



Policy Review Committee Action Report
for the January 12th, 2016 meeting held in
the Council Chambers following Council

PRESENT: Mayor Antonakos, Deputy-Mayor Flynn, Councillor Black, Councillor Doucett, Councillor Redmond, Councillor Fritz, Councillor Trimble, Duncan Rogers, Clerk, Paul Knowles, Chief Administrative Officer

- 1) **DECLARATION OF PECUNIARY/CONFLICT OF INTEREST AND GENERAL NATURE THEREOF** – now or anytime during the meeting
- 2) **PUBLIC MEETING – NONE THIS EVENING**
- 3) **REGISTRATION OF PUBLIC WISHING TO SPEAK**
- 4) **COMMUNICATION 127027 IS A CLOSED MEETING**
- 5) **PLEASE TURN OFF ALL CELL PHONES AND PAGERS**
- 6) **IF THERE IS AN ADDENDUM, IN ACCORDANCE WITH SECTION 15.2.4 (OF THE STRIKING REPORT) DOES THE COMMITTEE WISH TO APPROVED THIS ADDENDUM**

The following items are for information only and will not be discussed unless the Committee chooses to do so. The Chair will entertain a motion to receive and file for those items not pulled out for discussion.

COMMUNICATION 127023

Received from	Community Alliance for Refugee Resettlement (CARR)
Addressed to	Paul Knowles, Chief Administrative Officer
Date	December 7 th , 2015
Topic	Refugee Resettlement

SUMMARY

Last fall, a group of local citizens formed the Community Alliance for Refugee. These volunteers are working hard to prepare a settlement plan so they can hit the ground running as soon as they are connected with their first family. Details are available on the [Website for the Community Alliance for Refugee Resettlement](#). Volunteers and donations are welcome.

127023 Continued

COMMENT

For Council's information.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Receive and Record

COMMITTEE DECISION

Receive and Record

COMMUNICATION 127024

Received from	Ombudsman Ontario
Addressed to	Town of Carleton Place
Date	December 24 th , 2015
Topic	Oversight of Municipalities

SUMMARY

The Ontario Ombudsman's jurisdiction is being extended, as of January 1, 2016 to include full oversight of local government services, administration and officials. The Ombudsman comes to this role with eight years of experience in investigating closed municipal meetings, through their dedicated Open Meeting Law Enforcement Team (OMLET).

Copies of a brochure, *Complaints about Municipalities*, which explains key points about how they will handle municipal cases as of January 2 have been provided.

COMMENT

For Council's Information

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Receive and Record

COMMITTEE DECISION

Receive and record

TO BE DISCUSSED

COMMUNICATION 127025

Received from Jackie Kavanagh, General Manager, Chamber of Commerce
Addressed to Duncan Rogers, Clerk
Date December 21st, 2015
Topic November Business Walk

SUMMARY

Chamber Board would like to present the findings of their November Business Walk to Council.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

THAT Chamber Board present findings.

COMMITTEE DECISION

Committee thanked Chamber of Commerce for their presentation. Receive and Record

COMMUNICATION 127026

Received from Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs
Addressed to Paul Knowles, Chief Administrative Officer
Date January 4th, 2016
Topic 2nd Intake – Small Communities Fund (SCF)

SUMMARY

The Province has advised that the Town's application for Intake Two of the Small Communities Fund (SCF) was not selected because other municipalities have more challenging economic conditions and fiscal situations.

COMMENT

The rejection letter is identical to the rejection letter for our OCIF application and staff have obtained details of how OMAFRA scored Carleton Place (a score of 22 and a rank of 190) which means no funding (see attached). We should be concerned with the indicators used for the scoring.

There is some logic in the first two indicators – Median Household Income and Weighted Assessment per Household.

However, with the Net Financial Assets per Household indicator, a municipality is rewarded if they have no reserves and instead have considerable debt, even if that debt is because of poor management or for say a new arena or city hall. This indicator actually penalizes municipalities that plan for infrastructure needs by building reserves to cover future infrastructure costs. The Town scored fairly well on the 4th indicator, partly because of the significant childcare and recreation user fees we collect, but is it really relevant?

127026 Continued

Staff believe the last indicator is very relevant but it only has a weight of 3 instead of 10. This indicator (or some other indicator that actually measures and ensures a municipality is contributing a reasonable amount to their infrastructure) should be the most important indicator with the highest weighting.

If this criteria is not challenged it will no doubt continue to be used for the OCIF and SCF in future years, meaning the Town might as well not bother submitting an application. Perhaps more importantly, these criteria may be applied to future infrastructure programs that may be rolled out by the Federal government.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

THAT the province be encouraged to distribute predictable grants utilizing a fair and equitable formula to all municipalities. (Note – 50% of the OCIF funds are currently distributed based on a formula and the Town receives \$144,000 annually.) If the Province insists on using an application based process, the evaluation criteria must be modified to stop penalizing municipalities that plan to maintain their infrastructure.

COMMITTEE DECISION

Committee supported the staff recommendation and asked staff to outline a plan to lobby the province. Bring forward

COMMUNICATION 127027

Received from	Paul Knowles, Chief Administrative Officer
Addressed to	Policy Review Committee
Date	January 7 th , 2016
Topic	Closed Meetings

SUMMARY

As authorized by the Municipal Act, Council should review selected items in closed session.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

THAT in accordance with Section 239 of the Municipal Act, S.O. 2001, that the meeting be closed to the public with the following agenda:

AGENDA

- 01-12-16-1 litigation or potential litigation, including matters before administrative tribunals, affecting the municipality or local board; General Nature – Old Curling Club Property
- 01-12-16-2 personal matters about an identifiable individual, including municipal or local board employees; General Nature – Extension of McNeely Ave.

127027 Continued

01-12-16-3 personal matters about an identifiable individual, including municipal or local board employees; General Nature – Personal

COMMITTEE DECISION

THAT in accordance with Section 239 of the Municipal Act, S.O. 2001, that the meeting be closed to the public with the following agenda:

AGENDA

01-12-16-1 litigation or potential litigation, including matters before administrative tribunals, affecting the municipality or local board; General Nature – Old Curling Club Property

01-12-16-2 personal matters about an identifiable individual, including municipal or local board employees; General Nature – Extension of McNeely Ave.

01-12-16-3 personal matters about an identifiable individual, including municipal or local board employees; General Nature – Personal

10-11-15-5 litigation or potential litigation, including matters before administrative tribunals, affecting the municipality or local board; General Nature – Eastway 911

REPORT TO COUNCIL

01-12-16-1 Receive and Record

01-12-16-2 Bring Forward

01-12-16-3 Receive and Record

10-11-15-5 Receive and Record



Policy Review Committee Agenda
for the January 12th, 2016 meeting held in
the Council Chambers following Council

- 1) **DECLARATION OF PECUNIARY/CONFLICT OF INTEREST AND GENERAL NATURE THEREOF** – now or anytime during the meeting
- 2) **PUBLIC MEETING – NONE THIS EVENING**
- 3) **REGISTRATION OF PUBLIC WISHING TO SPEAK**
- 4) **COMMUNICATION 127027 IS A CLOSED MEETING**
- 5) **PLEASE TURN OFF ALL CELL PHONES AND PAGERS**
- 6) **IF THERE IS AN ADDENDUM, IN ACCORDANCE WITH SECTION 15.2.4 (OF THE STRIKING REPORT) DOES THE COMMITTEE WISH TO APPROVED THIS ADDENDUM**

The following items are for information only and will not be discussed unless the Committee chooses to do so. The Chair will entertain a motion to receive and file for those items not pulled out for discussion.

COMMUNICATION 127023

Received from	Community Alliance for Refugee Resettlement (CARR)
Addressed to	Paul Knowles, Chief Administrative Officer
Date	December 7 th , 2015
Topic	Refugee Resettlement

SUMMARY

Last fall, a group of local citizens formed the Community Alliance for Refugee. These volunteers are working hard to prepare a settlement plan so they can hit the ground running as soon as they are connected with their first family. Details are available on the [Website for the Community Alliance for Refugee Resettlement](#). Volunteers and donations are welcome.

COMMENT

For Council's information.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Receive and Record

COMMITTEE DECISION

COMMUNICATION 127024

Received from Ombudsman Ontario
Addressed to Town of Carleton Place
Date December 24th, 2015
Topic Oversight of Municipalities

SUMMARY

The Ontario Ombudsman's jurisdiction is being extended, as of January 1, 2016 to include full oversight of local government services, administration and officials. The Ombudsman comes to this role with eight years of experience in investigating closed municipal meetings, through their dedicated Open Meeting Law Enforcement Team (OMLET).

Copies of a brochure, *Complaints about Municipalities*, which explains key points about how they will handle municipal cases as of January 2 have been provided.

COMMENT

For Council's Information

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Receive and Record

COMMITTEE DECISION

TO BE DISCUSSED

COMMUNICATION 127025

Received from Jackie Kavanagh, General Manager, Chamber of Commerce
Addressed to Duncan Rogers, Clerk
Date December 21st, 2015
Topic November Business Walk

SUMMARY

Chamber Board would like to present the findings of their November Business Walk to Council.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

THAT Chamber Board present findings.

COMMITTEE DECISION

COMMUNICATION 127026

Received from Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs
Addressed to Paul Knowles, Chief Administrative Officer
Date January 4th, 2016
Topic 2nd Intake – Small Communities Fund (SCF)

SUMMARY

The Province has advised that the Town's application for Intake Two of the Small Communities Fund (SCF) was not selected because other municipalities have more challenging economic conditions and fiscal situations.

COMMENT

The rejection letter is identical to the rejection letter for our OCIF application and staff have obtained details of how OMAFRA scored Carleton Place (a score of 22 and a rank of 190) which means no funding (see attached). We should be concerned with the indicators used for the scoring.

There is some logic in the first two indicators – Median Household Income and Weighted Assessment per Household.

However, with the Net Financial Assets per Household indicator, a municipality is rewarded if they have no reserves and instead have considerable debt, even if that debt is because of poor management or for say a new arena or city hall. This indicator actually penalizes municipalities that plan for infrastructure needs by building reserves to cover future infrastructure costs. The Town scored fairly well on the 4th indicator, partly because of the significant childcare and recreation user fees we collect, but is it really relevant?

Staff believe the last indicator is very relevant but it only has a weight of 3 instead of 10. This indicator (or some other indicator that actually measures and ensures a municipality is contributing a reasonable amount to their infrastructure) should be the most important indicator with the highest weighting.

If this criteria is not challenged it will no doubt continue to be used for the OCIF and SCF in future years, meaning the Town might as well not bother submitting an application. Perhaps more importantly, these criteria may be applied to future infrastructure programs that may be rolled out by the Federal government.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

THAT the province be encouraged to distribute predictable grants utilizing a fair and equitable formula to all municipalities. (Note – 50% of the OCIF funds are currently distributed based on a formula and the Town receives \$144,000 annually.) If the Province insists on using an application based process, the evaluation criteria must be modified to stop penalizing municipalities that plan to maintain their infrastructure.

COMMITTEE DECISION

COMMUNICATION 127027

Received from Paul Knowles, Chief Administrative Officer
Addressed to Policy Review Committee
Date January 7th, 2016
Topic Closed Meetings

SUMMARY

As authorized by the Municipal Act, Council should review selected items in closed session.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

THAT in accordance with Section 239 of the Municipal Act, S.O. 2001, that the meeting be closed to the public with the following agenda:

AGENDA

- 01-12-16-1 litigation or potential litigation, including matters before administrative tribunals, affecting the municipality or local board; General Nature – Old Curling Club Property
- 01-12-16-2 personal matters about an identifiable individual, including municipal or local board employees; General Nature – Extension of McNeely Ave.
- 01-12-16-3 personal matters about an identifiable individual, including municipal or local board employees; General Nature – Personal

COMMITTEE DECISION

Carleton Place T

MUNID: 9028
 Tier: LT
 Region: East

Ontario Community Infrastructure Fund Fiscal Screen Summary

With the exception of the bonus, the respective municipality's score indicated below is assigned based on their distance from the median of all eligible municipalities. Therefore, the municipality at the median is awarded five points, the municipality at the maximum is awarded ten points and the municipality at the minimum is awarded zero points. All of the other municipality's scores are based on where they fall in this range for the respective indicator. The bonus methodology is outlined in the description below.

Indicator	Description	Carleton Place T	Median of all Eligible Municipalities	Carleton Place T Score	Maximum Available Score	Data Source	Distribution of Municipalities Carleton Place T
Median Household Income (\$) ^{1,3}	Higher scores are given to municipalities with lower median household income. Its use as an indicator reflects the economic conditions of the municipality from the perspective of their household's capacity to contribute to the tax base.	67,000	62,000	4	10	Statistics Canada - 2011 Census	
Weighted Assessment per Household (\$) ^{1,3}	Refers to the total assessment for a municipality weighted by the tax ratio for each class of property divided by the total number of households. This measure captures the value of the tax base of a municipality, from which the property tax rate is derived, and reflects the capacity of the municipality to raise revenue. Higher points are awarded to municipalities who have lower weighted assessments per household, as it indicates more challenging circumstances.	303,000	252,000	4	10	Municipal Property Assessment Corporation	
Net Financial Assets per Household (\$) ^{2,3}	Denotes the difference between total financial assets and total liabilities divided by the total number of households in the municipality. This measures the burden of a municipality's overall financial position on each household. More points are awarded to municipalities who have a lower financial position per household.	800	500	5	10	Financial Information Return /Municipal Property Assessment Corporation	
Property Taxes, User Fees and Service Charges per Household as a % of Median Household Income ^{2,3}	Captures the extent which municipalities are capitalizing from their residential assets to keep up with depreciation. Higher scores are awarded to municipalities with a higher score if the percentage is higher, as it implies those municipalities are capitalizing to a greater extent from their tax base to raise revenues. The municipalities with a higher percentage may also have more limited ability to raise taxes/rates to pay for projects.	7%	5%	7	10	Financial Information Return/ Statistics Canada	
Bonus: Total Additions and Betterments as % of Annual Amortization ^{2,3}	Ratio measuring the degree which municipalities are investing in their infrastructure assets to keep up with depreciation. Higher scores are awarded to municipalities with a higher percentage. Eg. A municipality which spends \$2.50 on additions and betterments for every \$1.00 they expense in annual amortization will be awarded 2.5 bonus points to a maximum of 3 points.	200%	160%	2	3	Financial Information Return	

1. Used as primary indicators for the Ontario Municipal Partnership Fund's Northern and Rural Municipal Fiscal Circumstances Index
 2. Indicators are averaged over most recent five year period (2010 - 2014)
 3. Values, scores and rank are rounded. Individual scores may not add up to total score as a result

Total Score:	22
Rank:	190