



# REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY OF WATERLOO ADMINISTRATION AND FINANCE COMMITTEE AGENDA

Tuesday, September 25, 2012

10:15 a.m.

(Time is approximate; meeting follows Community Services Committee)

Regional Council Chamber

150 Frederick Street, Kitchener, Ontario

---

## 1. DECLARATIONS OF PECUNIARY INTEREST UNDER THE MUNICIPAL CONFLICT OF INTEREST ACT

### 2. DELEGATIONS

- a) Mary Misner, Director, Cambridge Galleries re: P-12-105/F-12-075 and update on galleries' marketing project

### 3. INTERDEPARTMENTAL REPORTS

- a) [P-12-105/F-12-075](#), Ongoing Regional Investment in Community Arts and Culture Organizations 1

#### REPORTS - Finance

- b) [F-12-076](#), Municipal Performance Measurement Program 2011 Results 12
- c) [F-12-077](#), 150 Frederick Street Fire Panel Replacement Emergency Purchase 36
- d) [F-12-078](#), Waterloo Landfill Site – South Workshop Heavy Bay Doors Emergency Replacement 38

#### REPORTS – Corporate Resources

- e) [CR-CLK-12-010](#), Approval of Consent Agendas 41
- f) [CR-CLK-12-017](#), Response to Integrated Accessibility Standards Regulation (Built Environment) 51
- g) [CR-CLK-12-018](#), Legal Hold Policy 57
- h) [CR-FM-12-014](#), Pre-Budget Approval for 2013 Vehicle Procurement 64

### 4. INFORMATION/CORRESPONDENCE

### 5. OTHER BUSINESS

- a) [Council Enquires and Requests for Information Tracking List](#) 70

### 6. NEXT MEETING – October 16, 2012

### 7. ADJOURN



**REGION OF WATERLOO**

**PLANNING, HOUSING AND COMMUNITY SERVICES  
Community Services  
FINANCE DEPARTMENT  
Treasury Services**

---

**TO:** Chair T. Galloway and Members of the Administration and Finance Committee

**DATE:** September 25, 2012 **FILE CODE:** F11-20

**SUBJECT: ONGOING REGIONAL INVESTMENT IN COMMUNITY ARTS AND CULTURE ORGANIZATIONS**

---

**RECOMMENDATION:**

THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve the following approach to ongoing investment in community arts and culture organizations, as described in Report P-12-105/F-12-075, dated September 25, 2012:

- a) Provide funding for core arts and culture organizations as recommended in Report P-12-105/F-12-075 for the period 2013 through 2015, conditional on the receipt of an annual report including audited financial statements from the organization, with the total funding amount each year subject to annual budget approval;
- b) Subject to approval of funding through the 2013 budget process, and subsequent annual budget approvals, provide funding for collaborative initiatives proposed by at least three art galleries, conditional on receipt of a work plan and final report approved by Regional staff;
- c) Subject to annual budget approval, provide annual funding in the amount of the previous year's allocation plus \$1 per capita of population increase to flow through the Creative Enterprise Initiative (CEI) on the condition that this amount be matched by funding from other sources and used to support local arts and culture organizations; and
- d) Amend the Region's policy on grants to arts, culture and community organizations accordingly, and advise new applicants for arts and culture grants that the Region's annual grant application process for arts and culture organizations has been discontinued, and refer these organizations to the Waterloo Regional Arts Fund or the Creative Enterprise Initiative.

**SUMMARY:**

Staff has been working with the Creative Enterprise Initiative (formerly the Creative Enterprise Enabling Organization) and the Area Municipalities to review municipal funding for community arts and culture organizations in the Region. This review has focussed on the Region's funding for community-based arts and culture organizations but has not included the Region's owned and operated cultural facilities or the Region's funding for heritage programs. Some of the concerns the Region had noted regarding municipal funding for arts and culture organizations were: a lack of clarity and rationale as to which level (Region or Area Municipality) funds specific arts and culture organizations; the multiple applications and reporting formats required by the various municipalities; the Region's more onerous application process compared to the Area Municipalities; and the difficulty in adding new organizations or in changing the funded organizations. The staff discussions considered various options for shifting the existing funding levels between the Region and the Area Municipalities and the Area Municipal CAO's have indicated a preference for essentially maintaining the status quo.

Despite this preference to maintain the status quo between the Region and the Area Municipalities, there are still changes the Region could make to achieve its Strategic Plan Objective of strengthening the arts and culture sector while addressing concerns related to clarity (which organizations the Region will fund) and simplifying the process. This report includes a number of recommendations which maintain the Region's direct and indirect investment in arts and culture organizations, simplify the process for the organizations, and provide some stability for the arts and culture organizations traditionally funded by the Region.

## **REPORT:**

In connection with the 2011 grants to arts and culture organizations (Report RC-11-002, May 24, 2011) Regional Council directed staff to work with the Creative Enterprise Enabling Organization (now Creative Enterprise Initiative – CEI) and Area Municipalities to review municipal funding for arts and culture in the Region. Through several meetings of Regional and Area Municipal staff in 2011, information was exchanged about funding levels and processes, resulting in a number of accomplishments described in Report P-11-100/F-11-083, December 6, 2011. The report concluded, however, that more discussion was needed before recommendations could be made about fundamental changes to municipal funding of arts and culture organizations.

Further discussion in 2012 by the Regional and Area Municipal CAOs focussed on the larger cultural organizations, most of which receive funding from both the Region and one or more of the Area Municipalities. The concerns that the Region proposed to address were:

- lack of clarity and rationale as to which level (Region or Area Municipality) funds specific arts and culture organizations;
- funding from multiple municipalities requires multiple applications and reporting formats for the arts and cultural organizations;
- the Region's application process for arts and culture grants is more onerous than the process now being used by Area Municipalities to fund large cultural organizations; and
- the Region's direct grants to arts and culture organizations have become focussed on a limited number of organizations, and it is difficult to add new organizations or change the funded organizations as they have come to rely on this level of funding from the Region.

Various options for shifting the existing funding levels between the Region and Area Municipalities were outlined and discussed. The options included:

- maintaining the status quo, in which the Region directly funds a few cultural organizations, most of which also receive funding from one or more Area Municipalities;
- the Region providing all municipal funding for a selected group of organizations; and
- the Region providing no direct funding to cultural organizations.

After reviewing the options, the Area Municipal CAOs indicated their preference for essentially maintaining the status quo. Area Municipalities see a benefit in directly funding many types of cultural organizations, and would not want the Region to take on sole funding responsibility for any of the organizations currently being jointly funded. The Area Municipal funding process for cultural organizations is working well, and no significant changes at that level seem necessary. The Area Municipal CAOs recommended that any changes or streamlining should be undertaken solely by the Region, in the context of the funding traditionally provided by the Region to arts and culture organizations.

Current Municipal Funding for Community Arts and Culture Organizations

i) Region of Waterloo

Through 2011, the Region required arts and culture organizations to submit an annual grant application. To be considered for a Regional grant, the organization had to demonstrate that its purpose: is of Regional significance, which includes serving at least four of the seven area municipalities; is not duplicating services provided by another agency, area municipality, or the Region; and is meeting an identified and quantifiable need in the community.

Over the years, the Region has funded a variety of arts and culture organizations, for various periods of time. Following a decision by Regional Council in June, 2000 (Report FIN-00-030) operating support for art galleries became an Area Municipal responsibility. Art galleries were no longer funded through the Region’s grant budget. In 2001 the Region identified four “core organizations” to receive arts and culture grants, namely: the Kitchener-Waterloo Symphony, the Philharmonic Choir, the Waterloo Regional Arts Council and K-W Opera. In 2003 the Waterloo Regional Children’s Museum was added to the core group. The following chart shows the arts and culture organizations that have been funded through the Region’s grants process since 2000.

<b>Organization</b>	<b>Time Period Funded</b>
Kitchener-Waterloo Symphony	2000-2012
K-W/Grand Philharmonic Choir	2000-2012
Waterloo Region Arts Council	2000-2010
K-W Opera	2000-2007
THEMUSEUM (formerly Children’s Museum)	2003-2012
Grand River Film Festival	2010-2012
Creative Enterprise Initiative (for grants)	2012
Waterloo County & Area Quilt Festival	2000-2004

The funding allocated to arts and culture organizations by the Region in 2012 is summarized below:

Arts and Culture Grants	
• KWS	\$370,900
• THEMUSEUM	\$370,900
• Grand Philharmonic Choir	\$ 30,900
• Grand River Film Festival	\$ 10,300
• CEI-for matching investment	<u>\$ 33,000</u>
Total Arts and Culture Grants	\$816,000
Waterloo Region Arts Fund	\$252,400
Creative Enterprise Initiative Operations	\$100,000
Economic Development And Promotion Grants	
• Art Gallery Collaborative Marketing Project (see following description)	\$ 30,000

As part of the 2012 Budget Public Input, the Kitchener-Waterloo Art Gallery, Canadian Clay and Glass Gallery, and Cambridge Galleries made a joint presentation to Budget Committee requesting funding to support a collaborative marketing project. Budget Committee and Regional Council subsequently supported the concept, and directed that \$30,000 of one-time funding be included in the 2012 Economic Development and Promotion budget. A one-time grant of \$30,000 for the marketing initiative was approved in February of this year. This project has proven very successful in bringing together the three entities, with a subsequent inclusion of the Homer Watson Gallery into the collaboration. Three

initiatives have emerged: a promotional piece dedicated to Waterloo Region Art Excursions in the Toronto Art Map with a distribution of 100,000 copies throughout Toronto as well as Ontario Tourism sites; a joint marketing campaign launched at the Waterloo Jazz Festival and continuing through the Fall; and collaborative conversations among gallery, Waterloo Region Tourism, and CEI staff, leading to increased knowledge, resource sharing and tourism links.

ii) Area Municipalities

Both Kitchener and Waterloo have revised their annual grant application processes for their largest cultural organizations, such as KWS, KWAG and CCGG, and instituted multi-year agreements. The organizations submit annual financial statements, and total funding is subject to City Council approval. Cambridge provides substantial funding support for the Cambridge Galleries. In addition, all three Cities award grants to smaller organizations through an application and committee selection process.

iii) Waterloo Regional Arts Fund (WRAF)

Waterloo Regional Arts Fund (which operates as Region of Waterloo Arts Fund) is a not-for-profit corporation established in 2002 and solely funded by the Region. It was created to operate at arm's length from the Region and to provide funding for the performing, visual and literary arts. The overall intent of the Arts Fund is to "make art happen" (i.e. stimulate arts activity) in the Region. This includes projects to make art happen now (in the next 12 months) and projects that will enhance an organization or individual's ability to make even more art happen in the future. The Arts Fund typically directs its support to projects and does not generally fund capital projects or provide operating funds. The Arts Fund received \$252,400 of Regional funding in 2012 based on forty cents per capita on a population of 551,000 and \$32,000 of increased base funding approved in 2011.

iv) Creative Enterprise Initiative (CEI)

Initially called the Creative Enterprise Enabling Organization (CEEEO) when the concept was rolled out, CEI completed its first year of operation this past May. Among other accomplishments, CEI has, in just over a year:

- increased available funding by establishing a private sector Leadership Council to solicit new investment, with status to be announced later in the year;
- provided resources to the sector including training in grant application writing and revenue optimization, development of a web portal (to be available late Fall 2012) and securing a national public relations agency to provide direct publicity and PR support to local organizations which will drive audience development;
- provided services to the sector including access to health and dental benefits at a group rate;
- reinvested back into the sector through grants and creation of a low-rent, mixed-use studio for artists, funded in part by the Region's investment of matching funding.

The municipalities financially support the operation of CEI (on a similar basis as their support for CTT, Communitech, and Waterloo Region Tourism Marketing Corporation) and the Region's annual contribution is \$100,000. In addition, Kitchener provided \$20,000 in 2011 which CEI matched with private sector contributions and distributed through a grant application process to 12 organizations who demonstrated that the money would make them more self-sustaining. This pilot project was so successful that, in 2012, Kitchener increased their funding to \$31,000 and the Region allocated \$33,000 to CEI to be matched by funding from other sources and awarded to local arts and culture organizations through a competitive process. The low-rent studio space at Erb and Regina Streets in Uptown Waterloo, which attracted 30 applications from artists/organizations for 12 spots, is one outcome of the Region's investment.

### Options for Changes to Regional Funding

Any change to Regional funding of arts and cultural organizations should meet the Strategic Plan Objective of strengthening the arts and culture sector (Action 2.4.1) while addressing the concerns noted previously in the report. In summary, the recommended approach should:

- strengthen the arts and culture sector;
- clarify which arts and culture organizations the Region will fund through direct grants;
- simplify the funding process for arts and culture organizations;
- focus Regional funds on a limited number of organizations meeting established criteria; and
- recognize that the Region has little or no capacity to increase funding for arts and culture organizations.

One option is for the Region to stop making direct grants to arts and culture organizations. The funding could be completely withdrawn from the cultural sector which would have a significant impact on the organizations traditionally funded by the Region. These organizations would likely look to the Area Municipalities to replace the lost funding from the Region. While this option would clarify and simplify the funding process by removing one of the funding partners, it would negatively impact the Area Municipalities and the cultural sector. This option does not support the Region's Strategic Plan objective of strengthening the arts and culture sector, and would negatively impact other Regional actions, such as supporting vibrant core areas and attracting talent.

A second option is for the Region to continue its traditional process or approach of receiving applications, making recommendations and approving grants. While this approach appears to be competitive and open to many arts and cultural organizations, past practice has been to consistently fund the same organizations. This reflects the reality of limited resources and budget constraints, the need to maintain consistent funding because these organizations rely on it, and the desire of Council to ensure that these large cultural institutions continue to operate. The process of annual applications for grants that are essentially base operating funds is time-consuming and creates uncertainty for the organizations, does not add value to the Region's decision-making, and has been abandoned by the Area Municipalities. While this option does focus the funding, it does not strengthen the sector, simplify the process, or add clarity.

The negatives of these options outweigh the positives, and they are not recommended. Instead, an approach that essentially maintains the present funding levels, clarifies the Region's approach and simplifies the process is being recommended.

### Recommended Funding Option

The recommended funding option maintains both direct and indirect investment components for the Region. The key elements of the recommended approach are:

1. Once per term, Regional Council would review the arts and cultural organizations which are being directly funded by the Region.
2. The Region would enter into a four year agreement with the selected organizations, to provide them with financial stability and long term planning over the term of the agreement. The amount of funding each year would generally be expected to remain stable or increase with inflation, but would be subject to Council's decision during the annual budget approval process. The organizations would annually report on the use/impact of the funding and their overall financial status.

3. The large art galleries would not receive individual funding from the Region, but could access Regional funds for collaborative projects (as outlined below).
4. Regional Council would discontinue the annual grant application process for other arts and culture organizations but would continue to make indirect investments that strengthen arts and culture through the Waterloo Regional Arts Fund and the Creative Enterprise Initiative.

The details of how this recommended approach could be implemented are further described below.

### **Direct Funding to Selected Organizations**

The Kitchener-Waterloo Symphony, THEMUSEUM, and the Grand Philharmonic Choir have been long-time recipients (five or more years) of Regional funding. Each has previously submitted an application for grant funding and shown that it meets the Region's criteria. It is recommended that direct investment in these three organizations be continued for this funding cycle. Subject to 2013 budget deliberations, the existing 2012 funding amounts would be carried forward, possibly increased for inflation.

The Grand River Film Festival (GRFF) was funded through the grant application process in 2010 and 2011. In 2012, the previous year's funding was maintained as a status quo approach to avoid negative impacts on the four cultural organizations that had been funded in 2011. However, GRFF does not have the tenure and scope of the cultural organizations noted above, that have received long-time funding from the Region. There are other film festivals in the Region, as well as private sector venues, screening Canadian and international films. It is recommended that the Region not provide on-going direct funding to GRFF. This decision could be phased in over two years, so that GRFF receives half of its 2012 funding in 2013 (\$5,000) while providing the organization with time to look for alternate funding if needed.

### **Indirect Investment in Arts and Culture**

It is recommended that the Region continue to provide indirect investment in the arts through the Waterloo Region Arts Fund and the Creative Enterprise Initiative. The Region could maintain its 'sustainability' commitment of increasing arts and culture funding by \$1 per capita by annually increasing the CEI investment equivalent to the previous year's population growth. This is similar to the funding approach used for Waterloo Region Arts Fund and Waterloo Region Heritage Foundation. For 2013, the amount invested in CEI would be the 2012 base of \$100,000 for CEI operations, plus \$33,000 for matching investments with an additional \$6,700 added to the latter amount to reflect the 2011-2012 estimated population increase.

### **Art Galleries**

In their 2012 budget presentation to Regional Council, the three art galleries (KWAG, CCGG, Cambridge) noted that they each have wide appeal beyond individual municipal boundaries, nationally recognized collections, diverse but complementary mandates, and tourism potential. This position is further described in a recent joint submission (please see Attachment 1, Making the Case for a Regional Cultural Funding Program, dated September 10, 2012) which presents a rationale for targeted Regional funding of major art galleries. This submission outlines:

- how targeted arts funding contributes to the overall goals of the Region;
- proposed uses for Regional funds; and
- proposed funding criteria for arts institutions.

Despite the potential case made for Regional funding to individual art galleries, the submission concludes with a request from the three galleries that the Region provide \$30,000 in 2013 (the same as in 2012) to continue the galleries' shared marketing efforts.

Given the Region's budget constraints, it would be difficult to fund annual grants to each of the three galleries. As an alternative, the concept of funding initiatives that enable and encourage the galleries to collaborate, as was done in 2012, should be considered. The collaborative marketing project funded by Council in 2012 is proving to be a successful venture, with an additional gallery being included, and very positive synergies being created. More specifically, the funding has achieved the following results to date:

- A 25% increase in 2012 summer attendance at KWAG, Clay & Glass and Cambridge Galleries over summer 2011 numbers (32,544 in 2012 compared with 26,070 in 2011);
- Potential to share technical staff resources among the galleries; and
- Direct conversations with staff from Waterloo Region Tourism and CEI, leading to better combined marketing.

However, collaboration takes time and extra effort, and does not always happen unless an incentive is offered. Therefore, should Council approve the necessary additional funding in 2013, it is recommended that the Region plan to fund similar collaborative initiatives by the galleries, by allocating an annual amount of up to \$30,000 for such initiatives. The funding could be approved at the discretion of Regional staff based on the submission of a joint proposal and work plan by three (or more) galleries. As the 2012 decision was for one-time funding, a 2013 Budget Issue Paper would be needed to provide the on-going funding. Staff will bring this forward for Council consideration as part of the 2013 budget process.

### **Funding Cycle for the Selected Organizations**

Once per term, Regional Council would review the arts and cultural organizations which are being directly funded by the Region. In order to provide consistent timing of funding decisions, it is recommended that this review occur in the second year of each Council term. The second year is recommended as in the first year of a Council term, the Region's budget is typically not finalized until March, which can create uncertainty and potential hardship for funding recipients. Using this approach, the organizations selected for funding now (2013 budget year) would have a three-year agreement through 2015. Council would review this for the 2016 budget year, and subsequent agreements would be in effect for four years.

### **CORPORATE STRATEGIC PLAN:**

These recommendations support Action 2.4.1 of the Region's Strategic Plan, "Work with the Creative Enterprise Enabling Organization, area municipalities and others to strengthen the arts and culture sector".

### **FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:**

The approved 2012 budget provided funding of \$816,000 for grants to arts and culture organizations including \$783,000 in direct grants to organizations and \$33,000 for Creative Enterprise Initiative to be matched by funding from other sources and used to support local arts and culture organizations. The 2012 approved budget also included \$100,000 for CEI operations and \$252,400 for the Waterloo Region Arts Fund. As part of the 2013 budget process, Council will need to make decisions regarding the 2013 funding levels for these grants to community arts and culture organizations. Continued funding for the collaborative initiatives by the art galleries, which was not included in the 2012 base budget, would also be determined through the 2013 budget process.



**OTHER DEPARTMENT CONSULTATIONS/CONCURRENCE:** Nil

**ATTACHMENTS:**

Attachment 1 - "Making the Case for a Regional Cultural Funding Program", September 10, 2012, submitted jointly by the Kitchener-Waterloo Art Gallery, The Canadian Clay & Glass Gallery and Cambridge Galleries.

**PREPARED BY:** *L. Bish*, Director, Community Services  
*A. Hinchberger*, Director, Financial Services, Treasury and Tax Policy

**APPROVED BY:** *R. Horne*, Commissioner of Planning, Housing and Community Services  
*C. Dyer*, Chief Financial Officer

## Attachment 1

**MAKING THE CASE FOR A REGIONAL CULTURAL FUNDING PROGRAM**

Submitted Jointly by Kitchener-Waterloo Art Gallery, The Canadian Clay & Glass Gallery  
and Cambridge Galleries

**Introduction**

It is clear from decisions made by Regional Council over the past several annual budgets that its funding policy for cultural institutions is in flux. Historically the Region limited its cultural funding to the KW Symphony and the Grand Philharmonic Choir directly, and to local artists and not-for profit arts organizations indirectly, through the Regional Arts Fund. However, in 2010, the Canadian Clay and Glass Gallery received one-time funding from the Region and for the past five years THEMUSEUM has received substantial financial support through requests brought directly to Regional Council. In 2012, the Prosperity Council's newly created arts enabling organization, the Creative Enterprise Initiative, also received funding from the regions cultural budget.

This year the Kitchener Waterloo Art Gallery, The Canadian Clay & Glass Gallery and Cambridge Galleries together proposed to Regional Council that it provide funding to the 3 institutions for a joint marketing campaign to raise awareness of and bring more visitors to these institutions from both within and outside the Region. Regional Council approved the proposal with the caveat that the funding would only be for 1 year and during that period of time regional staff were directed to develop a new Regional policy for funding local cultural institutions.

As key players in the cultural life of our communities, we are encouraged by this increased commitment at the Regional level and offer the following to assist with the development of a new regional cultural funding policy.

**Targeted Arts Funding to Further Regional Goals**

We suggest there is a regional role for targeted arts funding which contribute to the overall goals of the Regional government, goals which include:

- Encouraging tourism and industry region wide.
- Enhancing the well being of residents in all of the Region's municipal jurisdictions
- Improving the image of Waterloo Region as a dynamic forward thinking metropolitan area with business opportunities, consumer and social services, and cultural amenities equal to, or better than, those offered by any other large urban area in the country.
- Encouraging cooperation and shared goals between municipalities and residents living within Waterloo Region irrespective of municipal boundaries.

### **Restricted Use of Regional Funds**

In keeping with the above noted aspirations, the Regional government might be prepared to provide financial support to qualifying institutions for:

- 1) marketing endeavours,
- 2) enhancing their collections, (where their unique elements are able to attract visitors from outside their local municipality)
- 3) cooperative ventures between two or more art institutions which would assist in creating a critical mass of art activity in the region enhancing the whole local arts scene in the eyes of people outside Waterloo Region, thus attracting visitors and growing the regional brand as a multifaceted cultural hub as well as a good place to work.
- 4) assist with facility improvements and equipment upgrades designed to preserve and display permanent collections and make them more appealing and available to visitors
- 5) assistance with institutional overheads including staffing and utilities, to increase access for visitors through increased open hours at times when visitors are most likely to visit.

### **Institution Requirements for Funding Eligibility**

Funding for arts institutions in the Region of Waterloo should be directed to cultural institutions:

- 1) whose appeal and programmes transcends the interests of the residents in the local municipality in which the institution is located.
- 2) whose collections have provincial and national scope, and whose exhibitions include but are not limited to artists from within the municipal boundaries in which the institutions are located.
- 3) which contribute significantly to the vitality, energy and attraction of the Region as a whole.
- 4) whose programmes attract the attention of audiences outside their immediate community and from outside the Region; bringing both recognition and visitors to the Waterloo Region from beyond the regional borders.
- 5) whose collections and programmes meet provincial and national museum and art gallery standards of excellence.

### **Funding Criteria**

This proposal has suggested regional goals which any funding to local art institutions needs to further be eligible for regional arts funding. In addition, we have identified basic eligibility requirements which individual institutes need to meet to qualify for funding. This section of the report addresses the actual funding criteria to be applied to any grant application from an art institution before funding from the region would be considered.

There is a delicate balance which art institutions need to maintain between their obligations to their local audience and visitors from outside their municipal boundaries. There also needs to be a proportional balance between funding from local municipalities in which the art institution resides and other levels of government. It is not in the interests of the local institution, nor the Region, for one level of tax based support to be substituted for another. Therefore, we recommend that in addition to the qualifying criteria outlined above, Regional funding to arts institutions in Waterloo Region be limited to those institutions which receive funding from their local municipalities, as well as sustaining federal or provincial funding.

To receive regional funding an art institution must:

- 1) be located in the Region of Waterloo
- 2) provide cultural services which contribute to regional goals
- 3) have been in continuous operation for a minimum of 5 years
- 4) qualify for, and be in receipt of, either project or operating funding from the Canada Council for the Arts or the Ontario Arts Council for 3 consecutive years previous to the application for regional funding
- 5) have received funding from local municipalities in the 3 years prior to the application for regional funding, equal to a minimum of 15% of their annual operating budget
- 6) complete a report on the expenditure and impact of regional arts funding from a previous year, if applicable.

### **Joint Funding Request for 2013**

In 2012, the Kitchener Waterloo Art Gallery, The Canadian Clay & Glass Gallery and Cambridge Galleries received \$30,000 to fund a joint marketing campaign which would raise awareness of, and bring more visitors to, our galleries. We believe that combining our marketing efforts has a much greater impact on potential visitors than separate smaller campaigns. Working together also allow us to include the Homer Watson House and Gallery in our advertising even though they were not part of our initial collaboration. Our three institutions believe that an ongoing shared marketing campaign will continue to build awareness and increase visitors from within, and outside, the region and request funding of the same amount in 2013 to continue our efforts. Should our request be approved, we intend to include Homer Watson House and Gallery and other arts organizations, where possible, in the 2013 advertising program.

September 10<sup>th</sup> 2012



## REGION OF WATERLOO

### FINANCE DEPARTMENT Administration Division

Report: F-12-076

**TO:** Chair T. Galloway and Members of the Administration and Finance Committee

**DATE:** September 25, 2012      **FILE CODE:** A35-80

**SUBJECT: MUNICIPAL PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT PROGRAM 2011 RESULTS**

---

#### **RECOMMENDATION:**

For Information

**SUMMARY:** Nil

#### **REPORT:**

The Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing (MMAH) requires all municipalities to produce and publicly report standard performance measures for selected programs through the Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP). The MMAH requires the MPMP measures to be made available to the public by September 30<sup>th</sup> of each year. This report will result in this requirement being met within the stipulated time frame.

The attached MPMP results will be available on the Region's website after Committee has received Report F-12-076. Waterloo Region reports on 9 of the 13 MPMP service areas. Measures relating to fire, parks and recreation, building services, and storm water are not reported by the Region as these services are provided by local municipalities.

MPMP contributes to improved municipal service delivery in Ontario by providing a standardized set of performance measures relating to the efficiency and effectiveness of key service areas. That being said, in certain cases more details and context are required to understand the factors that contribute to reported performance results. MPMP data is useful in providing general trends about current performance levels compared to prior years.

Committee and Council should be cautious when considering these measures in one-year increments. There may be unique circumstances surrounding each municipality's reported results. Measures can be influenced by many factors including:

- Service delivery models - services may be delivered by staff, through private sector contractors, or in partnership with other local governments. Each model can influence how results are reported.
  - e.g., Some municipalities may have employees perform waste collection, while others, like the Region of Waterloo, use a contractor.
- Municipal Council decisions about service levels and quality standards
  - e.g., Council chose to maintain waste site visits as no-charge in the 2012 budget.
- Geographic differences
  - e.g., Some municipalities have a large body of freshwater it can draw upon and send wastewater to, while others, like the Region of Waterloo, rely predominantly on ground water.

- Differences in the age, quality and intensity of use of infrastructure
- Differences in socio-demographic composition, with related differences in service needs
- The extent of urban/rural form within a municipality
  - e.g., Transit and Library services at the Region vary from urban to rural areas, due to population density considerations and services provided by the local municipalities.
- Local decisions about financial policies that influence how costs are reported
  - e.g., The dollar threshold established for capital expenditures can vary by municipality. The Region of Waterloo capitalizes water projects over \$100,000 while other municipalities may capitalize at a lower or higher threshold, depending on the size of their capital plan.

The Province periodically redefines the required measures. In the year a change is made to a measure, the prior years' measures are restated accordingly.

The 2012 MPMP requirements were announced by the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing on September 11, 2012. There are no changes planned for 2012 MPMP reporting.

#### **CORPORATE STRATEGIC PLAN:**

This initiative supports Focus Area 5 of the Region's Corporate Strategic Plan to deliver excellent and responsive services that inspire public trust and specifically Strategic Objective 5.3.2 to further integrate Performance Measurement into Regional Programs.

#### **FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:**

There are no financial implications associated with this report. MPMP data forms part of the information used for comparative analyses across years within the Region's service portfolio, and therefore may contribute to the identification of program efficiencies and/or service level improvement opportunities.

#### **OTHER DEPARTMENT CONSULTATIONS/CONCURRENCE:**

Waterloo Regional Police Services, Transportation and Environmental Services, Planning Housing and Community Services.

**ATTACHMENTS:** MPMP 2011 Results

**PREPARED BY:** *A. Wong*, Manager, Budgets & Performance Measurement

**APPROVED BY:** *C. Dyer*, Chief Financial Officer

**The Regional Municipality of Waterloo**  
Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2011 RESULTS

**Questions about MPMP results should be addressed to:**

Name: Allan Wong	Phone: 519-575-4705
Title: Manager, Budgets and Performance Measurement	
Municipality: Region of Waterloo	
Email: awong@regionofwaterloo.ca	

**Related documents and links:**

2011 FIR at DOC# 1202766 or at <a href="http://cscconramp.mah.gov.on.ca/fir/View/FI113000%20Copy.pdf">http://cscconramp.mah.gov.on.ca/fir/View/FI113000%20Copy.pdf</a>
2011 audited financial statements at: <a href="http://www.regionofwaterloo.ca/en/regionalGovernment/resources/RoWFinal2011FS.pdf">http://www.regionofwaterloo.ca/en/regionalGovernment/resources/RoWFinal2011FS.pdf</a>

## Local Government

### 1.1 GENERAL GOVERNMENT - EFFICIENCY

	2011	2010	2009
1.1 a) Operating costs for governance and corporate management as a percentage of total municipal operating costs.	1.8%	2.1%	2.9%
1.1 b) Total costs for governance and corporate management as a percentage of total municipal costs.	1.6%	2.0%	

**OBJECTIVE:**

Efficient local government.

**NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:**

Governance and corporate management costs grew at a lesser rate than service delivery operating costs.

**REFERENCE:**

- The formulas for efficiency measures were revised in 2009 to reflect changes in the reporting of expenses consistent with accrual accounting concepts. New total cost measures were introduced and revised in 2010. Total costs mean operating costs as defined in MPMP, plus amortization and interest on long-term debt, less revenue received from other municipalities for tangible capital assets.
- Financial Information Return: 91 0206 35 (Operating costs measure) and 91 0206 45 (Total costs measure).

## Police Services

<b>3.1 POLICE SERVICES – EFFICIENCY</b>			
	2011	2010	2009
3.1 a) Operating costs for police services per person. <sup>1</sup>	\$ 223.78	\$ 208.91	\$ 208.65
3.1 b) Total costs for police services per person.	\$ 233.42	\$ 218.30	
<b>OBJECTIVE:</b> Efficient police services.			
<b>NOTES &amp; KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:</b> Policing costs are influenced by the Region's geography, population, crime rates, compensation and benefit packages, charges for goods and services, fuel, and specialized police services that may be required in larger municipalities such as special response teams, forensic identification services, and emergency task forces.			
<b>REFERENCE:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The formulas for efficiency measures were revised in 2009 to reflect changes in the reporting of expenses consistent with accrual accounting concepts. New total cost measures were introduced and revised in 2010. Total costs mean operating costs as defined in MPMP, plus amortization and interest on long-term debt, less revenue received from other municipalities for tangible capital assets.</li> <li>• <sup>1</sup> As of 2009, the efficiency measures for police services exclude expenses for prisoner transportation and court security since expenses for these services will be uploaded to the Province in the future, over a number of years. These correspond to OMBI's PLCE910M and PLCE911M measures.</li> <li>• Financial Information Return: 91 1204 35 (Operating costs measure) and 91 1204 45 (Total costs measure).</li> </ul>			



The Regional Municipality of Waterloo  
Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2011 RESULTS

**3.2 VIOLENT CRIME RATE – EFFECTIVENESS**

		2011	2010	2009
3.2	Violent crime rate per 1,000 persons. <sup>1</sup>	9.2	9.6	9.3

**OBJECTIVE:**

Safe communities.

**NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:**

Crime rates are influenced by economic, social and demographic factors. Crime rates reflect police reported crime only and do not include unreported, unfounded or undetected crime. Crime rates include offences recorded by the Waterloo Regional Police Service and by the Royal Canadian Mounted Police within the same jurisdiction.

**REFERENCE:**

- <sup>1</sup> The number of criminal code incidents for violent crimes as defined by Statistics Canada's Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics (CCJS) and as provided by CCJS in the CLRRATE Verification Table - Line 0100. Statistics Canada has expanded the definition of violent crime. Therefore, prior years are not comparable unless restated. This corresponds to OMBI's PLCE105 measure.

- Financial Information Return: 92 1258 07.

**3.3 PROPERTY CRIME RATE – EFFECTIVENESS**

		2011	2010	2009
3.3	Property crime rate per 1,000 persons. <sup>1</sup>	29.5	31.9	37.5

**OBJECTIVE:**

Safe communities.

**NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:**

Crime rates are influenced by economic, social and demographic factors. Crime rates reflect police reported crime only and do not include unreported, unfounded or undetected crime. Crime rates include offences recorded by the Waterloo Regional Police Service and by the Royal Canadian Mounted Police within the same jurisdiction.

**REFERENCE:**

- <sup>1</sup> The number of criminal code incidents for property crimes as defined by Statistics Canada's Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics (CCJS) and as provided by CCJS in the CLRRATE Verification Table - Line 0200. Statistics Canada has expanded the definition of property crime. Therefore, prior years are not comparable unless restated. This corresponds to OMBI's PLCE110 measure.

- Financial Information Return: 92 1259 07.

**The Regional Municipality of Waterloo**  
Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2011 RESULTS

<b>3.4 TOTAL CRIME RATE – EFFECTIVENESS</b>					
	2011	2010	2009	2008	2007
3.4 Total crime rate per 1,000 persons ( <i>Criminal Code</i> offences, excluding traffic). <sup>1</sup>	44.3	47.5	52.8	48.5	46.7
<b>OBJECTIVE:</b> Safe communities.					
<b>NOTES &amp; KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:</b> Crime rates are influenced by economic, social and demographic factors. Crime rates reflect police reported crime only and do not include unreported, unfounded or undetected crime. Crime rates include offences recorded by the Waterloo Regional Police Service and by the Royal Canadian Mounted Police within the same jurisdiction. Total crime rates do not include traffic offences or offences under other federal statutes such as the Controlled Drug and Substance Act and the Youth Criminal Justice Act.					
<b>REFERENCE:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <sup>1</sup> The number of total (non-traffic) criminal code incidents as defined by Statistics Canada's Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics (CCJS) and as provided by CCJS in the CLRRATE Verification Table - Line 0500. This corresponds to OMBI's PLCE120 measure.</li> <li>• Financial Information Return: 92 1263 07</li> </ul>					

<b>3.5 YOUTH CRIME RATE – EFFECTIVENESS</b>					
	2011	2010	2009	2008	2007
3.5 Youth crime rate per 1,000 youths <sup>1</sup>	57.5	60.2	69.7	64.2	59.8
<b>OBJECTIVE:</b> Safe communities.					
<b>NOTES &amp; KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:</b> Total number of youths charged and cleared otherwise for total (non-traffic) criminal code violations. Does not necessarily reflect the total amount of crimes committed by youth as it does not capture the numbers of youth committing crimes who were not apprehended or arrested for the crimes. Represents the number of youths who were formally charged or who were dealt with using extrajudicial (non-court) measures such as being issued a warning or referral to a community program.					
<b>REFERENCE:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <sup>1</sup> The number of youth cleared by charge and cleared otherwise as provided by Statistics Canada's Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics (CCJS) in the CAYMUN Verification Table - Line 0500. This corresponds to OMBI's PLCE130 measure.</li> <li>□ • Financial Information Return: 92 1265 07</li> </ul>					

## Roads

### 5.1 PAVED ROADS – EFFICIENCY

	2011	2010	
5.1 a) Operating costs for paved (hard top) roads per lane kilometre. <sup>1</sup>	\$ 2,024.84	\$ 1,494.76	
5.1 b) Total costs for paved (hard top) roads per lane kilometre.	\$ 17,968.35	\$ 16,383.20	
<b>OBJECTIVE:</b> Efficient maintenance of paved roads.			
<b>NOTES &amp; KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:</b> 2010 paved roads operating cost was comingled with costs related to bridges and winter maintenance. As part of the Region's process of continuous improvement, costs were better segregated for 2011, and as such 2010 costs were restated to match the 2011 methodology.			
<b>REFERENCE:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <sup>1</sup> The formulas for efficiency measures for paved roads were revised in 2010 to net out revenue received from utilities for utility cut repairs.</li> <li>• The Total cost measure was also revised in 2010. Total costs mean operating costs as defined in MPMP, plus amortization and interest on long-term debt, less revenue received from other municipalities for tangible capital assets.</li> </ul> <hr/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Financial Information Return: 91 2111 35 (Operating costs measure) and 91 2111 45 (Total costs measure).</li> </ul>			

### 5.3 BRIDGES AND CULVERTS – EFFICIENCY

	2011	2010	2009	
5.3 a) Operating costs for bridges and culverts per square metre of surface area.	\$ 7.35	\$ 6.68	\$ 8.21	
5.3 b) Total costs for bridges and culverts per square metre of surface area.	\$ 37.53	\$ 33.22		
<b>OBJECTIVE:</b> Efficient maintenance of bridges and culverts.				
<b>NOTES &amp; KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:</b> Results for 2009 and 2010 have been restated to reflect a methodology consistent with 2011.				
<b>REFERENCE:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The formulas for efficiency measures were revised in 2009 to reflect changes in the reporting of expenses consistent with accrual accounting concepts. New total cost measures were introduced and revised in 2010. Total costs mean operating costs as defined in MPMP, plus amortization and interest on long-term debt, less revenue received from other municipalities for tangible capital assets.</li> </ul> <hr/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Financial Information Return: 91 2130 35 (Operating costs measure) and 91 2130 45 (Total costs measure).</li> </ul>				

**The Regional Municipality of Waterloo**  
Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2011 RESULTS

**5.4 WINTER MAINTENANCE OF ROADS – EFFICIENCY**

	2011	2010	2009
5.4 a) Operating costs for winter maintenance of roadways per lane kilometre maintained in winter.	\$ 3,997.34	\$ 2,803.02	\$ 3,427.06
5.4 b) Total costs for winter maintenance of roadways per lane kilometre maintained in winter.	\$ 3,997.34	\$ 2,803.02	

**OBJECTIVE:**  
Efficient winter maintenance of roads.

**NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:**  
No amortization costs for the Region of Waterloo in winter road maintenance. Snow days: 2009=119, 2010=51, 2011=65.

**REFERENCE:**

- The formulas for efficiency measures were revised in 2009 to reflect changes in the reporting of expenses consistent with accrual accounting concepts. New total cost measures were introduced and revised in 2010. Total costs mean operating costs as defined in MPMP, plus amortization and interest on long-term debt, less revenue received from other municipalities for tangible capital assets.

- Financial Information Return: 91 2205 35 (Operating costs measure) and 91 2205 45 (Total costs measure).

**5.5 ADEQUACY OF PAVED ROADS – EFFECTIVENESS**

	2011	2010	2009	2008	2007
5.5 Percentage of paved lane kilometres where the condition is rated as good to very good. <sup>1</sup>	52%	52%	54%	53%	

**OBJECTIVE:**  
Pavement condition meets municipal objectives.

**NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:**

**REFERENCE:**

- <sup>1</sup> Pavement condition is rated using a Pavement Condition Index (PCI) such as the Index used by the Ontario Good Roads Association (OGRA) or the Ministry of Transportation's Roads Inventory Management System (RIMS).

- Financial Information Return: 92 2152 07.

The Regional Municipality of Waterloo  
Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2011 RESULTS

<b>5.6 ADEQUACY OF BRIDGES AND CULVERTS – EFFECTIVENESS</b>						
		2011	2010	2009		
5.6	Percentage of bridges and culverts where the condition is rated as good to very good. <sup>1</sup>	67%	67%	64%		
<b>OBJECTIVE:</b> Safe bridges and culverts.						
<b>NOTES &amp; KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:</b>						
<b>REFERENCE:</b>						
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The effectiveness measure for bridges and culverts was introduced in 2009.</li> <li>• <sup>1</sup> A bridge or culvert is rated in good to very good condition if distress to the primary components is minimal, requiring only maintenance. Primary components are the main load carrying components of the structure, including the deck, beams, girders, abutments, foundations, etc.</li> </ul>						
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Financial Information Return: 92 2165 07.</li> </ul>						

<b>5.7 WINTER EVENT RESPONSES – EFFECTIVENESS</b>						
		2011	2010	2009	2008	2007
5.7	Percentage of winter events where the response met or exceeded locally determined municipal service levels for road maintenance.	100%	100%	100%	100%	
<b>OBJECTIVE:</b> Response to winter storm events meets locally determined service levels for winter road maintenance.						
<b>NOTES &amp; KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:</b>						
<b>REFERENCE:</b>						
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Financial Information Return: 92 2251 07.</li> </ul>						

## Conventional Transit

<b>6.1 CONVENTIONAL TRANSIT – EFFICIENCY</b>				
	2011	2010	2009	
6.1 a) Operating costs for conventional transit per regular service passenger trip.	\$ 3.62	\$ 3.78	\$ 3.94	
6.1 b) Total costs for conventional transit per regular service passenger trip.	\$ 4.08	\$ 4.24		
<b>OBJECTIVE:</b> Efficient conventional transit services.				
<b>NOTES &amp; KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:</b>				
<b>REFERENCE:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The formulas for efficiency measures were revised in 2009 to reflect changes in the reporting of expenses consistent with accrual accounting concepts. New total cost measures were introduced and revised in 2010. Total costs mean operating costs as defined in MPMP, plus amortization and interest on long-term debt, less revenue received from other municipalities for tangible capital assets.</li> <li>• Financial Information Return: 91 2203 35 (Operating costs measure) and 91 2203 45 (Total costs measure).</li> </ul>				

<b>6.2 CONVENTIONAL TRANSIT RIDERSHIP – EFFECTIVENESS</b>					
	2011	2010	2009	2008	2007
6.2 Number of conventional transit passenger trips per person in the service area in a year.	39.4	37.5	35.0	33.4	31.7
<b>OBJECTIVE:</b> Maximum utilization of municipal transit services.					
<b>NOTES &amp; KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:</b>					
<b>REFERENCE:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Financial Information Return: 92 2351 07.</li> </ul>					

## Wastewater (Sewage)

### 7.1 WASTEWATER COLLECTION/CONVEYANCE – EFFICIENCY

	2011	2010	2009
7.1 a) Operating costs for the collection/conveyance of wastewater per kilometre of wastewater main.	\$ 18,616.57	\$ 16,908.80	\$ 17,930.50
7.1 b) Total costs for the collection/conveyance of wastewater per kilometre of wastewater main.	\$ 23,626.16	\$ 23,070.43	
<b>OBJECTIVE:</b> Efficient municipal wastewater collection/conveyance.			
<b>NOTES &amp; KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:</b> The Region operates a small collection system of 34 km as the majority of the collection system is operated and maintained by the local municipalities. However the Region operates 13 wastewater treatment plants, which results in a disproportionately high cost per kilometre.			
<b>REFERENCE:</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The formulas for efficiency measures were revised in 2009 to reflect changes in the reporting of expenses consistent with accrual accounting concepts. New total cost measures were introduced and revised in 2010. Total costs mean operating costs as defined in MPMP, plus amortization and interest on long-term debt, less revenue received from other municipalities for tangible capital assets.</li> </ul>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Financial Information Return: 91 3111 35 (Operating costs measure) and 91 3111 45 (Total costs measure).</li> </ul>			

### 7.2 WASTEWATER TREATMENT AND DISPOSAL – EFFICIENCY

	2011	2010	2009
7.2 a) Operating costs for the treatment and disposal of wastewater per megalitre.	\$ 399.36	\$ 413.51	\$ 439.54
7.2 b) Total costs for the treatment and disposal of wastewater per megalitre.	\$ 482.96	\$ 504.06	
<b>OBJECTIVE:</b> Efficient municipal wastewater treatment and disposal.			
<b>NOTES &amp; KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:</b>			
<b>REFERENCE:</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The formulas for efficiency measures were revised in 2009 to reflect changes in the reporting of expenses consistent with accrual accounting concepts. New total cost measures were introduced and revised in 2010. Total costs mean operating costs as defined in MPMP, plus amortization and interest on long-term debt, less revenue received from other municipalities for tangible capital assets.</li> </ul>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Financial Information Return: 91 3112 35 (Operating costs measure) and 91 3112 45 (Total costs measure).</li> </ul>			

**The Regional Municipality of Waterloo**  
Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2011 RESULTS

**7.3 WASTEWATER INTEGRATED SYSTEM – EFFICIENCY**

	2011	2010	2009
7.3 a) Operating costs for the collection/conveyance, treatment, and disposal of wastewater per megalitre (integrated system).	\$ 409.11	\$ 421.84	\$ 450.08
7.3 b) Total costs for the collection/conveyance, treatment, and disposal of wastewater per megalitre (integrated system).	\$ 495.34	\$ 515.42	
<b>OBJECTIVE:</b> Efficient municipal wastewater system (integrated system).			
<b>NOTES &amp; KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:</b> The local municipalities operate the majority of the collection system, the Region operates the collection system in North Dumfries and Wellesley. The Region also operates the 13 wastewater treatment plants.			
<b>REFERENCE:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The formulas for efficiency measures were revised in 2009 to reflect changes in the reporting of expenses consistent with accrual accounting concepts. New total cost measures were introduced and revised in 2010. Total costs mean operating costs as defined in MPMP, plus amortization and interest on long-term debt, less revenue received from other municipalities for tangible capital assets.</li> </ul> <hr/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Financial Information Return: 91 3113 35 (Operating costs measure) and 91 3113 45 (Total costs measure).</li> </ul>			

**7.4 WASTEWATER MAIN BACKUPS – EFFECTIVENESS**

	2011	2010	2009	2008	2007
7.4 Number of wastewater main backups per 100 kilometres of wastewater main in a year.	0	0	0	0	
<b>OBJECTIVE:</b> Municipal sewage management practices prevent environmental and human health hazards.					
<b>NOTES &amp; KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:</b>					
<b>REFERENCE:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Financial Information Return: 92 3154 07.</li> </ul>					



The Regional Municipality of Waterloo  
Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2011 RESULTS

<b>7.5 WASTEWATER BYPASSES TREATMENT– EFFECTIVENESS</b>						
		2011	2010	2009	2008	2007
7.5	Percentage of wastewater estimated to have by-passed treatment.	0.590%	0.200%	0.015%	0.117%	0.007%
<p><b>OBJECTIVE:</b> Municipal sewage management practices prevent environmental and human health hazards.</p>						
<p><b>NOTES &amp; KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:</b> Untreated sewage that has not undergone primary and/or secondary treatment estimated at 78 megalitres versus 65672 megalitres of treated water (65750 total megalitres of wastewater).</p>						
<p><b>REFERENCE:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Financial Information Return: 92 3155 07.</li> </ul>						

## Drinking Water

### 9.1 DRINKING WATER TREATMENT – EFFICIENCY

	2011	2010	2009	
9.1 a) Operating costs for the treatment of drinking water per megalitre.	\$ 672.77	\$ 651.49	\$ 707.36	
9.1 b) Total costs for the treatment of drinking water per megalitre.	\$ 869.11	\$ 874.84		

**OBJECTIVE:**

Efficient municipal water treatment services.

**NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:**

The local municipalities operate the majority of the distribution system, the Region operates the distribution system in North Dumfries and Wellesley. The Region also operates a water treatment plant and 44 wells.

**REFERENCE:**

- The formulas for efficiency measures were revised in 2009 to reflect changes in the reporting of expenses consistent with accrual accounting concepts. New total cost measures were introduced and revised in 2010. Total costs mean operating costs as defined in MPMP, plus amortization and interest on long-term debt, less revenue received from other municipalities for tangible capital assets.

- Financial Information Return: 91 3311 35 (Operating costs measure) and 91 3311 45 (Total costs measure).

### 9.4 BOIL WATER ADVISORIES – EFFECTIVENESS

	2011	2010	2009	2008	2007
9.4 Weighted number of days when a boil water advisory issued by the medical officer of health, applicable to a municipal water supply, was in effect.	0.0501	0.0000	0.0000	0.0510	0.0000

**OBJECTIVE:**

Water is safe and meets local needs.

**NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:**

Roseville (population 290) had a boil water advisory for June 28-29 2011

**REFERENCE:**

- Financial Information Return: 92 3355 07.

The Regional Municipality of Waterloo  
Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2011 RESULTS

<b>9.5 BREAKS IN WATER MAINS – EFFECTIVENESS</b>					
	2011	2010	2009	2008	2007
9.5 Number of water main breaks per 100 kilometres of water distribution pipe in a year.	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
<b>OBJECTIVE:</b> Improve system reliability.					
<b>NOTES &amp; KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:</b>					
<b>REFERENCE:</b> • Financial Information Return: 92 3356 07.					

## Solid Waste Management (Garbage)

### 10.1 GARBAGE COLLECTION – EFFICIENCY

	2011	2010	2009
10.1 a) Operating costs for garbage collection per tonne	\$ 110.48	\$ 106.82	\$ 117.40
10.1 b) Total costs for garbage collection per tonne	\$ 110.48	\$ 106.82	

**OBJECTIVE:**

Efficient municipal garbage collection services.

**NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:**

No amortization costs as collection services are provided by a third party contractor.

**REFERENCE:**

- The formulas for efficiency measures were revised in 2009 to reflect changes in the reporting of expenses consistent with accrual accounting concepts. New total cost measures were introduced and revised in 2010. Total costs mean operating costs as defined in MPMP, plus amortization and interest on long-term debt, less revenue received from other municipalities for tangible capital assets.

- Financial Information Return: 91 3404 35 (Operating costs measure) and 91 3404 45 (Total costs measure).

### 10.2 GARBAGE DISPOSAL – EFFICIENCY

	2011	2010	2009
10.2 a) Operating costs for garbage disposal per tonne	\$ 40.51	\$ 55.75	\$ 49.91
10.2 b) Total costs for garbage disposal per tonne or per household	\$ 68.03	\$ 81.24	

**OBJECTIVE:**

Efficient municipal garbage disposal services.

**NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:**

Increases in operating costs were more than offset by decrease in the amount expensed for landfill post-closure liability.

**REFERENCE:**

- The formulas for efficiency measures were revised in 2009 to reflect changes in the reporting of expenses consistent with accrual accounting concepts. New total cost measures were introduced and revised in 2010. Total costs mean operating costs as defined in MPMP, plus amortization and interest on long-term debt, less revenue received from other municipalities for tangible capital assets.

- Financial Information Return: 91 3504 35 (Operating costs measure) and 91 3504 45 (Total costs measure).

**The Regional Municipality of Waterloo**  
Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2011 RESULTS

**10.3 SOLID WASTE DIVERSION (RECYCLING) – EFFICIENCY**

	2011	2010	2009
10.3 a) Operating costs for solid waste diversion per tonne	\$ 114.45	\$ 133.56	\$ 113.83
10.3 b) Total costs for solid waste diversion per tonne or per household	\$ 120.67	\$ 140.40	

**OBJECTIVE:**

Efficient solid waste diversion (recycling) services.

**NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:**

2011 result was impacted by favourable market prices for recyclable materials.

**REFERENCE:**

- The formulas for efficiency measures were revised in 2009 to reflect changes in the reporting of expenses consistent with accrual accounting concepts. New total cost measures were introduced and revised in 2010. Total costs mean operating costs as defined in MPMP, plus amortization and interest on long-term debt, less revenue received from other municipalities for tangible capital assets.

- Financial Information Return: 91 3606 35 (Operating costs measure) and 91 3606 45 (Total costs measure).

**10.4 SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT (INTEGRATED SYSTEM) – EFFICIENCY**

	2011	2010	2009
10.4 a) Average operating costs for solid waste management (collection, disposal and diversion) per tonne	\$ 96.46	\$ 117.61	\$ 104.51
10.4 b) Average total costs for solid waste management (collection, disposal and diversion) per tonne	\$ 120.54	\$ 140.38	

**OBJECTIVE:**

Efficient solid waste management (integrated system).

**NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:**

Reduction in cost per tonne driven by reduced landfill post closure liability costs and high market prices for recyclable goods.

**REFERENCE:**

- The formulas for efficiency measures were revised in 2009 to reflect changes in the reporting of expenses consistent with accrual accounting concepts. New total cost measures were introduced and revised in 2010. Total costs mean operating costs as defined in MPMP, plus amortization and interest on long-term debt, less revenue received from other municipalities for tangible capital assets.

- Financial Information Return: 91 3607 35 (Operating costs measure) and 91 3607 45 (Total costs measure).

The Regional Municipality of Waterloo  
Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2011 RESULTS

**10.5 COMPLAINTS – COLLECTION OF GARBAGE AND RECYCLED MATERIALS  
EFFECTIVENESS**

	2011	2010	2009	2008	2007
10.5 Number of complaints received in a year concerning the collection of garbage and recycled materials per 1,000 households.	11.5	11.2	9.3	12.0	7.5
<b>OBJECTIVE:</b> Improved collection of garbage and recycled materials.					
<b>NOTES &amp; KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:</b>					
<b>REFERENCE:</b> • Financial Information Return: 92 3452 07.					

**10.6 NUMBER OF MUNICIPAL SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT FACILITIES  
EFFECTIVENESS**

	2011	2010	2009	2008	2007
10.6 Total number of solid waste management facilities owned by the municipality with a Ministry of Environment certificate of approval.	6	6	6	6	6
<b>OBJECTIVE:</b> Context for solid waste management facility compliance measure.					
<b>NOTES &amp; KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:</b>					
<b>REFERENCE:</b> • Financial Information Return: 92 3552 07.					

**The Regional Municipality of Waterloo**  
Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2011 RESULTS

**10.7 FACILITY COMPLIANCE – EFFECTIVENESS**

10.7 Number of days per year when a Ministry of Environment compliance order for remediation concerning an air or groundwater standard was in effect for a municipally owned solid waste management facility, by facility.

FIR line #	Facility Name	Days 2011	Days 2010	Days 2009	Days 2008	Days 2007
3553	Ayr waste transfer station	0	0	0	0	0
3554	Cambridge waste transfer station	0	0	0	0	0
3555	Crosshill waste transfer station	0	0	0	0	0
3556	Elmira waste transfer station	0	0	0	0	0
3557	Waterloo waste transfer station	0	0	0	0	0
3558	Wilmot waste transfer station	0	0	0	0	0

List facilities in the order they appear in the 2011 Financial Information Return (FIR).

**OBJECTIVE:**

Municipal solid waste services do not have an adverse impact on environment.

**NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:**

**REFERENCE:**

- Facility Name: 92 3553 03 to 92 3562 03 in Financial Information Return.
- Days: 92 3553 07 to 92 3562 07.

**10.8 DIVERSION OF RESIDENTIAL SOLID WASTE  
EFFECTIVENESS**

	2011	2010	2009	2008	2007
10.8 Percentage of residential solid waste diverted for recycling.	52%	51%	50%	47%	45%

**OBJECTIVE:**

Municipal solid waste reduction programs divert waste from landfills and/or incinerators.

**NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:**

**REFERENCE:**

- Financial Information Return: 92 3655 07.

## Libraries

### 12.1 LIBRARY COSTS PER PERSON – EFFICIENCY

	2011	2010	2009
12.1 a) Operating costs for library services per person.	\$ 37.71	\$ 37.60	\$ 39.39
12.1 b) Total costs for library services per person.	\$ 41.47	\$ 41.41	
<b>OBJECTIVE:</b> Efficient library services.			
<b>NOTES &amp; KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:</b> The Region of Waterloo's library system consists of 10 small branches in small urban/rural communities. The large urban cities within the Region of Waterloo (Cambridge, Waterloo, Kitchener) operate their own library systems.			
<b>REFERENCE:</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The formulas for efficiency measures were revised in 2009 to reflect changes in the reporting of expenses consistent with accrual accounting concepts. New total cost measures were introduced and revised in 2010. Total costs mean operating costs as defined in MPMP, plus amortization and interest on long-term debt, less revenue received from other municipalities for tangible capital assets.</li> </ul>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Financial Information Return: 91 7405 35 (Operating costs measure) and 91 7405 45 (Total costs measure).</li> </ul>			

### 12.2 LIBRARY COSTS PER USE – EFFICIENCY

	2011	2010
12.2 a) Operating costs for library services per use. <sup>1</sup>	\$ 2.16	\$ 2.16
12.2 b) Total costs for library services per use.	\$ 2.38	\$ 2.38
<b>OBJECTIVE:</b> Efficient library services.		
<b>NOTES &amp; KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:</b>		
<b>REFERENCE:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The formulas for efficiency measures were revised in 2009 to reflect changes in the reporting of expenses consistent with accrual accounting concepts. New total cost measures were introduced and revised in 2010. Total costs mean operating costs as defined in MPMP, plus amortization and interest on long-term debt, less revenue received from other municipalities for tangible capital assets.</li> </ul>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><sup>1</sup> The calculation of electronic library uses was updated in 2009 to include the number of people using the public library wireless connection. In 2011 three additional categories of reference transactions were added to the definition of library uses. This may affect the comparability of 2011 results with earlier years.</li> </ul>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Financial Information Return: 91 7406 35 (Operating costs measure) and 91 7406 45 (Total costs measure).</li> </ul>		



The Regional Municipality of Waterloo  
Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2011 RESULTS

**12.3 LIBRARY USES – EFFECTIVENESS**

		2011	2010	
12.3	Library uses per person. <sup>1</sup>	17.45	17.40	
<b>OBJECTIVE:</b> Increased use of library services.				
<b>NOTES &amp; KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:</b>				
<b>REFERENCE:</b>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><sup>1</sup> The calculation of electronic library uses was updated in 2009 to include the number of people using the public library wireless connection. In 2011 three additional categories of reference transactions were added to the definition of library uses. This may affect the comparability of 2011 results with earlier years.</li> </ul>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Financial Information Return: 92 7460 07.</li> </ul>				
<b>Line numbers for prior years:</b>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The FIR reference for the measure, library uses per person, did not change in 2009.</li> </ul>				

**12.4 ELECTRONIC LIBRARY USES – EFFECTIVENESS**

		2011	2010	2009	
12.4	Electronic library uses as a percentage of total library uses. <sup>1</sup>	32%	28%	19%	
<b>OBJECTIVE:</b> Better information on library usage.					
<b>NOTES &amp; KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:</b>					
<b>REFERENCE:</b>					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><sup>1</sup> The calculation of electronic library uses was updated in 2009 to include the number of people using the public library wireless connection. In 2011 three additional categories of reference transactions were added to the definition of library uses. This may affect the comparability of 2011 results with earlier years.</li> </ul>					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Financial Information Return: 92 7463 07.</li> </ul>					

The Regional Municipality of Waterloo  
Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2011 RESULTS

<b>12.5 NON - ELECTRONIC LIBRARY USES – EFFECTIVENESS</b>					
		2011	2010	2009	
12.5	Non-electronic library uses as a percentage of total library uses. <sup>1</sup>	68%	72%	81%	
<b>OBJECTIVE:</b> Better information on library usage.					
<b>NOTES &amp; KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:</b>					
<hr/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Financial Information Return: 92 7462 07.</li> </ul>					

## Land Use Planning

### 13.2 PRESERVATION OF AGRICULTURAL LAND DURING REPORTING YEAR EFFECTIVENESS

	2011	2010	2009	2008	2007
13.2 Percentage of land designated for agricultural purposes which was not re-designated for other uses during the reporting year.	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
<b>OBJECTIVE:</b> Preservation of agricultural land.					
<b>NOTES &amp; KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:</b> Preservation of agricultural land in 2011.					
<b>REFERENCE:</b> • Financial Information Return: 92 8163 07.					

### 13.3 PRESERVATION OF AGRICULTURAL LAND RELATIVE TO 2000 EFFECTIVENESS

	2011	2010	2009	2008	2007
13.3 Percentage of land designated for agricultural purposes which was not re-designated for other uses relative to the base year of 2000.	99%	99%	99%	99%	99%
<b>OBJECTIVE:</b> Preservation of agricultural land.					
<b>NOTES &amp; KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:</b> Preservation of agricultural land versus 2000 base land. 91177 hectares agricultural land, 200 hectares re-designated in 2009, or 0.22%.					
<b>REFERENCE:</b> • Financial Information Return: 92 8164 07.					

The Regional Municipality of Waterloo  
Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2011 RESULTS

**13.4 CHANGE IN NUMBER OF AGRICULTURAL HECTARES DURING REPORTING YEAR  
EFFECTIVENESS**

	2011	2010	2009	2008	2007
13.4 Number of hectares of land originally designated for agricultural purposes which was re-designated for other uses during the reporting year.	0	0	0	0	0
<b>OBJECTIVE:</b> Preservation of agricultural land.					
<b>NOTES &amp; KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:</b>					
<b>REFERENCE:</b> • Financial Information Return: 92 8165 07.					

**13.5 CHANGE IN NUMBER OF AGRICULTURAL HECTARES SINCE 2000  
EFFECTIVENESS**

	2011	2010	2009	2008	2007
13.5 Number of hectares of land originally designated for agricultural purposes which was re-designated for other uses since January 1, 2000.	1,423	1,423	1,423	1,223	1,223
<b>OBJECTIVE:</b> Preservation of agricultural land.					
<b>NOTES &amp; KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:</b> Preservation of agricultural land versus 2000 base land. 91177 hectares agricultural land, 200 hectares re-designated in 2009, or 0.22%.					
<b>REFERENCE:</b> • Financial Information Return: 92 8166 07.					



**REGION OF WATERLOO**

**FINANCE DEPARTMENT  
Procurement & Supply Services Division**

---

**TO:** Chair T. Galloway and Members of the Administration and Finance Committee

**DATE:** September 25, 2012                      **FILE CODE:** F18-20

**SUBJECT: 150 FREDERICK STREET FIRE PANEL REPLACEMENT EMERGENCY PURCHASE**

---

**RECOMMENDATION:**

For Information

**SUMMARY:** Nil

**REPORT:**

The existing fire panel at 150 Frederick Street, Kitchener was scheduled to be replaced this year. In July 2012 the fire panel caught fire. The fire was extinguished quickly and the damage was confined to the panel. The cause of the fire is still under investigation. As the fire panel is an essential piece of equipment for life safety of building occupants and protection of Regional property, the replacement of the damaged fire panel was deemed an emergency purchase. Staff received a quotation from Chubb Edwards, the supplier of the original fire panel and fire alarm systems, in the amount of \$122,513.47 including all applicable taxes. A purchase order was issued to cover this purchase.

Work to be completed under this purchase included the supply of all material, labour, and other equipment necessary to replace the building's existing fire panel. The fire panel had reached the end of its useful life cycle (20 years) and was scheduled to be replaced with a current and more reliable system. Chubb Edwards is expected to begin work shortly with completion expected by November 2012. To ensure building safety until the fire panel replacement is completed, the panel continues to be maintained by Facilities Maintenance staff and Chubb Edwards. Additionally, the fire panel continues to be monitored by Chubb Edwards 24 hours a day, so in the event of an emergency, the Region would be notified immediately.

This purchase is in accordance with the Emergency Purchase provision, as described within the Regional Purchasing By-law which states in Part 8 Clause 22. (1) The Chief Purchasing Officer may acquire any goods or services that are required by the Region to respond to an emergency; and (4) after the emergency is over, the Chief Purchasing Officer shall report to Council any expenditure with a value in excess of \$100,000 and the Chief Purchasing Officer shall include an explanation in regard to the emergency and the need for the goods or service.

**CORPORATE STRATEGIC PLAN:**

Award of this contract meets Focus Area 2 – Growth Management and Prosperity of the Corporate Strategic Plan and specifically strategic objective 2.2 to continue to prioritize and implement capital program projects required to meet community needs and ensure sustainability.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:**

Chubb Edwards Quote dated July 24, 2012	\$122,513.47
Less: Municipal Rebate of 86.46% of HST (11.24%)	<u>(12,186.30)</u>
Total	<u>\$110,327.17</u>

The approved 2012 Facilities Regional Accommodation Capital Budget provides \$1,387,000 for capital building upgrades to 150 Frederick Street (project #90025) to be funded from debentures. To-date, \$505,935 of the total project budget has been spent or committed, leaving a balance of \$881,065. The cost of the fire panel replacement will be accommodated within the remaining budget.

**OTHER DEPARTMENT CONSULTATIONS/CONCURRENCE:** Nil

**ATTACHMENTS:** Nil

**PREPARED BY:** *C. Whitlock*, Director, Procurement & Supply Services

**APPROVED BY:** *C. Dyer*, Chief Financial Officer



**REGION OF WATERLOO**  
**FINANCE DEPARTMENT**  
**Procurement & Supply Services**

---

**TO:** Chair T. Galloway and Members of the Administration and Finance Committee

**DATE:** September 25, 2012                      **FILE CODE:** F18-30

**SUBJECT: WATERLOO LANDFILL SITE – SOUTH WORKSHOP HEAVY BAY DOORS  
EMERGENCY REPLACEMENT**

---

**RECOMMENDATION:**

THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo transfer \$172,987.92 from capital project 01154 (New Landfill Cells Design & Construction) to capital project 01010 (Facilities Maintenance-Waterloo Landfill) to finance the costs of the emergency replacement of four overhead doors at the Waterloo Waste Management Centre – South Workshop.

**SUMMARY:**

The Regional Municipality of Waterloo has purchased on an emergency basis four (4) overhead doors manufactured by Indotech Industrial Doors and supplied and installed by Waterloo Garage Doors Inc. at a cost of \$192,100. This emergency purchase adheres with the Purchasing By-law 61-91 where clause 22 (1) The Chief Purchasing Officer may acquire any goods or services that are required by the Region to respond to an emergency, and that (4) After the emergency is over, the Chief Purchasing Officer shall report to Council any expenditure with a value in excess of \$100,000 and the Chief Purchasing Officer shall include an explanation in regard to the emergency and the need for the goods or services.

**REPORT:**

The Region of Waterloo Waste Management Division is responsible for a wide variety of programs and services related to the collection, diversion and disposal of waste from residential and industrial/commercial sources. The Waterloo Waste Management Centre is the division's largest facility and includes a South Workshop that is used for vehicle and heavy equipment servicing and maintenance. The South Workshop building is also used for storage of tools and equipment as well as for offices and amenities for operations staff. Construction of the South Workshop was completed in early 2009 and the building was commissioned in April 2009.

Contract T2007-127 for the construction of the Waterloo Landfill South Workshop, included the installation of 12 Ultrafast Albany Door Systems, a fabric overhead bay door system. Four Ultrafast doors were installed in the heavy bay and 8 doors were installed in the roll off bay in accordance with the contract specifications. The Ultrafast door was specified in the contract documents as the most technically suitable for the South Workshop application. In addition, the Ultrafast door contained large window panels that allowed daylight into the South Workshop.

On April 16<sup>th</sup>, 2012, at approximately 2 p.m. heavy bay door No. 1 ripped and fell from the building and sustained severe damage when it was operated during an episode of strong winds. Winds were recorded at up to 76.6 km/hour at a continuous weather monitoring station located at the adjacent Waterloo Region Emergency Service Training Centre.

In the weeks following the incident a thorough investigation into the door failure revealed that the door in question would require substantial repairs totaling approximately \$16,000 plus applicable taxes and that the 3 remaining heavy bay doors Nos. 2, 3, and 4 were demonstrating similar signs of wear and tear due to local prevailing wind conditions.

It has recently been noted by the door supplier that the doors specified in the original construction contract are not suitable for the significant prevailing westerly wind conditions that occur at the site. Given that each overhead door weighs several hundred kilograms, the health and safety risk should an employee be struck with a falling door warranted immediate replacement on an emergency basis. Corporate Health and Safety was consulted regarding the door failure and provided recommendations regarding a safe operating protocol until the doors can be replaced.

Facilities Maintenance and Waste Management staff collaborated to investigate alternatives for a replacement bay door. In researching a door more appropriate to the prevailing wind conditions at the South Workshop, staff evaluated three door options. Since each door system is different, the factors used to evaluate each door system included wind rating, door seal, energy costs, and whether a local door service provider could service the door. Based on history when service providers come from the GTA area it can take in excess of 24 hours to respond to emergency maintenance calls, which is unacceptable when Facilities Maintenance needs to secure the building. The Indotech door, currently installed at the Material Recycling Centre at the Waterloo Landfill Site performs very well under similar site conditions and the local service provided to date by Waterloo Garage Door has been very satisfactory. Based on the factors noted above, the Indotech Door supplied by Waterloo Garage Door was selected for the emergency replacement of heavy bay door Nos. 1, 2, 3, and 4 at the South Workshop.

Facilities Engineering and Waste Management staff will continue to evaluate the operations of the eight (8) remaining roll off bay doors to determine if a replacement plan is needed for the remaining bay doors.

#### **CORPORATE STRATEGIC PLAN:**

The recommendation in this report is consistent the Corporate Strategic Plan Objective 2.2 to develop, optimize and maintain infrastructure to meet current and projected needs.

#### **FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:**

Heavy Bay Door Replacements	\$192,100.00
Less: Municipal Rebate of 86.48% of HST (11.24%)	<u>(19,112.08)</u>
Total	<u>\$172,987.92</u>

The 2012 approved Waste Management Capital Program includes \$4,172,000 for the development of the South Expansion Area and the construction of the North Expansion Area Cell Four (NE-4), Leachate and Landfill Gas Collection Systems (capital project 01154). The source of financing for capital project 01154 is debentures. The award of T2012-001 (Report F-12-012) for this work resulted in the savings of approximately \$236,000. Staff recommends that part of this savings be allocated towards the purchase of these overhead bay doors.



**OTHER DEPARTMENT CONSULTATIONS/CONCURRENCE:**

Staff from Facilities Engineering, Waste Management and Health & Safety provided input in the preparation of this report.

**ATTACHMENTS:** Nil

**PREPARED BY:** *C. Whitlock*, Director of Procurement & Supply Services

**APPROVED BY:** *C. Dyer*, Chief Financial Officer



**REGION OF WATERLOO**  
**CORPORATE RESOURCES**  
**Council and Administrative Services**

---

**TO:** Chair Tom Galloway and Members of the Administration and Finance Committee

**DATE:** September 25, 2012 **FILE CODE:** C04-01

**SUBJECT: APPROVAL OF CONSENT AGENDAS**

---

**RECOMMENDATION:**

THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo amend Procedural By-law 00-031, as amended, for the implementation of the consent agenda process for Regional Administration and Finance, Community Services and Planning and Works Standing Committee meetings, effective January 1, 2013 for a one year trial period;

AND FURTHER THAT appropriate notice be given in advance of the amendment to the Procedural By-law.

**REPORT:**

Direction was given at the May 8, 2012 Administration & Finance Committee and May 16, 2012 Regional Council meetings to staff to bring a report back to implement the consent agenda process along with any necessary amendments to the Procedural By-law. As outlined in Report CR-CLK-12-005, consent agendas are used to deal with routine matters on the agenda. Potential items for inclusion in a Council and Committee consent agenda that were outlined in that report included: approval of minutes; receiving of correspondence; reports for information; approval of Finance reports; approval of Committee recommendations; and appointments to Committees. Councillors had some concerns with items such as Finance reports and Committee recommendations being included in a Council consent agenda, however they are currently approved in a manner similar to what would be done for consent agendas. Based on how the Council agenda currently proceeds, it is being recommended in this report to approve the implementation of consent agendas for the three main Standing Committees of Administration and Finance, Community Services and Planning and Works only and not Regional Council at this time. The use of consent agendas will be reviewed at the end of 2013.

**Process**

The Regional Chair and Committee Chairs met to discuss the process for including items on the consent agendas. It was recommended by the Committee Chairs that a process for placing items on the consent agendas be put in place whereby the Standing Committee Chairs would work with the appropriate staff one week prior to the Standing Committee meeting to review the agenda items for inclusion on the consent portion of the agenda. Staff supports this position. Education and training with staff on the proposed criteria for consent agenda items will take place prior to the implementation.

## **Addition or Removal of Items from Consent Agenda**

Any member of Council can request an item be removed from the consent agenda by either contacting the Clerk's Office in advance of the meeting or making the request at the consent agenda item (example, proposed item #4a) at the meeting. It will continue to be the role of each councillor in a consent agenda process to ensure they have scrutinized all agenda items ahead of the meeting and are satisfied with the proposed consent agenda items. It will also be the responsibility of each individual councillor to declare a pecuniary interest on any related matters and request those items to be removed from the consent agenda and taken separately. The sample agendas attached include an agenda item for request to remove an item from the consent agenda.

## **Criteria**

A list of potential criteria for automatically including or excluding items on the consent agenda has been developed. It is proposed that annual reports not be included on the consent agendas in order to provide a full opportunity to review these matters, especially for those areas where Regional Council fulfills the role as the Board of Health, Library Board, etc. The Region has delegated a number of administrative matters to staff and many of the reports that are brought forward to Standing Committees and Council would meet with the criteria for excluding items from the consent agenda. The potential criteria are.

- a) Exclude from consent agenda:
  - items with registered delegations;
  - presentations;
  - delegations;
  - items with known pecuniary interests;
  - items that are politically sensitive/controversial;
  - annual reports
  
- b) Include on consent agenda:
  - reports for information or with relatively routine recommendations after consultation between Committee Chair and Commissioner;
  - correspondence/communications;
  - routine matters such as monthly report of development activity, etc.

The sample agendas attached to this report reflect the implementation of these criteria.

## **Webcasting/Public Viewing**

Additional time will be required by the Clerk's Office in preparing agendas and discussing in advance with the Commissioners which items will qualify for the consent agenda. There will be an initial learning phase if consent agendas are implemented. Since Standing Committee and Council meetings are also now being webcast, it is important keep in mind the people watching the meetings and how they may be confused by the consent agenda process and the fast movement through portions of the agenda. This is not unlike what currently happens at Council meetings with certain approvals such as Finance reports and Committee recommendations. Transparency and openness is an important consideration. The Chair of the meeting will be responsible to ensure that the public observing the meetings are adequately informed and clear on the proceedings.

**Public Notice**

There will be twenty-one (21) days public notice required for the amendment to the Procedural By-law. The amendments will be brought forward to the December 5<sup>th</sup> Regional Council meeting. These amendments will include: addition of definition of consent agenda; re-ordering of the agenda outlined in the by-law and other housekeeping matters such as clearly defining deadlines for delegation registration, use of website postings for giving notice, ability to use email for rescheduled meetings, etc.

**Alternatives/Options**

If Committee wishes to implement a different approach for consent agendas, the following options are available:

1. Implement consent agendas for all Council and Standing Committee (Administration and Finance, Community Services and Planning and Works) meetings;
2. Implement consent agendas for Council meetings only;
3. Maintain the current agenda process (no change)

**CORPORATE STRATEGIC PLAN:**

The recommendation for consent agendas falls under Strategic Focus Area #5, Service Excellence to ensure Regional programs and services are efficient and effective.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:**

Costs for providing notice of the proposed amendments to the Procedural By-law in the newspapers can be covered in the current budget.

**OTHER DEPARTMENT CONSULTATIONS/CONCURRENCE:**

All Departments will be affected by this move to Consent Agendas. The Regional Chair and Committee Chairs have also been consulted in the preparation of this report.

**ATTACHMENTS:**

Sample Consent Agenda for each Standing Committee  
Copy of Report CR-CLK-12-005 available upon request

**PREPARED BY:** *Lee Ann Wetzel*, Manager, Council & Administrative Services/Deputy Clerk

**APPROVED BY:** *Kris Fletcher*, Director, Council & Administrative Services/Regional Clerk

# **SAMPLE COMMUNITY SERVICES COMMITTEE** **CONSENT AGENDA**



MEDIA RELEASE: Friday, May XX, XXXX, 4:30 p.m.

## **REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY OF WATERLOO COMMUNITY SERVICES COMMITTEE AGENDA**

Tuesday, May XX, XXXX  
9:00 a.m.  
Regional Council Chamber  
150 Frederick Street, Kitchener

1. **MOTION TO RECONVENE INTO OPEN SESSION**
2. **DECLARATIONS OF PECUNIARY INTEREST UNDER THE *MUNICIPAL CONFLICT OF INTEREST ACT***
3. **DELEGATIONS**

4.

### **CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS**

Items on the Consent Agenda can be approved in one motion of Committee to save time. Prior to the motion being voted on, any member of Committee may request that one or more of the items be removed from the Consent Agenda and voted on separately.

### **REQUEST TO REMOVE ITEMS FROM CONSENT AGENDA**

#### **REPORTS – Public Health**

- a) PH-12-XXX/P-12-XXX, Smoke-Free Policy for New Leases and Transfers in Regionally-Owned Community Housing – Annual Update

#### **REPORTS – Social Services**

- b) SS-12-XXX, Waterloo Region Energy Assistance Program Update
- c) SS-12-XXX, Provincial Funding for Sunnyside Home
- d) SS-12-XXX, Request for Domiciliary Hostel Agreement Assignment and Amendment

**REPORTS – Planning, Housing and Community Services**

- e) CR-RS-12-XXX/P-12-XXX/F-12-XXX, Region of Waterloo Community Housing Inc. – Completion of Transfer of Properties

**INFORMATION/CORRESPONDENCE**

- f) Memo: 2012 Elementary School Suspension Update
- g) Memo: First Response Protocol 2011 Update
- h) Memo: Ontario Works Community Forum 2012
- i) Council Enquiries and Requests for Information Tracking List

<b><u>REGULAR AGENDA RESUMES</u></b>
--------------------------------------

**5. REPORTS – Public Health**

- a) PH-12-XXX/CR-CLK-LIC-12-XXX, Water Pipe Smoking in Waterloo Region

**REPORTS – Social Services**

- b) SS-12-XXX, Ontario Retirement Homes Act 2010

**REPORTS – Planning, Housing and Community Services**

- c) CA-12-XXX/P-12-XXX, Rent Supplement Program Review 2011-2012
- d) P-12-XXX, Housing Services Act – One-Date Chronological System for Coordinated Access Waiting List Applications
- e) P-12-XXX, Joseph Schneider Haus and McDougall Cottage – 2011 Operations and 2012 Planned Initiatives

**6. OTHER BUSINESS****7. NEXT MEETING – May XX, XXXX****8. ADJOURN**

# **SAMPLE ADMINISTRATION AND FINANCE COMMITTEE** **CONSENT AGENDA**



MEDIA RELEASE: Friday, May XX, XXXX, 4:30 p.m.

## **REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY OF WATERLOO ADMINISTRATION AND FINANCE COMMITTEE AGENDA**

Tuesday, May XX, XXXX  
11:00 a.m.  
Regional Council Chamber  
150 Frederick Street, Kitchener

1. **MOTION TO RECONVENE INTO OPEN SESSION**
2. **DECLARATIONS OF PECUNIARY INTEREST UNDER THE *MUNICIPAL CONFLICT OF INTEREST ACT***
3. **DELEGATIONS**

4. **CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS**

Items on the Consent Agenda can be approved in one motion of Committee to save time. Prior to the motion being voted on, any member of Committee may request that one or more of the items be removed from the Consent Agenda and voted on separately.

### **REQUEST TO REMOVE ITEMS FROM CONSENT AGENDA**

#### **REPORTS – Human Resources**

- a) CA-HR-12-XXX, Waterloo Region Energy Assistance Program Update
- b) CA-HR-12-XXX, Additions to Human Resources Policy Manual

#### **REPORTS – Finance**

- c) F-12-XXX, Quarterly Summary of Tenders, Request for Proposals and Consultant Proposals Approved by the Chief Administrative Officer
- d) F-12-XXX, Investment Position at December 31, 2011
- e) F-12-XXX, P2012-09 Professional Banking Services

**REPORTS – Corporate Resources**

- f) CR-ITS-12-XXX, Information Technology Services Program Review – Close Out Report

**REPORT OF THE AUDIT COMMITTEE**

- g) Minutes of the Audit Committee – June XX, XXXX

**OTHER BUSINESS**

- h) Council Enquiries and Requests for Information Tracking List

<b><u>REGULAR AGENDA RESUMES</u></b>
--------------------------------------

**5. REPORTS – Chief Administrative Officer**

- a) CA-EM-12-XXX, Debrief Report on Helicopter Crash – November XX, 2011

**REPORTS – Finance**

- b) F-12-XXX, 2013 Budget Timetable

**REPORTS – Corporate Resources**

- c) CR-RS-12-XXX, Community Policing Partnerships Program (Ministry of Community Safety and Correctional Services) – Renewal Agreement
- d) CR-CLK-12-XXX, Ontario Association of Police Services Boards (OAPSB) White Paper – Defaulted Fines, Provincial Offences Court

**6. REPORT OF THE AUDIT COMMITTEE**

- a) Consolidated Financial Statements of the Regional Municipality of Waterloo - December XX, 2011

**7. OTHER BUSINESS**

**8. NEXT MEETING – May XX, XXXX**

**9. ADJOURN**



# **SAMPLE PLANNING AND WORKS COMMITTEE** **CONSENT AGENDA**



MEDIA RELEASE: Friday, May XX, XXXX, 4:30 p.m.

## **REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY OF WATERLOO** **PLANNING AND WORKS COMMITTEE** **AGENDA**

Tuesday, May XX, XXXX  
1:00 p.m.  
Regional Council Chamber  
150 Frederick Street, Kitchener

1. **MOTION TO RECONVENE INTO OPEN SESSION**
2. **DECLARATIONS OF PECUNIARY INTEREST UNDER THE *MUNICIPAL CONFLICT OF INTEREST ACT***
3. **DELEGATIONS**
4. **PRESENTATIONS**
5. **REQUEST TO REMOVE ITEMS FROM CONSENT AGENDA**

### **CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS**

Items on the Consent Agenda can be approved in one motion of Committee to save time. Prior to the motion being voted on, any member of Committee may request that one or more of the items be removed from the Consent Agenda and voted on separately.

### **REPORTS – PLANNING, HOUSING AND COMMUNITY SERVICES**

#### **COMMUNITY PLANNING**

- a) P-12-XXX, Notification of Upcoming East Side Lands Master Environmental Servicing Plan and Community Plan Public Information Centre 2
- b) P-12-XXX, Monthly Report of Development Activity for May 2012
- c) P-12-XXX, Councillor's Request for Response Regarding the Town of Halton Hills' Resolution Concerning Provincial Regulations for Commercial Fill Operations

#### **COMMUNITY SERVICES**

- d) P-12-XXX, Regional Heritage Conservation Toolbox

**TRANSPORTATION PLANNING**

- e) P-12-XXX, Walk Cycle Waterloo Region and King-Victoria Transit Hub Walking and Cycling Links - Joint Public Consultation Centre

**REPORTS – TRANSPORTATION AND ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES****DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION**

- f) Bishop Street Improvements, Conestoga Boulevard to Concession Road - Information Package in Advance of Public Consultation Centre
- f) Northfield Drive Corridor Class Environmental Assessment Study, King Street to Davenport Road, City of Waterloo and Township of Woolwich - Information Package in Advance of Public Consultation Centre
- g) E-12-XXX, Consultant Selection – Detailed Design and Services During Construction, Fountain Street Bridge Rehabilitation over the Grand River, City of Cambridge

**TRANSIT**

- h) E-12-XXX, Alternate Fuel Technology for Transit Buses

**TRANSPORTATION**

- i) E-12-XXX, Renewal of Red Light Camera Agreement between the Ministry of Transportation of Ontario and the Regional Municipality of Waterloo

**WATER**

- j) Kitchener WWTP Phase 3 Upgrades Municipal Class Environmental Assessment – Information Package in advance of Public Information Centre #2

**INFORMATION/CORRESPONDENCE**

- k) Memo, Response to Councillor's Request for Information about Unrehabilitated Sand and Gravel Pits in Waterloo Region
- l) Memo, 2014 Canadian Institute of Transportation Engineers – Region of Waterloo

**OTHER BUSINESS**

- m) Council Enquiries and Requests for Information Tracking List

<b><u>REGULAR AGENDA RESUMES</u></b>
--------------------------------------

**6. REPORTS – PLANNING, HOUSING AND COMMUNITY SERVICES**

---

**COMMUNITY SERVICES**

- a) P-12-XXX, Year End 2011 Population and Household Estimates for the Region of Waterloo

**TRANSPORTATION PLANNING**

- b) P-12-XXX, Recommended Grand River Transit 2012 Fare Structure

**REPORTS – TRANSPORTATION AND ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES****TRANSIT**

- c) E-12-XXX, *MobilityPlus* 5 Year Business Plan (2012 – 2016)

**RAPID TRANSIT**

- d) E-12-XXX, Stage 1 Light Rail Transit: Vehicle Procurement
- e) CR-RS-12-XXX, Authorization to Expropriate (1st Report) Lands Supplementary to Phase 1 of Stage 1 for Rapid Transit Project Representing a Further Partial Taking from the Property Municipally Known as 750-760 King Street West, Kitchener

**TRANSPORTATION**

- f) E-12-XXX, Revised 2012 Transportation Base, System Expansion, and Airport Capital Budget

**WATER**

- g) E-12-XXX, Standard of Care – Safe Drinking Water Act
- h) E-12-XXX, Strange Street Water Supply System Class Environmental Assessment Update: Notice of Completion

**WASTE MANAGEMENT**

- i) E-12-XXX, Shingle Diversion – Pilot Program Update
- j) E-12-XXX, Waste Management Division Update

**7. OTHER BUSINESS****8. NEXT MEETING – May XX, XXXX****9. ADJOURN**



**REGION OF WATERLOO**

**CORPORATE RESOURCES  
Council and Administrative Services**

---

**TO:** Chair Tom Galloway and Members of the Administration and Finance Committee

**DATE:** September 25, 2012 **FILE CODE:** A34-41

**SUBJECT: RESPONSE TO INTEGRATED ACCESSIBILITY STANDARDS REGULATION  
(BUILT ENVIRONMENT)**

---

**RECOMMENDATION:**

THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo forward "Appendix A: Region of Waterloo Response to the Integrated Accessibility Regulation (Built Environment)" attached to report CR-CLK-12-017 dated September 25, 2012, as the Region's official response to the Ministry of Community and Social Services.

**REPORT:**

**Background**

When the *Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act, 2005* (AODA) was enacted, the Province of Ontario committed to developing standards in accessibility in the areas of customer service, information and communication, employment, transportation, and the built environment. Now, seven years later, the final set of standards in the built environment, Design of Public Spaces, is being proposed for regulation as an amendment to the Integrated Accessibility Standards Regulation (IASR) under the AODA.

The proposed amendments to the IASR include changes to the existing provisions of the IASR in the areas of accessibility planning, employment, and transportation, along with the addition of a set of standards in the Design of Public Spaces. The proposed amendments were released on the Regulatory Registry on August 15, 2012, for a 45-day review period. All submissions for comment must be received by the Ministry of Community and Social Services by October 1, 2012.

The proposed amendments to the existing provisions of the IASR include:

- Adding a definition of "mobility aid" to the Regulation
- Clarifying aspects of the accessibility planning, including allowing for joint accessibility plans.
- Clarifying when to consult with employees during the employee accommodation process.
- Replace the word "courtesy seating" in the Transportation Standards to "priority seating"
- Clarify the use of automated and verbal bus stop announcements.

The proposed Design of Public Spaces Standards covers exterior spaces and other areas not currently under the *Ontario Building Code*. On the Ministry of Community and Social Service's website the Ministry indicates that accessibility standards for buildings will be proposed at a later date through the *Ontario Building Code* rather than through the AODA. The proposed standards are intended for new construction and planned development, and will not require the retrofitting of existing public spaces unless the space is being renovated. The proposed standards, to be implemented by 2016, outline requirements in seven areas of the built environment:

- Recreation trails and beaches
- Outdoor eating areas
- Outdoor play areas

- Exterior paths of travel (sidewalks, curbs, ramps, stairs, pedestrian signals)
- On- and off-street accessible parking
- Service areas (queue lines and waiting areas)
- Maintenance (must maintain accessibility related equipment in public spaces)

### **Region of Waterloo Involvement in the Consultation Process**

Since 2010, the Region of Waterloo has been involved in a working group, led by the Association of Municipalities of Ontario (AMO), working with the Accessibility Directorate of Ontario (ADO) to provide input and advice on the development of accessibility standards in the built environment. Through active participation on this working group Region of Waterloo staff have had opportunity to participate in the development of the built environment standard, resulting in the present proposed Design of Public Spaces Standards. Region of Waterloo staff appreciate taking part in the working group, and commend AMO for their efforts in advocating for municipalities across Ontario. The present proposed amendments to the IASR reflect the focus of the working group on ensuring municipalities can meet the accessibility requirements within the specified timeframe while also improving accessibility for people with disabilities.

### **Comments on the Proposed Amendments to the IASR**

To gather comments on the proposed amendments to the IASR, Citizen Service worked with staff from various departments across the Region including Corporate Resources, Human Resources, Planning, Housing, and Community Services, Social Services, and Transportation and Environmental Services. These comments are specified in a response letter to the Ministry of Community and Social Services in Appendix A of this report.

- Staff support the direction of the proposed amendments to the existing provisions in the IASR. Staff are recommending that an additional amendment be made to the IASR to clarify the consultation requirements in the IASR.
- Staff support the scope and application of the proposed Design of Public Spaces Standards. By excluding spaces covered under the *Ontario Building Code*, with a plan to include accessibility standards in future *Ontario Building Code* amendments, the potential regulatory burden has been reduced. Further, by applying the proposed standards to new and planned development, the standards can be incorporated into future project plans and budgeted as such, creating an achievable accessibility standard.
- The proposed Design of Public Spaces standards are scheduled to come into effect by January 1, 2016. This will allow the Region of Waterloo to develop tools and resources to support implementation, plan and budget to incorporate the standards into upcoming projects, and, in some cases, implement the standards ahead of the required timeline on existing or upcoming projects, such as in the Waterloo Regional Police North Division. The release of the proposed standards also help the Region of Waterloo to set priorities for retrofitting existing spaces and to make proactive capital improvements to reduce barriers for people with disabilities.
- It is unclear if the requirements for outdoor play spaces specified in the proposed standards will apply to child care play spaces and other spaces not accessed by the public. Staff have recommended that the ministry specify that the requirement apply to public play spaces.
- The proposed requirements for accessible pedestrian signals may require the relocation of some poles when the signals are being installed. This may be both challenging and costly. Staff are urging the Province to make funding available to municipalities to implement the requirements of the standard, recognizing the anticipated increase to costs for installing and upgrading pedestrian signals.
- The Region of Waterloo recommends that the accessible parking requirements be linked to land use and zoning by-laws, rather than a universal minimum percentage of accessible parking spaces. The need for accessible parking differs depending on the type of facility, for example more spaces may be needed for medical facilities than for commercial facilities. Linking accessible parking to zoning may reduce barriers for people with disabilities.

- Staff appreciate the proposed amendment to the existing transportation standards to replace “courtesy seating” with “priority seating” on transit vehicles. This change in wording will help clarify with staff, the public, and persons with disabilities the intent of these important seats on transit vehicles, giving priority to persons with disabilities.
- The current IASR requires municipalities to consult with their accessibility advisory committee, the public, and persons with disabilities in accessibility planning and in several transportation standards. Since the accessibility advisory committee is comprised of members of the public who have disabilities, staff recommend additional amendments be made to those provisions requiring consultation, to clarify that municipalities are to consult with their accessibility advisory committee or the public and persons with disabilities.
- The Design of Public Spaces Standards is the final standard the Province committed to developing under the AODA. Staff recommend that, with this final standard in place, the *Ontarians with Disabilities Act, 2001* (ODA) be repealed. This will remove the annual reporting required under the ODA, which is currently being addressed by the multi-year reporting required under the AODA.

#### **CORPORATE STRATEGIC PLAN:**

The Region of Waterloo’s active involvement in the consultation process for the standards developed under the *Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act, 2005* is an identified action under the Corporate Strategic Plan Focus Area 5: Deliver excellent and responsive services that inspire public trust, Action 5.1.3: Implement the standards under the *Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act* (AODA) to comply with Provincial regulations.

#### **FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:**

NIL

#### **OTHER DEPARTMENT CONSULTATIONS/CONCURRENCE:**

Many Departments at the Region provided comment on the proposed amendments to the Integrated Accessibility Regulation including: Corporate Resources; Human Resources; Planning, Housing, and Community Services; Social Services, and Transportation and Environmental Services.

#### **ATTACHMENTS**

Appendix A: Region of Waterloo Response to the Proposed Amendments to the Integrated Accessibility Regulation

**PREPARED BY:** *Vanessa Lopak*, Social Planning Associate  
*Charlotte Gravlev*, Manager, Citizen Service

**APPROVED BY:** *Gary Sosnoski*, Commissioner of Corporate Resources

## **Appendix A: Region of Waterloo Response to Integrated Accessibility Regulation (Built Environment)**

October 1, 2012

### **Attention: The Hon. John Milloy, Minister of Community and Social Services**

c/o Accessibility Directorate of Ontario  
Ministry of Community and Social Services  
777 Bay Street, Suite 601a  
Toronto, Ontario, Canada  
M7A 2J4

### **RE: Feedback on the Proposed Amendments to the Integrated Accessibility Standard**

Dear Minister Milloy,

Since the *Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act, 2005* was released seven years ago the Region of Waterloo has been closely observing the development process and draft accessibility standards for the built environment. Providing accessibility standards for buildings and spaces is a significant undertaking and the Region of Waterloo recognizes the evolution that the draft built environment standard has undergone in light of the extensive consultation and feedback processes undertaken by the Accessibility Directorate of Ontario.

This letter of response to the proposed amendments to the Integrated Accessibility Standard, incorporating the Design of Public Spaces Standards, outlines the comments from the Region of Waterloo as we consider the ways in which the standards could be implemented. This letter was compiled by Region of Waterloo staff and approved by the Region of Waterloo Administration and Finance Standing Committee of Council on September 25, 2012. The 45-day review period did not allow the approval of the letter to be ratified by Regional Council prior to the October 1, 2012 deadline.

Overall, the Region of Waterloo finds the proposed Design of Public Spaces Standards to provide enough guidance to help in setting priorities for making improvements in accessibility for people with disabilities. The requirements to consult with the municipal accessibility advisory committee on several aspects of the standard will allow us to focus on local needs, and the standards offers the flexibility to set local guidelines for implementation. Comments on specific aspects of the proposed standard are outlined below.

**Standard development process:** The Region of Waterloo has appreciated the extensive consultation process undertaken by the Accessibility Directorate of Ontario, engaging the Association of Municipalities of Ontario for advice on how accessibility standards will be implemented within a municipal context. It is clear by the application, scope and timing of the present proposed standard that the ADO has attempted to create an achievable standard that reduces barriers for people with disabilities across Ontario.

**Application:** The application of the Design of Public Spaces Standards to new and renovated spaces reflects the economic reality in which municipalities operate.

**Scope:** The present proposed standard, outlining accessibility standards for outdoor spaces and areas not otherwise covered under the *Ontario Building Code*, provides opportunity to integrate accessibility standards for buildings in existing legislation, reducing the regulatory burden on municipalities.

**Timing:** The application of the proposed standard starting January, 2016 provides time for the Region of Waterloo to fully develop compliance awareness and evaluation tools, and to plan for upcoming projects. This timing will allow the Region of Waterloo to comply in advance on some existing projects where feasible, and to plan and budget for upcoming projects appropriately.

**Outdoor Play Spaces:** It is unclear if the requirements for outdoor play spaces apply equally to public spaces, such as parks, as to enclosed spaces found in municipally-run child care centres. We recommend that the regulation specify that this requirement applies to municipally-run public outdoor play spaces.

**Accessible Pedestrian Signals:** There will be significant budgetary implications for implementing Subsection 80.27 of the proposed standard. In addition to the cost of replacing pedestrian signals with the vibro-tactile accessible pedestrian signals, it may be challenging and costly to relocate the poles. In light of this, the Region of Waterloo recommends that the Province make funding available to municipalities to support the implementation of the Design of Public Spaces Standards.

**Accessible Parking:** The Region of Waterloo recommends that Subsection 80.35 establish a minimum number of off-street accessible parking spaces based on the land use and municipal zoning by-laws rather than an overall minimum percentage of spaces. It is our experience that there are different demands for accessible parking depending on the use of the building, such that more accessible spaces are needed for health care facilities than for other facilities. Basing accessible parking on the type of facility may provide better accessibility for persons with disabilities.

**Amendments to the Transportation Standards:** The Region of Waterloo appreciates the change in language for “courtesy seating”, substituting “priority seating” in the transportation standards. This change provides clarity and consistency for transit staff, the public, and persons with disabilities on the intent and expectation of the priority seats on transit vehicles.

**Consulting with AAC’s, the public, and persons with disabilities:** Within the existing Integrated Accessibility Standards Regulation there are several provisions which require municipalities to consult with an accessibility advisory committee, the public, and persons with disabilities. These requirements are under subsections 4(1), 78 (1), and 78 (1) of the existing IASR, and 80.7 (2), 80.19, 80.28, and 80.37 of the proposed amendments. The Region of Waterloo recommends that amendments be made under each of these subsections to replace the requirements that municipalities must “*consult with their municipal accessibility advisory committees, where one has been established in accordance with subsection 29 (1) or (2) of the Act, the public and persons with disabilities*” with “*consult with their municipal accessibility advisory committees, where one has been established in accordance with subsection 29 (1) or (2) of the Act, or with the public and persons with disabilities*”. This would clarify the expectations for municipalities, acknowledge that the municipal accessibility advisory committees are comprised of both members of the public and persons with disabilities, as well as provide consistency within the regulation regarding consultation.

**Repeal of the *Ontarians with Disabilities Act, 2001*.** Once the amendments to the IASR are in place, including the Design of Public Spaces Standards, the Region of Waterloo recommends the Province repeal the *Ontarians with Disabilities Act, 2001*. This will remove the annual accessibility



reporting requirements for municipalities, which is currently being addressed by the multi-year reporting requirements under the AODA, and will ensure a clear understanding of the legislated requirements for organizations regarding accessibility.

Should you have any questions regarding this submission, please contact:

Vanessa Lopak  
Social Planning Associate  
Region of Waterloo  
Citizen Service, Council and Administrative Services  
519-575-4757 ex 3861  
519-575-4608 (TTY)  
[vlopak@regionofwaterloo.ca](mailto:vlopak@regionofwaterloo.ca)

Thank you once more for providing opportunity to give feedback on the proposed amendments to the Integrated Accessibility Standard. We look forward to working with the Ministry to implement this important and groundbreaking piece of legislation.

Sincerely,

Kris Fletcher  
Director, Council and Administrative Services / Regional Clerk

CC: Association of Municipalities of Ontario



## REGION OF WATERLOO

### CORPORATE RESOURCES

#### Council and Administrative Services – Information Management and Archives

**TO:** Chair T. Galloway and Members of the Administration and Finance Committee

**DATE:** September 25, 2012 **FILE CODE:** A10-00

**SUBJECT:** LEGAL HOLD POLICY

#### RECOMMENDATION:

THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve and implement the Legal Hold Policy as outlined in Appendix “A” and attached to Report CR-CLK-12-018 dated September 25, 2012.

#### SUMMARY:

This report establishes a legal hold policy that impacts Region Councillors and staff. A legal hold will prevent the destruction of records. Once litigation/arbitration is foreseeable, this report establishes the procedures for initiating and establishing a legal hold.

#### REPORT:

Subject to certain privileges, the law requires the Region of Waterloo to retrieve and produce all records, regardless of format, that are relevant to litigation involving the Region of Waterloo. Therefore, any intended or scheduled destruction of documents must stop once litigation/arbitration becomes reasonably foreseeable, or when the information has been requested under the *Municipal Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act* (MFIPPA), *Personal Health Information Protection Act* (PHIPA) or the federal *Personal Information Protection and Electronic Documents Act* (PIPEDA). That information will then be subjected to a “Legal Hold”, which shall involve its collection and segregation pending further direction from applicable staff.

A legal hold is an order to cease destruction and preserve all records, regardless of form, related to the nature or subject of the legal hold. This order is usually given by a corporation to its staff and agents in response to pending or potential litigation. In the event that a legal hold is placed on a certain set of records, the legal hold would supersede the Information Retention and Disposal by-law, thus preserving records that are scheduled for destruction. Other municipalities have implemented similar policies and/or procedures. Specifically, Niagara Region used the Region of Waterloo’s draft policy as the basis for their policy, which was approved in June 2012.

Currently, the process by which a legal hold is placed is informal and as technology changes the ability to place a legal hold in certain systems is more feasible, but the process by which this is prompted and carried out is not documented. The form and characteristics of electronic information has resulted in changes to litigation procedures involving electronic information and how that is “discovered”. With regards to electronic information this is considered e-discovery, which refers to “discovery” in litigation terms that pertain to electronic information.

By implementing a legal hold policy, in the event of litigation, an employee related issue such as a human rights investigation or a Freedom of Information request, the process for preserving and obtaining all related documentation is formalized and the roles for staff are clearly outlined.

In regards to litigation the Regional Solicitor will be designated as the lead for initiating the process, the Commissioner, Human Resources will initiate the process with regards to employee matters and the Access and Privacy Officer for Freedom of Information requests. As a result, all information related to the litigation will be reliable, admissible and have integrity.

Therefore, Councillors and staff should be aware that any record (including paper, electronic, email, text message, etc.) that relates to Regional business should be retained and kept in the event of a Legal Hold or access request under Freedom of Information or Privacy legislation.

#### An initiation of a legal hold:

A legal hold may be initiated by, without limitation, the following circumstances:

- imminent lawsuit is apparent;
- pre-litigation correspondence, such as a letter from a third party or their legal counsel threatening legal action or a letter from a party's attorney;
- retainer of counsel and/or experts;
- partial settlement of claims;
- human rights investigation, arbitration and labour issues; and
- a formal request made under *Municipal Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act*, *Personal Health Information Protection Act* or the federal *Personal Information Protection and Electronic Documents Act*.

#### Information/instruction for a legal hold

- that records be managed according to normal operating policy;
- that the destruction or alteration of records be stopped when litigation is pending or thought to be pending etc.;
- that the notice of pending or potential litigation be transmitted to the persons with the authority to initiate the legal hold and ensure that it is carried out properly;
- all custodians of relevant information should be given notice that a legal hold has been initiated and confirm receipt of notification, and agree in writing to comply;
- the litigation may be very broad. Council and Regional staff, including without limitation, in-house and external consultants should be consulted to ensure that the legal hold is successful;
- the process for determining what records must be held from destruction and how;
- that electronic document profiles must not be edited when legal action is pending or in process;
- metadata must be maintained with relevant documents;
- when to call in an outside expert to employ special software or other tools to locate and sort information;
- the need to have a discovery plan to address issues of preservation of information, proportionality of potentially relevant documentation, and an analysis of cost vs. benefit of the exercise; and
- a repository of relevant or potentially relevant documents subject to legal hold must be developed. The repository must meet the unique retention requirements and access needs of the subset of an organization's stored documents. Ideally this information should be categorized and tagged according to relevance.

#### Implementation and the impact on Council and staff

The implementation of this operating principle would be for the most part limited to communication and awareness. Information Management and Archives and/or Legal Services

staff can present the operating principle to Coordinating Committees and Management Team meetings. Staff is also preparing a briefing package for Council with respect to information practices. Council and staff would only be impacted in the event of litigation pertaining to a specific program area, which would implement the hold.

The Information Retention and Disposal By-Law 93-076 (as amended) will be updated to include a reference to placing a Legal Hold.

**CORPORATE STRATEGIC PLAN:**

Focus Area – Service Excellence

Objective – Ensure Regional programs and services are efficient and effective and demonstrate accountability to the public

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:**

NIL

**OTHER DEPARTMENT CONSULTATIONS/CONCURRENCE:**


Legal Services, Human Resources, Risk Management, Internal Audit and Council and Administrative Services participated in the development of the policy. Other interdepartmental working groups provided comment and revision. Other municipalities were also consulted.

**ATTACHMENTS**

Appendix A - Legal Hold Policy

**PREPARED BY:** *Oriana Sharp*, Manager, Information Management and Archives  
*Arlene Metz*, Corporate Solicitor

**APPROVED BY:** *Gary Sosnoski*, Commissioner, Corporate Resources

 <b>CORPORATE RESOURCES POLICY</b>		Section #	Policy #
		<b>7</b>	
		Approval Date:	Revision Date:
Title:	<b>LEGAL HOLD</b>		
Responsibility:	Council & Administrative Services/ Information Technology Services/Legal Services	Approval Level:	Council
Applies to:	All Staff/Council		

### POLICY STATEMENT:

All information regardless of format, is discoverable pursuant to Rule 30 of the Rules of Civil Procedure and therefore subject to litigation. The ordinary destruction of documents must stop once litigation becomes reasonably foreseeable.

This policy also applies with appropriate modifications to records subject to requests or appeals under access to information provisions in applicable Freedom of Information (FOI) and Privacy statutes.

### DEFINITIONS:

This policy adopts the following definitions from the *Canada Evidence Act*:

- Section 30 that a "record" includes the whole or any part of any book, document, paper, card, tape or other thing on or which information is written, records, stored or reproduced."
- Section 31.8 that an "electronic document" means data that is recorded or stored on any medium in or by a computer system or other similar device and that can be read or perceived by a person or a computer system or other similar device. It includes a display, printout or other output of that data.

#### Litigation

- Includes but is not limited to, a proceeding before a court, hearing before a quasi-judicial tribunal or commissioner, and Coroner's Inquests.

#### Metadata

- provides information about a certain item's content. For example, an image may include metadata that describes how large the picture is, the color depth, the image resolution, when the image was created, and other data. A text document's metadata may contain information about how long the document is, who the author is, when the document was written, and a short summary of the document

**OPERATING PRINCIPLES:**

A "legal hold" program defines the process by which information is identified, preserved and maintained when it has been determined that a duty to preserve has arisen as a result of specific, predictable or identifiable litigation or an access request under FOI or Privacy legislation. When preservation of records is required for litigation, the duty to preserve supersedes the Information Retention and Disposal By-law 93-076 (as amended)

The Region will institute a legal hold program, when litigation is pending, or is reasonably foreseeable. The normal and routine destruction of records must be suspended despite the *Information Retention and Disposal By-law 93-076*, (as amended) and a legal hold will be established. The authority to place a legal hold is vested with either the Regional Solicitor, Commissioner, Human Resources or Access and Privacy Advisor or their respective designate, as applicable. Affected records must be preserved until the legal hold is released by the appropriate authority or their respective designate.

This policy and procedure applies to all Regional Councillors and staff including full-time, part-time, temporary, contract, students, interns and volunteers, if applicable, and includes all records, regardless of format, made or received in the transaction of Regional business.

**OPERATING DETAILS:**

A legal hold will be established to ensure that information related to litigation is reliable, has integrity and is admissible.

The responsibility for leading the process of a legal hold is shared between Legal Services, Human Resources, Council and Administrative Services, as well as Information Technology Services.

Violations of this policy and procedure are subject to disciplinary action.

**PROCEDURES:**

The stages of the legal hold process will be to identify, collect, preserve, review and produce information related to litigation in the most cost effective manner.

**Identification**

- Councillors and Regional staff including full-time, part-time, temporary, contract, students, interns, volunteers and consultants, if applicable, who become aware of any administrative, civil, or criminal, or quasi-criminal claim, investigation or proceeding, through the receipt of notification or other information identifying the possibility of the same, must immediately notify their immediate supervisor who will in turn report to the responsible Manager, Director and Commissioner, if necessary.

The Regional Solicitor, Commissioner, Human Resources or Information Access and Privacy Advisor or their respective designate in consultation with the responsible Department, will identify whether to initiate a legal hold and identify Councillors and Regional staff subject to the hold.

- The Regional Solicitor, Commissioner, Human Resources or Information Access and Privacy Advisor or their respective designate as applicable, will notify all custodians of relevant information that a legal hold has been initiated. The notice will inform affected Regional staff of their obligation to identify and preserve all evidence that may be relevant to the legal hold.
- Councillors and Regional staff subject to the legal hold must acknowledge both receipt and understanding of the legal hold and agree to comply with the legal hold without undue delay by e-mail and memorandum to the Regional Solicitor, Commissioner, Human Resources or Information Access and Privacy Advisor or their respective designate as applicable. Any Regional staff subject to a legal hold should consult Information Management and Archives and Information Technology Services for assistance in securing and preserving their records.

### **Collection**

Upon notice of a legal hold, affected Councillors and Regional staff must immediately suspend deletion, overriding, or any other destruction and preserve all records regardless of format, relevant to the legal hold that are under their control. This includes electronic records wherever stored, including, but not limited to, in emails, in DOCS Corporate, on hard drives of Region computers, laptops, on flash drives, CD-ROMS, DVDs, memory sticks, zip disks, diskettes or mobile devices. Metadata must be maintained with relevant documents.

Councillors and Regional staff must not destroy or amend records that are responsive to access requests made under the Municipal Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act (MFIPPA), the Personal Health Information Protection Act, 2004 (PHIPA) or the federal Personal Information Protection and Electronic Documents Act (PIPEDA). The Information Access and Privacy Advisor (for Freedom of Information requests), and the relevant contact person (for person health information requests) will communicate the need to apply a legal hold to the relevant Regional staff. The Manager of any activity affected by PIPEDA will communicate the need to apply a legal hold to the relevant Regional staff with assistance from the Information Access and Privacy Advisor.

- Previously deleted information is exempt from a legal hold.

### **Preservation**

- Affected Councillors and Regional staff must preserve all existing records as well as any new information or records that are relevant to the subject of the legal hold notice, regardless of format, which are generated after receipt of such notice;
- Once a hold has been placed Councillors and Regional staff are not to amend, correct or otherwise alter records

- The development of a separate repository, electronic or otherwise, of relevant and potentially relevant information, may be required for ease of preservation and production to other parties.

**Review**

- Legal counsel, Commissioner, Human Resources or the Information Access and Privacy Advisor or designate with carriage of the matter will then determine what records should be held and in what manner for the duration of the period during which the legal hold is in effect.

**Production**

- Affected Councillors and Regional staff will cooperate with the Regional Solicitor, Commissioner, Human Resources or Information Access and Privacy Advisor or their respective designate, as applicable, to produce records for the legal proceeding.
- The Regional Solicitor, Commissioner, Human Resources or Information Access and Privacy Advisor or their respective designate as applicable, will determine and communicate to affected Councillors and Regional staff when a legal hold may be lifted and evidence no longer preserved.

**SEE ALSO:**

*Information Retention and Disposal By-law 93-076 (as amended)*

*Official Repository for Electronic Documents Operating Principle 7.7*

*Use of Shared Drives Operating Principle (7.8)*

*Transfer of Document Access/Security DOCS Corporate Standard (7.9.2)*

*Document Classification/Retention/Disposition DOCS Corporate Standard (7.9.5)*

*Treatment of Official and Transitory Documents DOCS Corporate Standard (7.9.6)*

*Saving E-mail and Attachments into DOCS, DOCS Corporate Interim Guideline (7.9.8)*





## REGION OF WATERLOO

### CORPORATE RESOURCES Facilities Management and Fleet Services

**TO:** Chair Tom Galloway and Members of the Administration and Finance Committee

**DATE:** September 25, 2012

**FILE CODE: V05-20(A)**

**SUBJECT: PRE-BUDGET APPROVAL FOR 2013 VEHICLE PROCUREMENT**

#### RECOMMENDATION:

THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve the pre-budget expenditure not to exceed \$6,069,000 for the purchase of 37 vehicles and equipment to replace those listed in Appendix A of report CR-FM-12-014 dated September 25, 2012, which were scheduled for replacement in 2013 in the Ten Year Capital Plans of various departments, to be funded from the appropriate vehicle/equipment reserve funds.

**SUMMARY:** Nil

#### REPORT:

In September 2003, Regional Council approved a vehicle procurement cycle which called for the tender of vehicles in the fall of the preceding year with delivery for most vehicles occurring during the January - May time frame of the year of procurement. Specialized vehicles with longer delivery times will be delivered throughout the year. This change was approved to ensure that vehicles are delivered in a timely manner to meet operational requirements in the year they are due for replacement, reduce tender costs and enable vehicle deliveries and conversions to be scheduled to fit the availability of limited staff resources. If this report is approved, replacements for the vehicles listed in Appendix A will be procured in October/November/December 2012 and delivered in 2013 at which time funds will be expended.

The 2013 capital budget forecast identified the need to potentially replace 89 vehicles in 2013 valued at \$11,257,000. The capital plan is based on an average useful service life determined through the use of life cycle models established in collaboration with the operating department and fleet services. The procurement cycle for 2013 was initiated in March 2012 and as part of the process, Regional staff completed a detailed evaluation of the vehicles, including mechanical and body condition inspections, operating cost and operational requirements, utilization and a green fleet analysis. The evaluation provided the information to determine if any of the vehicles should be replaced and or if they could be deferred or deleted from the fleet establishment. As a result of this review, staff determined that 52 vehicles could be deferred for one or more years for a total deferred expenditure of \$5,188,000. The vehicles deferred are shown in Appendix B.

As a result of this evaluation, the original 2013 vehicle procurement plan for 89 vehicles has been reduced to 37 vehicles at a budgeted cost of \$6,069,000. The list of the 37 vehicles to be replaced in 2013 is shown in Appendix A. All of these vehicles are being replaced due to high kilometers, heavy off road usage, higher than normal operating and maintenance requirements in the previous year, or higher than normal fuel consumption.

**Green Fleet Initiatives Update:**

As part of the strategy to green the fleet, opportunities to reduce fuel consumption will be investigated before procurement to purchase more fuel efficient vehicles (i.e. gas/electric hybrid, clean diesel technology, or right sizing for more fuel efficient vehicles as appropriate).

Fleet Services' life cycle modeling determines the environmental and economic benefits of using vehicles which consume less fuel to meet the same functional requirements. This program has resulted in optimization of life cycles for existing vehicles/equipment, right sizing of the fleet, greater standardization, reduction in emissions and fuel consumed by the replacement units.

Over the past 5 years vehicles were replaced with clean diesel and hybrid vehicles which resulted in a 30-50% reduction in fuel consumed. This profound improvement combined with the successes experienced in refurbishing heavy equipment and the utilization of OEM (Original Equipment Manufacturer) and aftermarket technologies has enhanced efficiencies and sustainability of the Regional fleet.

A pilot of electronic devices which control engine idling is currently underway. (Ref: Region of Waterloo Strategic Plan "Environmental Sustainability 1.2.4"). Although the implementation and data collection is in the early stages of the pilot, preliminary analysis suggests fuel savings of 6% would be achievable.

**CORPORATE STRATEGIC PLAN:**

This procurement will enable Regional programs to continue to provide the current level of service to citizens and will result in reduced air pollution from Regional operations. These results meet the goals and objectives of Focus Areas #1 and #6 in the Corporate Strategic Focus, namely "Environmental Sustainability: Protect and enhance the environment", and "Service Excellence: Foster a culture of citizen/customer service that is responsive to community needs".

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:**

Funding for the purchase of replacement vehicles will be provided from existing vehicle and equipment reserves set up for this purpose or other specific capital funds approved as part of the budget process. The revised capital plans for vehicle and equipment for 2013 which includes the deferral of 52 vehicles at a cost of \$5,188,000 will be included in the 2014 budget. Procurement documents for the 37 new vehicles will be processed as set out in the purchasing by-law.

**OTHER DEPARTMENT CONSULTATIONS/CONCURRENCE:**

Finance and the Regional programs affected have reviewed this report and their comments included as appropriate.

**ATTACHMENTS**

Appendix A –2013 Vehicle Procurement Plan

Appendix B –2013 Vehicle Deferrals

**PREPARED BY:** *Rick Ellig, Manager, Fleet Services*

**APPROVED BY:** *Gary Sosnoski, Commissioner, Corporate Resources*

**SUMMARY – 2013 VEHICLE PROCUREMENT PLAN**  
(Budget values in \$000s)

**Waste****Management**

Pickup	\$25
Loader w/8y bucket	\$400
Loader w/8y bucket	\$410
Loader	\$400
Hydraulic wheeled excavator	\$260
Compactor	\$890
D8 Dozer	\$950
Skid steer	\$90
Automatic tarper	\$110
Sub total:	\$3,535

**Water -****Operations &  
Maintenance**

Pickup Utility	\$35
Pickup Utility	\$35
Minivan	\$35
Sub total:	\$105

**Transportation  
– Roads,  
Signs, Signals**

Pickup class 1	\$33
Pickup class 1	\$33
Pickup class 1	\$33
Pickup class 1	\$33
Pickup class 1	\$33
Pickup class 1	\$33
U-body plow and wing truck	\$310
U-body plow and wing truck	\$310
Excavator	\$120
Aerial truck	\$240
Sub total:	\$1,178

**Airport**

SINGLE AXLE DUMP TRUCK	\$130
Plow for #102	\$25
Dump box for #102	\$50
Granular spreader for #102	\$105
Sub total:	\$310

**EMS**

Ambulance	\$130
Ambulance	\$130
Ambulance	\$130
Ambulance	\$130
Ambulance	\$130
Ambulance	\$130
SUV, 4wd	\$65
Van class 3	\$36
Sub total:	\$881

**Facilities**

Van	\$60
Sub total:	\$60

Total:	37	=====	\$6,069
--------	----	-------	---------

## APPENDIX B

**SUMMARY – 2013 VEHICLE DEFERRALS**

(Budget values in \$000s)

**Waste Management**

Loader	\$400
Pickup class 3, plow spreader	\$60
Rolloff truck	\$210
Rolloff truck	\$210
Hydraulic track excavator	\$210
Articulating rock truck	\$400
Water truck	\$250
Giant vacuum	\$80
Compressor	\$18
Pump	\$28
Sub-total:	\$1,866

**Water - Operations & Maintenance**

Van	\$60
Pickup 4wd	\$35
Pickup 4wd	\$35
Pickup	\$35
Van	\$35
Van	\$55
Car	\$22
Class 5 chemical truck – hypo chlorite	\$100
Class 5 chemical truck – fl – hypo chlorite	\$100
Pickup 4wd	\$35
Pickup 4wd	\$35
Sub-total:	\$547

**Transportation – Roads, Signs, Signals**

Pickup class 1	\$33
Mini van	\$35
Dump truck class 4	\$60
Dump truck class 4	\$60
Dump truck class 4	\$60
Loader, backhoe	\$120
Aerial truck - Versa Lift	\$205
Pickup class 1	\$28
Dump truck class 5	\$80
Pickup class 2, 4door - zone painter	\$33
Pickup class 1	\$33
Van class 2	\$55

	Dump truck class 4	\$60
	Trailer	\$10
	Sub-total:	\$872
<b>Water - Lab</b>		
	Van	\$35
	Van	\$35
	Van	\$35
	Van	\$35
	SUV	\$35
	Van	\$35
	Sub-total:	\$210
<b>Airport</b>		
	Sweeper	\$350
	Tandem fire truck	\$1,000
	Mower	\$20
	Bush Hog	\$15
	Sub-total:	\$1,385
<b>EMS</b>		
	Ambulance, bariatric upgrade	\$15
	Sub-total:	\$15
<b>Sunnyside Home</b>		
	Mobility bus	\$93
	Van, passenger	\$30
	Sub-total:	\$123
<b>Facilities</b>		
	Pickup, midsize	\$35
	Mini van	\$35
	Van, class 2	\$60
	Pickup, 4wd	\$40
	Sub-total:	\$170
Total Deferred:	52	\$5,188

**COUNCIL ENQUIRIES AND REQUESTS FOR INFORMATION****ADMINISTRATION AND FINANCE COMMITTEE**

<b>Meeting date</b>	<b>Requestor</b>	<b>Request</b>	<b>Assigned Department</b>	<b>Anticipated Response Date</b>
26-Jan-10	Committee	Report on a policy related to development charge grants, exemptions and deferral requests, to include past history/practice, implications, and options.	Finance	2013, as part of Development Charges By-law review
08-Jun-10	A&F	Review current funding for the tax increment grant program, with full range of funding options.	Finance	2012
23-Nov-10	A&F	Assess the application of the prequalification guidelines (both generals and sub contractors) and report back to A & F after one years experience	Finance	2012
10-Jan-12	A&F	Consent agendas	Council Services	Sep-2012
28-Feb-12	A&F	Process for calculating/appeal of development charges	Finance / Legal Services	2013, as part of Development Charges By-law review
20-Mar-12	A&F	Report maintaining the optional class for new multi-residential development, including revenue forecasts	Finance	Fall 2012/Winter 2013
25-Sep-12	P&W	Consultant's report on economic development in Waterloo Region	CAO	Dec-2012