Present were: Chair T. Galloway, L. Armstrong, J. Brewer, T. Cowan, D. Craig, R. Deutschmann, J. Haalboom, B. Halloran, R. Kelterborn, G. Lorentz, C. Millar, J. Mitchell, K. Seiling, J. Wideman and C. Zehr

Members absent: S. Strickland

MOTION TO RECONVENE INTO OPEN SESSION

MOVED by L. Armstrong
SECONDED by T. Cowan

THAT the meeting reconvene into Open Session.

CARRIED

DECLARATIONS OF PECUNIARY INTEREST UNDER THE MUNICIPAL CONFLICT OF INTEREST ACT

The following members re-declared their pecuniary interest related to the preceding closed session of the Administration and Finance Committee:

K. Seiling declared a pecuniary interest regarding item 4(a) as well as item 7(b) listed on the Community Services Committee agenda, in that two of his adult children own residential properties within the transit corridor. He confirmed that he left the meeting during consideration of the matter.

R. Deutschmann declared a conflict of interest regarding item 4(a) as well as item 7(b) listed on the Community Services Committee agenda as well as report CA-11-006, due to an indirect pecuniary interest since he and his spouse are shareholders of corporations that have an interest in a property at 10 Duke Street West, Kitchener. He confirmed that he left the meeting during consideration of the matter.

D. Craig declared a non-pecuniary interest regarding item 4(a) as well as item 7(b) listed on the Community Services Committee agenda as well as report CA-11-006, due to his son owning property within the area of a proposed station on the rapid transit system. He confirmed that he left the meeting during consideration of the matter.

The following members declared their pecuniary interest with respect to the closed session of the Planning and Works Committee to be held following the Administration and Finance Committee meeting:

R. Deutschmann declared a conflict of interest regarding item 8(d) listed on the Administration and Finance Committee agenda, due to an indirect pecuniary interest since he and his spouse
are shareholders of corporations that have an interest in a property at 10 Duke Street West, Kitchener.

D. Craig declared a non-pecuniary interest regarding item 8(d) listed on the Administration and Finance Committee agenda, due to his son owning property within the area of a proposed station on the rapid transit system.

K. Seiling declared a pecuniary interest regarding item 8(d) listed on the Administration and Finance Committee agenda, in that two of his adult children own residential properties within the proposed corridor.

T. Galloway declared a pecuniary interest regarding item 8(d) listed on the Administration and Finance Committee agenda, due to his employment at the University of Waterloo.

REPORTS – Chief Administrative Officer

a) CA-11-006, The 2011-2014 Strategic Plan

Mike Murray, Chief Administrative Officer, provided an overview of the report and merits of the plan, and affirmed the efforts made in developing the strategic plan.

The Committee noted that strategic objective 3.1 and actions therein should be revised to more clearly denote the implementation of a light rail transit system. M. Murray agreed, stating that the plan could clarify that the vision of the transit system is for light rail throughout with recognition of the phased implementation.

The Committee observed that the conservation of heritage structures is a means of waste reduction, and M. Murray indicated that such activity would be captured under action 1.3.1 which addresses the waste management master plan as well as action 2.4.3 which establishes a regional heritage conservation toolbox. J. Haalboom suggested that the conservation of heritage structures would have more emphasis if those activities were set out in the plan more explicitly, and emphasized that the Region should make a serious effort to become leaders in the conservation of heritage structures.

The Committee clarified with M. Murray that action 3.4.3 relating to improved rail service pertains to improved service of GO Train service as well as VIA Rail service, and that Regional staff has taken every opportunity to liaise with those organizations as well as Metrolinx to advance improved rail access to the Region. The Committee observed that an environmental assessment for a double track from Union Station to Milton provides an opportunity for the Region to advocate for the extension of the same line, as other communities on the line are in support of the overall service expansion.

The Committee took the question of approving actions 3.1.1. and 3.1.2 separately.

MOVED by G. Lorentz
SECONDED by J. Wideman

THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve the 2011-2014 Strategic Plan, particularly the Vision, Mission and Values and the 2011-2014 Focus Areas, Strategic Objectives and Priority Actions for the organization, excluding actions 3.1.1 and 3.1.2, as outlined in report CA-11-006.

CARRIED
MOVED by G. Lorentz
SECONDED by J. Wideman

THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve actions 3.1.1 and 3.1.2 contained within the 2011-2014 Strategic Plan, as outlined in report CA-11-006;

AND THAT strategic objective 3.1 and action 3.1.1 and 3.1.2 in the report be amended by removing “Rapid Transit” and adding “Light Rail Transit” in its place.

CARRIED
(C. Millar opposed)

Excused - Conflicts: D. Craig, R. Deutschmann, K. Seiling

M. Murray noted that Council would receive an annual progress report on the plan, as well as a substantive mid-term progress review in late 2012/early 2013.

REPORTS – Corporate Resources

b) CR-CLK-11-011, 2012 Schedule of Council/Committee Meetings

The Committee requested that staff take steps to coordinate the Regional schedule with that of the area municipalities to the extent possible, while affirming the desirability of having the next year’s schedule set in August of the current year. Lee Ann Wetzel, Manager, Council and Administrative Services/Deputy Clerk, noted that traditionally the Region has prepared its schedule and circulated it to area municipalities to allow setting of their schedules with the knowledge of the Regional schedule. She observed that the draft schedule varies little from previous years, and that complete coordination among municipalities is difficult to achieve.

It was generally agreed that decision on the schedule of meetings would be deferred to the upcoming Council meeting, and the Committee directed staff to circulate the proposed schedule to the area municipalities as a courtesy to solicit feedback prior to the Council date.

c) CR-CLK-11-012, Service First Call Centre Implementation

Gary Sosnoski, Commissioner, Corporate Resources, provided an overview of the report including the actions taken and reports made to date, the details of the model and approach to implementation, and the goals and benefits of the call centre implementation. He emphasized that a significant part of the capital expense of the project is the customer relationship management software to replace the numerous ad-hoc systems in place presently, and noted that the three main benefits of this model would be simpler access, extended hours of service, and reduction in transfers of calls. He related that staff is examining potential synergies with the City of Kitchener on a 311 initiative, and though full implementation of 311 would require partners across the Region and it would be a political decision. He acknowledged the work of Deb Bergey, Manager, Citizen Service as well as departmental staff in the progress to date.

The Committee affirmed the importance of this initiative and the benefits of the call centre.

The Committee ascertained from G. Sosnoski that a new space would be required to house the call centre, and not necessarily within a current Regional property. D. Bergey emphasized that Council would be involved in this initiative’s implementation into the future through purchasing and tendering reports.
The Committee obtained clarification as to the current process for incoming calls to the Region, and confirmed that the goal of the initiative includes a live person answering customers’ questions.

The Committee questioned the implementation timelines provided in the report and asked if any action could be taken to shorten the timelines. G. Sosnoski responded that the timelines are determined mainly by obtaining a site for the call centre and proper training to ensure a high-level of service, and emphasized that each is a time-intensive process to complete correctly.

D. Bergey confirmed that the software to be implemented is proprietary, that many vendors offer such software, and that the figures provided in the report are typical of what is offered in the market. G. Sosnoski added that most costs listed in the report reflect the worst-case scenario, and that savings on the projected costs could be realized as implementation proceeds.

MOVED by J. Wideman
SECONDED by T. Cowan

THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve the implementation of the Service First Call Centre as outlined in report CR-CLK-11-012.

CARRIED

d) CR-CLK-11-016, Region of Waterloo Archives Update on Recent Activities

Received for information.

G. Sosnoski observed that the report is in response to a request from J. Haalboom, and thanked her for the request and for the review of the Archives’ good work that was spurred as a result.

The Committee confirmed with Charlotte Woodley, Archivist, that the items of interest listed in the report are available online. She identified a number of successful actions taken by the archives, including the movement to an online archive, forming a relationship and partnership with the Waterloo Regional Police Service, and archiving of the Regional website.

The Committee ascertained that the Archives is tackling a backlog of materials for processing as well as limitations on space and resources, which has not deterred staff from being able to respond to requests from staff and the public. C. Woodley provided details on the Archives’ emergency plan, which includes plan to avoid/mitigate damage from water, fire, theft, smoke and other perils. Staff reviews the plan annually and works with partner organization to establish a network to ensure the maintenance and safety of vital records.

REPORTS – Finance

e) F-11-056, 2012 Budget Process

D. Craig requested that the Police Services Board visit the City of Cambridge to discuss the police allotment to Cambridge and concerns of the community prior to the Board’s budget deliberations, specifically as it relates to hiring and distribution of officers.

The Committee confirmed with Larry Ryan, Chief Financial Officer, that a detailed review of reserves and reserve funds, including an analysis of municipal comparators and recommendations for the future, is planned for September.
Chair T. Galloway noted a typographical error in the report and affirmed that the prospective date for final budget approval is January 18, 2012, and not January 11, 2012.

MOVED by T. Cowan
SECONDED by J. Brewer

THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve the dates for the 2012 budget process included within Report F-11-056 dated August 16, 2011.

CARRIED

f) F-11-057, Options for Paid Parking for Employees

A letter from Michael Druker of Waterloo was circulated to the Committee, and is attached to the original minutes.

L. Ryan noted that the report is for direction and provided an overview of the report, including:

- Direction to proceed with report received from Council;
- Working group of staff was set up, and developed the options contained in report;
- Environmental scan of other municipalities’ parking practices;
- Canada Revenue Agency (CRA) assesses that 4 of 49 Regional locations have a market value for parking, with employees at those locations assessed for a taxable benefit; and
- Preference of the working group for Option 3 contained in the report.

The Committee debated the merits of the options provided as well as issues around employer-provided parking, including:

- Incentives to employees and progress on transportation demand management (TDM) initiatives;
- Labour and employment law with respect to changing conditions of employment;
- Past ‘grandfathering’ of existing employees during policy changes, such as for payouts of sick time;
- Merits of obtaining a detailed report on one or more options for parking;
- Merits of implementing some payment for parking for all employees;
- Appropriate transition period for various options;
- Consideration for sites where alternative transportation is not an option i.e. airport;
- Consideration for sites where other employers share parking facilities;
- Merits of separating Regional policies from current/future CRA rulings;
- Legal implications and accommodation issues of various options; and
- Equity issues between employees at different sites, between present and new employees, and between employees at different compensation levels.

M. Murray reminded the Committee that any option that Council directs will have significant implementation issues, and that with clear direction from Council, staff can examine implementation issues in detail and provide in-depth options for Council consideration.

G. Lorentz requested a recorded vote.

MOVED by K. Seiling
SECONDED by T. Cowan
1024112
THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve changes to employer-provided parking based on Option #3 in report F-11-057;

AND THAT staff be directed to prepare a report for Council on options for implementation of employer-provided parking for new staff, including timelines, costs, affected sites and impacts including an option or options for applying parking costs for all new employees irrespective of Canada Revenue Agency Fair Market Value assessments.

CARRIED

Nays: D. Craig, R. Deutschmann, J. Haalboom, B. Halloran, C. Millar, C. Zehr

M. Murray indicated that Council could expect a report before the end of 2011.

OTHER BUSINESS

a) Council Enquiries and Requests for Information Tracking List was received for information.

NEXT MEETING – September 6, 2011

MOTION TO GO INTO CLOSED SESSION

MOVED by J. Brewer
SECONDED by L. Armstrong

THAT a closed meeting of the Planning & Works Committee be held on Tuesday, August 16, 2011 immediately following the Administration and Finance Committee meeting in the Waterloo County Room in accordance with Section 239 of the Municipal Act, 2001, for the purposes of considering the following subject matters:

a) proposed or pending disposition of land in the Township of Woolwich
b) proposed or pending acquisition of land in the City of Cambridge
c) proposed or pending acquisition of land in the City of Cambridge
d) proposed or pending acquisition of land in the City of Waterloo
e) proposed or pending acquisition of land in the City of Kitchener
f) proposed or pending litigation and receiving of legal advice and opinion that is subject to solicitor-client privilege related to a matter before an administrative tribunal

CARRIED

MOTION TO ADJOURN

MOVED by J. Brewer
SECONDED by L. Armstrong

THAT the meeting adjourn at 12:39 p.m.

CARRIED

COMMITTEE CHAIR, T. Galloway

COMMITTEE CLERK, M. Grivicic
Re: F-11-057, Options for paid parking for employees, 16 August 2011

Chair Galloway and Members of Administration and Finance Committee,

I am strongly in support of Regional employees paying for parking, as this enables them to make commute decisions with all costs considered – instead of being implicitly encouraged to drive to work. Reducing unnecessary driving is good for the community, and converting commuters away from driving to work improves their health and cuts down on their own vehicle expenses.

The most direct option, Option 4, of simply transitioning all employees (where reasonable) to pay parking seems to me to be the most effective. But I can understand why Option 3 – with a transition for only new employees – may be an attractive middle ground.

The ultimate purpose is still to transition to an employee-pays scenario, however it may take a very long time with Option 3. If Committee does go with this approach, I suggest that "grandfathered" employees be offered parking cash-out to encourage transition. This means that employees are given the choice between their existing free parking, or the value of that parking added to their paycheck.

Research shows that given such a choice and promotion of alternatives, about 10-20% of employees or more will opt for the cash value and give up the parking. At both 150 Frederick and 99 Regina, there are plenty of paid parking options, so employees without a parking pass would have a way to occasionally drive to work.

The issue with employer-paid parking is not simply about taxable benefits. It is also about this being an unnecessary encouragement to driving, which is why I would like to see all employees given the option of the cash value of the subsidy in lieu of the parking pass. This would also be an opportunity to model the use of parking cash-out to other employers in the Region.

Sincerely,

Michael Druker
mdruker@gmail.com
Waterloo, Ontario