simply get worse over time and asked if the roads are prioritized across a multi year plan.

Mark Segsworth confirmed that the roads are prioritized but asked Council to clarify whether what has been accomplished in the past is the appropriate level for road construction. With regard to sidewalks in Battersea, they need to be addressed as well as storm sewers.

Councillor Robinson pointed out the importance of a road tour for Council.

With regard to Battersea, Mark Segsworth clarified that only a portion of Battersea will be addressed in the 2011 budget as amended. A portion of the work to be done in Bellrock will be shortened to match only the city funding.

Councillor Stowe asked if the number of bridge studies could be limited in the current year to only those that are scheduled for 2012.

Mark Segsworth commented that there is a need to maintain jobs to be shovel ready and that multi year approvals with multi year stable funding will allow a consistent plan across the township for addressing roads.

Councillor Robinson questioned doing all of Bellrock Road construction. However because of the restrictions on the city funding, those funds have to be used on specific roads, in which Bellrock Road has been identified for 2011.

Mark Segsworth then reviewed solid waste. He indicated that the budget includes a proposed \$40,000.00 transfer to reserves and that this amount would increase incrementally by \$1000.00 per year for the next 30 years so that we could have stable funding for future closing costs. The \$100.00 current garbage charge was set arbitrarily. It was suggested that the amount should be pegged at an unspecified percentage of costs so that this would always be calculated as we move forward. Garbage and solid waste services can be viewed as a utility and that this should have a pay for what you use component. He commented that the strategy for 2011 is to integrate the dumps across the township so that there is a common level of service and access to waste disposal sites. After the evaluation in 2011, we would tender the sites for 2012 which would result in savings in 2012. There is an opportunity to fund some variable costs from reserves.

Councillor Vandewal questioned why we bothered to break out the garbage charge and not include it in taxation.

Mark Segsworth explained that this was part of the initiative to reduce and divert garbage and that economics will drive a change in behaviour.

Councillor McPhail clarified that the \$1.4 million previously mentioned by Mr. Segsworth for dump closures was incremental to the current amount that is in reserves.

Councillor York pointed out the challenge that young families face with restrictions on garbage bag tags and that they find it difficult to raise families with a limit of one bag per week.

Mark Segsworth clarified that there are alternatives to trying to fund additional bag tags for families however there are not staffing resources available to administer such a program.

Councillor Vandewal pointed out that if there is change to the fee, then it should be tied to a change in the fixed number of bag tags issued otherwise he anticipated that this would be a very vocal issue.

Councillor McPhail proposed that we increase the fee to \$125.00 and that the additional \$250,000.00 come from reserves to balance the 2011 budget and that we would review this over the year.

Councillor Naish indicated that he is clearly not in favour of increasing the garbage charge by the \$25.00 as proposed.

Councillor Vandewal suggested approximately \$150.00 garbage charge with 100 bag tags.

Councillor Robinson pointed out that he believed there was a need for more bag tags based on a survey he has conducted.

Mayor Davison asked if the reduction in tags has led to a reduction in the amount of garbage or otherwise increased our diversion rates.

Mark Segsworth clarified that it was too early to tell.

Deputy Mayor Tinlin pointed out his concern with regard to reducing hours at current landfill sites. He asked if a cost analysis has been done on collection versus operation of the dumps.

Mark Segsworth pointed out that it is too early to evaluate given that a full year cycle is necessary to gather the data.

Councillor McPhail suggested a \$150.00 charge with 75 bag tags at the \$2.00 value and this would be consistent with the current sale price of individual tags.

Councillor York pointed out that changes to the number of tags would take care of the issues he previously raised with regard to young families.

Councillor McDougall pointed out that the fundamental challenge of changing the number of tags is that the philosophy so far has been on trying to reduce the amount of garbage and that providing more tags is a potential encouragement to simply throw items out.

Mark Segsworth brought forward to Council other issues that are not currently addressed in the two budget areas, specifically the need for additional resources in terms of staffing to address areas such as asset management, traffic management, storage, solid waste and water.

Councillor McDougall pointed out the need that with the potential federal election and pending provincial election, to have shovel ready projects prepared for one time funding opportunities. He questioned whether any work has been done on studies for water in areas outside of Sydenham.

Councillor Vandewal pointed out that with the savings offered by the Public Works Manager, there is still an additional \$600,000.00 or 6% to be reduced and he believed there are opportunities to look at savings of another \$100,000.00 that could be addressed at the March 29th meeting.

5. Other Business - nil

6. Adjournment

The Committee of the Whole meeting adjourned at 9:17 p.m.