Committee of the Whole
December 20, 2018 – Following Council
Council Chambers, Grey County Administration Building

1. Call to Order
2. Declaration of Pecuniary Interest
3. Determination of Items Requiring Separate Discussion
4. Consent Agenda

That the following Consent Agenda items be received; and

That staff be authorized to take the actions necessary to give effect to the recommendations in the staff reports; and

That the correspondence be supported or received for information as recommended in the consent agenda.

a. Ontario Cannabis Legalization Implementation Fund Correspondence

That the Ontario Cannabis Legalization Implementation Fund correspondence be received for information.

b. Municipal Reporting Burden Correspondence and Bearing the Burden Summary Report

That the Municipal Reporting Burden Correspondence and the Bearing the Burden Summary Report be received for information.

c. Grey County Building Task Force minutes dated November 22, 2018

That the Grey County Building Task Force minutes dated November 22, 2018 be adopted as presented; and

That the following resolution contained therein be endorsed:

i. THAT Report HDR-BTF-21-18 regarding the Administration Addition and Renovation Summary Report be received for information; and

THAT the draft borrowing by-law attached to Report HDR-BTF-21-18 be brought forward for Council’s consideration; and

THAT the Building Task Force Committee now be dissolved.
d. Grey County Cycling and Trails Master Plan Notice of Study Commencement

That the Grey County Cycling and Trails Master Plan Notice of Study be received for information.

5. Items For Direction and Discussion


That Report FR-CW-01-19 regarding the 2019 Insurance Renewal be received; and

That a Request for Proposal for the County’s 2020 Municipal General Insurance and Risk Management Services Program be issued in 2019.

b. SSR-CW-01-19 EarlyON Community Based Capital Project – Dundalk Arena and Community Centre

That SSR-CW-01-19 regarding the EarlyON Community Based Capital Project (CBCP) proposed within the Dundalk Arena and Community Centre be received; and

That the Warden and Clerk be authorized to execute an agreement with the Township of Southgate to flow $302,500 CBCP funds for the renovation of the second floor of the Dundalk Arena and Community Centre to create an accessible EarlyON Centre; and

That as per Section 25.6 (b) of the Procedural By-law, Committee of the Whole authorize, staff to proceed in advance of Council approval of the 2019 Grey County budget.

c. SSR-CW-02-19 EarlyON Community Based Capital Project – Sydenham

That SSR-CW-02-19 regarding the EarlyON Community Based Capital Project (CBCP) proposed within Grey County’s Sydenham building be received; and

That Council authorizes staff to procure the design and renovation of the former Sydenham school building to provide EarlyON and childcare services; and

That staff, in accordance with Section 3.3 b) of the Purchasing Procedure, bring back a report to a future meeting seeking Council approval to award the project.

d. CCR-CW-01-19 Agency, Board and Committee Appointments 2019

That Report CCR-CW-01-19 be received and the following appointments be confirmed:

i. Owen Sound Community Advisory Committee for Georgian College-Warden Hicks;
That the Board of Health, Long-Term Care Committee of Management, Tourism Advisory Committee and Economic Development and Planning Advisory Committee be voted on by a single vote by show of hands; and

That all other required appointments noted in Report CCR-CW-01-19 be endorsed.

6. Other Business

a. Ontario Good Roads Association (OGRA) Board of Directors Nomination (deadline December 21, 2018)

That ______ be nominated to the Ontario Good Roads Association (OGRA) Board of Directors for the 2019 – 2021 term of office.

b. Ontario Good Roads Association (OGRA) Delegation Requests (deadline January 14, 2019)

That the following delegation requests be submitted to the Ontario Good Roads Association (OGRA) for the 2019 Conference:

7. Notice of Motion

8. Adjournment

A 60 Minute Information Technology Security and Training Session will occur immediately following Committee of the Whole
November 20, 2018

Dear Head of Council (elect):

Recently, Ontario’s Government for the People moved to a new cannabis retail model to meet our key priorities of combatting the illegal market and keeping our children and communities safe.

Today, the Province is beginning the fulfillment of its commitment to provide $40 million in funding over two years to municipalities to help with the implementation costs of recreational cannabis legalization.

The Ontario Cannabis Legalization Implementation Fund (OCLIF) will be distributed as follows:

- In early January, the first payment of $15 million will be made to all municipalities on a per household basis, adjusted so that at least $5,000 is provided to each municipality. This will enable all municipalities to proceed with their planned legalization activities.

- A second payment of $15 million will then be distributed following the deadline for municipalities to opt-out under the Cannabis Licence Act, which is January 22, 2019.
  - Municipalities that have not opted-out as of January 22, 2019 will receive funding on a per household basis, adjusted so that at least $5,000 is provided to each municipality. This funding will support initial costs related to hosting retail storefronts.
    - Municipalities that have opted-out will receive only a second $5,000 each.

- The Province is setting aside $10 million of the municipal funding to address costs from unforeseen circumstances related to the legalization of recreational cannabis, and priority will be given to municipalities that have not opted-out. Further details will be provided at a later date.

.../cont'd
Finally, if Ontario's portion of the federal excise duty on recreational cannabis over the first two years of legalization exceeds $100 million, the Province will provide 50 per cent of the surplus only to municipalities that have not opted-out as of January 22, 2019.

Our government is committed to respecting taxpayers and their hard-earned money. We believe municipalities have an obligation to do likewise.

As such, municipalities must use this funding to address the costs that directly relate to the legalization of recreational cannabis. Examples of permitted costs include:

- increased enforcement (e.g. police, public health and by-law enforcement, court administration, litigation);
- increased response to public inquiries (e.g. 311 calls, correspondence);
- increased paramedic services;
- increased fire services; and
- by-law / policy development (e.g. police, public health, workplace safety policy).

Lower-tier and upper-tier municipalities will receive a 50/50 split of the allocation. The household numbers will be split between the upper- and lower-tier, and the allocation calculated accordingly. Decisions to adjust the split in allocation and transfer funding can be made at the local level as needed. Upper-tier municipalities will receive funding in relation to opt-out decisions made by the lower-tier municipality.

The Deputy Minister of Finance will write to your Treasurer with further details on the administration of this funding and attach each municipality's specific allocation notice.

To assess the impact of the funding, the Association of Municipalities of Ontario and the City of Toronto have been asked to work with the Ministry of Finance to establish a process by which a sample group of municipalities can assess the use and impact of these funds. More information on this process will be provided at a later date.

Our government is committed to building a retail system for cannabis sales that will help eliminate the illegal market and is safe and reliable with rules that keep cannabis out of the hands of children and youth, while keeping our roads safe. Complementary to this municipal funding, the Province continues to do the following:

.../cont'd
• Increase the capacity of law enforcement to help detect drug impaired driving through training. The Province has also created a specialized legal team to support drug impaired driving prosecutions, increased capacity at the province’s Centre of Forensic Sciences, and has created a Cannabis Intelligence Coordination Centre.

• Support local boards of health (public health units) by providing a suite of tools and resources for enforcement of the Smoke-Free Ontario Act, 2017, which includes rules for smoking and vaping of cannabis.

• Conduct an integrated public awareness campaign to communicate the rules and regulations for recreational cannabis and educate Ontarians about the health and safety measures in place to protect them.

We appreciate the efforts of municipalities in the implementation of the federal government’s legalization of cannabis and look forward to continuing to work together.

Sincerely,

Vic Fedeli
Minister of Finance

c: The Honourable Caroline Mulroney, Attorney General
The Honourable Steve Clark, Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing
Paul Boniﬁerro, Deputy Attorney General
Greg OrenCsak, Deputy Minister of Finance
Laurie LeBlanc, Deputy Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing
Renu Kulendran, Ontario Legalization of Cannabis Secretariat, Ministry of Attorney General
Nicole Stewart, Executive Lead, Cannabis Retail Implementation Project, Ministry of Finance
Kate Manson-Smith, Assistant Deputy Minister, Local Government and Planning Policy Division, Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing
Dan Miles, Chief of Staff
November 26, 2018

Dear Treasurer:

Re: Ontario Cannabis Legalization Implementation Fund

In his November 20, 2018 letter to Heads of Council (elect), the Minister of Finance announced funding for all municipalities through the Ontario Cannabis Legalization Implementation Fund (“Fund”). This Fund will provide $40 million in funding over two years to municipalities across Ontario to help with the implementation costs of recreational cannabis legalization.

This letter sets out the terms and conditions of receiving money under the Fund.

1. First Payment of Funds

For the first payment in January, the Province will distribute $15 million of the Fund between all municipalities based on the following:

- 2018 MPAC Household numbers
- 50/50 split in household numbers between lower- and upper-tier municipalities
- Adjustments to provide at least $5,000 to each municipality

Municipalities will receive a first payment in the amount set out in the attached allocation notice.

2. Second Payment of Funds

For the second payment, the Province will distribute $15 million of the Fund between all municipalities based on the following:

- If a municipality has not opted-out of hosting private retail stores in accordance with Cannabis Licence Act, it will receive funding based on the 2018 MPAC household numbers, adjusted so that at least $5,000 is provided to each municipality.

.../cont’d
• If a municipality has opted-out of hosting private retail stores in accordance with the *Cannabis Licence Act*, it will receive a maximum amount of $5,000. Please note that if a municipality opts-out by January 22, 2019, and opts back in at a later date, that municipality will not be eligible for additional funding.

Municipalities will receive a second payment based on the above criteria. The Province will send an allocation notice to municipalities setting out the amount of the second payment by March 2019.


3. **Use of Funds**

Municipalities must use the money they receive from the Fund solely for the purpose of paying for implementation costs directly related to the legalization of cannabis.

Examples of permitted costs include:

• Increased enforcement (e.g., police, public health and by-law enforcement, court administration, litigation)
• Increased response to public inquiries (e.g., 311 calls, correspondence)
• Increased paramedic services
• Increased fire services
• By-law / policy development (e.g., police, public health, workplace safety policy)

Municipalities must not use the money they receive from the Fund to pay for:

• Costs that have been, or will be, funded or reimbursed by any other government body, or third party
• Costs not related to cannabis legalization

4. **Transfer of Funds Within Upper-Tier and Lower-Tier Municipalities**

Upper-tier municipalities and lower-tier municipalities may transfer any money that they receive from the Fund between each other. Despite any transfer of money that may occur under this section, municipalities remain responsible for ensuring compliance with the terms and conditions of this letter with respect to the transferred money.

.../cont’d
5. Funding Assessment

To assess the impact of this funding, the Province has requested that the Association of Municipalities of Ontario and the City of Toronto work with the Ministry of Finance to establish a process by which a sample group of municipalities will provide information on use of funds and impact of funding. More information will be available as this process is developed.

If municipalities are asked to provide information on the use of the money received under the Fund and impact of such funding, they must provide the information requested, in a timely manner. As such, municipalities must keep and maintain all records relating to money received from the Fund.

In addition, the Province or any authorized representative or identified independent auditor, may request to review the records or conduct an audit in respect of the expenditure of money a municipality has received from the Fund.

If you have any further questions, please contact:

Cannabis Retail Implementation Project
Ministry of Finance
Email: OCLIF@ontario.ca

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]
Greg Orencsak
Deputy Minister

Attachment

c. Paul Boniferro, Deputy Attorney General
Laurie LeBlanc, Deputy Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing
Nicole Stewart, Executive Lead, Cannabis Retail Implementation Project
Allan Doheny, Assistant Deputy Minister, Provincial-Local Finance Division
Renu Kulendran, Ontario Legalization of Cannabis Secretariat, Ministry of Attorney General
Ontario Cannabis Legalization Implementation Fund
2018-19 First Payment - Allocation Notice

County of Grey

The Ontario Cannabis Legalization Implementation Fund (OCLIF) is provided to municipalities to help with the implementation costs of recreational cannabis legalization.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Allocation</th>
<th>$63,795</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A Funding Amount based on Number of Households (A1 x A2 ÷ 100)</td>
<td>$63,795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Number of Households</td>
<td>50,035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Funding Amount per 100 Households</td>
<td>$127.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes and Data Sources

A - funding amount is rounded up to the nearest dollar.

A1 - household figures are based on the 2018 returned roll provided by the Municipal Property Assessment Corporation (MPAC).

A2 - represents the funding amount per 100 households for upper-tier municipalities.
RE: Municipal Reporting Burden

Dear Heads of Council,

As you have heard me say, reducing the provincial reporting burden affecting the municipal sector is a priority for the government. I addressed municipal concerns about the reporting burden at the Association of Municipalities of Ontario (AMO) conference in Ottawa this past summer. I have heard from municipalities that the province asks for too many reports, which impacts the ability of municipalities to focus on local priorities.

I have struck a team in my ministry to lead the reduction of the municipal reporting burden across government. In addition to reducing the number of reports, we must make sure any remaining information collected is necessary for the province's work. We must confirm the information requested is not duplicative, and that the reporting requirements for small municipalities are appropriate.

To address these goals, my ministry will be convening a cross-government working group to bring together ministries with municipal reporting requirements. This group will be tasked with reducing reporting and undertaking the work to meet the aforementioned commitments.

In addition to our cross-government working group, in 2018, my team will be convening a stakeholder working group of various municipal associations with a shared common interest in municipal reporting requirements.

I invite you to share your thoughts on what changes can be made to municipal reporting directly to my office, as well.

Thank you for your support.

Steve Clark
Minister, Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing

c: Laurie LeBlanc, Deputy Minister, MMAH
BEARING THE BURDEN

AN OVERVIEW OF MUNICIPAL REPORTING TO THE PROVINCE
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INTRODUCTION

Every day in communities across Ontario local governments work hard to deliver crucial services to their citizens. Most of this is tangible and visible: garbage trucks collect trash, police officers patrol the streets, and road crews fix potholes. However, a key feature of municipal service delivery—municipal reporting to the province—is not visible to even well-informed citizens. Reporting is both important and necessary. It helps the province to ensure accountability, monitor performance of funded programs, and ensure that transferred money is being spent appropriately. However, over time municipal reporting has become unwieldy. New regulations, funding agreements and programs have made municipal-provincial relations more complex. As new requirements were added, too few were taken away. Steadily municipalities became deeply over regulated and burdened with requirements to report to the province on hundreds of programs and services.

Governments at all three levels in Canada have entered a period where evolution and change are imperative. Steep fiscal pressures, rapid technological and demographic change, globalization and the spread of populism have all dramatically altered the environment in which they deliver services and govern. Intergovernmental relationships must also evolve and adapt to the meet the changing demands of Ontarians.

Accountability is essential, but we often treat that goal as an absolute good. Taxpayers expect excellent management and transparent procurement, but an exclusive focus on rigorous financial reporting and compliance requires a significant investment of time, energy and resources that is subject to diminishing returns. 

— DRUMMOND REPORT, 2012

Far from achieving the goals of good governance and accountability, municipal-provincial reporting in Ontario now hinders the ability of municipalities to function like responsible orders of government. Reporting threatens to weaken municipal productivity at a time when municipalities must modernize to face increasing demands. This report provides an overview of the municipal reporting burden. It’s based on interviews and focus groups with municipalities and municipal public servants from across the province. Its goal is to provoke a conversation about how to reimagine the reporting relationship between municipalities and the province.
**PRECEDES FOR REFORM**

While bringing meaningful change to the municipal reporting burden will be no easy task, over the past decade the government has demonstrated that it can tackle difficult challenges. Below are a few examples.

**Open for Business:** The government of Ontario has made a valuable contribution to reducing and streamlining regulation and reform for the private sector. In 2008 the government unveiled its Open for Business Strategy, which was designed to produce a regulatory environment more conducive to businesses. Open for Business is a government-wide burden reduction and service modernization effort, and includes the government’s Red Tape Challenge, Regulatory Centre of Excellence, Regulatory Modernization Committee, Government Modernization Fund, and Regulatory Burden Reduction Team. According to the Ministry of Economic Development and Growth, the government has achieved 50% of its target to reduce the burden on businesses with $100 million in savings by 2017. In 2014 alone, five ministries worked together to help save $6 million and 150,000 hours for the businesses in Ontario. Similarly, in 2015, seventeen ministry initiatives saved $44 million and 2.3 million hours (Ministry of Economic Development and Trade, 2015).

**TPAM:** The Transfer Payment Administrative Modernization Initiative (TPAM), run by the Government of Ontario’s Treasury Board Secretariat is designed to streamline and modernize the government’s approach to managing its transfer payments. One of the elements of TPAM is a Transfer Payment Common Registration system (TPCR); a one-window, online portal that enables organizations that receive transfer payments to maintain a single profile and allows this information to be accessed and used by all ministries. One of the goals of TPAM is to allow transfer payment recipients, such as municipalities, to spend less time on administrative processes and more time on delivering services.
METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this report is to better understand the impact of municipal reporting to the province, and identify recommendations to streamline and improve the effectiveness of reporting. The findings are based on interviews and focus groups with 29 local government professionals throughout July and August of 2016. This qualitative data was supplemented by an online survey of municipal public servants from across the province, which received over 300 responses. Research respondents represented a wide cross-segment of Ontario’s municipal sector, including a variety of population sizes, tiers, years of employment in the sector, and regions of the province.

LIMITATIONS

While this research project was designed to provide a wholesome picture of municipal-provincial reporting in Ontario, several limitations must be acknowledged. The interviews and focus groups conducted for this project were conducted in six municipalities. While this qualitative research was supplemented by a survey of municipal public servants from across the province, the conclusions presented in this report may not necessarily be representative of the experience of every municipality.

In addition, while this project provides an overview of municipal reporting to the province, it does not cover reporting to the federal government (which is extensive). Nor does it cover the effect of regulations, either provincial or federal, on municipalities. These are both important topics in their own right.

1 The six municipalities included both upper and lower tier, small, medium, and large communities, and municipalities located in a number of regions of the province, including the north.
FINDINGS

This section presents the key findings of this research project. Full research results, and a broader discussion of the context of municipal reporting can be found in the full technical report, which is located on the AMCTO website.

1. REPORTING NEGATIVELY IMPACTS SERVICE DELIVERY AND PREVENTS MUNICIPALITIES FROM INNOVATING AND PREPARING FOR THE FUTURE

The most alarming finding that emerged from this research is that reporting to the province is negatively impacting the ability of municipalities to effectively deliver services to the citizens of their communities, and to plan, prepare and innovate for the future. As seen in Figure 1, almost half of municipal public servants surveyed for this project agree that provincial reporting impacts their ability to effectively deliver services. This finding was validated by interview and focus group respondents who talked at length about how reporting obligations frequently draw them away from their service-delivery responsibilities.

“Time and resources are the biggest drawbacks for municipalities when they are complying with reporting. It takes staff away from working on service-delivery and improving municipal business.”

— FOCUS GROUP PARTICIPANT

FIGURE 1: PROVINCIAL REPORTING REQUIREMENTS ARE IMPACTING MY ABILITY TO PRODUCTIVELY DELIVER SERVICES
Respondents noted that they are forced to squeeze reporting into their already busy schedules. Their time is prioritized and primarily devoted to delivering services in the community, and they find it difficult to keep up with the reporting that they are responsible for. However, they recognize the need to fulfill reporting requirements, especially as they become increasingly linked to provincial funding agreements.

In many cases municipalities expend substantial resources to manage and complete reporting by the deadlines. They deal with this problem in a variety of ways, from working overtime to hiring consultants. Both solutions are financially costly, diverting scarce municipal resources away from core service delivery.

Focus group and interview participants also emphasized that the amount of time they spend on reporting carries a broader and more profound implication for their municipality. Over and over again municipal public servants emphasized that in the current system the amount of time that they spend in reporting is preventing them from being able to plan for the future, and look for ways to innovate and improve. A fairly clear conclusion from this research is that reporting is a barrier to innovation. Every hour that is spent filling out reports to be sent the province is an hour not spent analyzing service-level data, conducting program reviews or consulting with stakeholders in the community. Some municipalities, especially those located in smaller communities, are so bogged down by reporting that they are forced to simply operate through business as usual. They don’t have the time to think of the future because they are constantly looking back.

2. REPORTING IS ONEROUS AND EXCESSIVE

There was broad agreement amongst focus group, interview, and survey respondents that reporting is both onerous and excessive. Based on our research, we estimate that the province collects at least 422 reports from municipalities every year (225 separate reports, collected monthly, quarterly, biannually, and annually). We think that this is a conservative estimate. Consider that municipalities must complete reports for every environmental-related site, wastewater facility, or long-term care home in their jurisdiction. Moreover, this number doesn’t include reports submitted on a unique frequency, like grant-based reporting. A full list of reports that we have collected can be found on the AMCTO website.

While no single municipality is responsible for filling out all 422 reports in any given year, we know from other estimates that some municipalities complete more than 200. The amount of reporting a municipality completes generally depends on the set of services they are responsible for. Some are required to complete as few as 90 reports, while others complete more than 200. For instance, in 2012 the City of Toronto documented that they submit about 270 reports to 11 separate provincial ministries or agencies, not considering granted-based reporting or audits. Similarly, the Drummond Report identified that one Ontario municipality submits 287 reports to the province every year.

As seen in Figure 2, 63% of survey respondents agreed with the statement that there are too many provincial reporting requirements. Focus group and interview participants also agreed that there is more reporting now than 3–5 years ago, and that the trend seems to be for the province to consistently add new reporting requirements without taking many away. Reporting requirements are rarely if ever removed or streamlined. Even when reporting requirements are removed, there is usually a corresponding increase somewhere else. For instance, several respondents noted that when the Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) was removed, it didn’t mitigate a corresponding increase in the difficulty of the Financial Information Return (FIR).
Reporting is also time consuming. For example, the Long-Term Care Home Service Accountability Agreement takes municipalities anywhere from 21 to 45 days to complete for just one home. An overwhelming percentage of respondents believe provincial reporting takes too much time to complete, with 75% of survey respondents agreeing that provincial reporting is too time consuming (Figure 3).

While the volume of reporting was a key area of concern, so too was the difficulty and complexity of some of the reporting. The process of reporting is considerably more complex than simply filling out a form or template. Reporting requires data gathering, data input, and record keeping. As seen in Figure 4, about 73% of survey respondents from all categories agree that complying with reporting requirements is onerous. Only 9% disagreed. Many respondents felt that the time and resources spent on reporting outweighed the benefit, or was not proportional to the program or service being reported on. Some described the report that they are responsible for as frustrating to complete, bringing them little or no added benefit, and taking time away from what they view as their actual job.

Some reporting requirements are described as straightforward and clear in terms of determining what is required. Others, however, are vague and leave crucial details up to a municipality’s interpretation. For instance, respondents noted that compliance reporting for environmental assessments come with vague instructions, that ask for information based on what the municipality believes is “sufficient.” In these cases, provincial staff are often not able to provide useful clarification. To mitigate this uncertainty, many municipalities go above and beyond what they think is necessary to ensure that they’ve met the require-
ments. One focus group respondent talked about sending huge stacks of binders to the province to ensure that all of their bases were covered. Should questions or problems arise with reporting, respondents said that when they seek clarification or support from provincial ministries or agencies the response is inconsistent. While some ministries and agencies are helpful, others were reported to be unreliable, slow and unhelpful. Some respondents indicated that it is common for municipal public servants to use their informal networks instead of official ministry contacts when they have questions about reporting.

FIGURE 4: COMPLYING WITH PROVINCIAL REPORTING REQUIREMENTS IS ONEROUS

As seen in Figure 5, every municipality faces its own unique challenges. Smaller municipalities have fewer coordination challenges but have less capacity and fewer resources to deal with reporting challenges. Conversely larger municipalities have greater staff capacity and resources but face more complex coordination challenges. Similar findings have been noted in the experience of provincial reporting to the federal government (Graefe et al., 2013, 76).

FIGURE 5: COMPLYING WITH PROVINCIAL REPORTING REQUIREMENTS IS ONEROUS, BY POPULATION SIZE
Respondents describe feeling frustrated with reporting, and note that it impacts their stress levels, mental health and ability to work effectively. As one senior municipal official noted, there are broader impacts to the health of municipal employees associated with being overworked. Several focus group respondents also reported that reporting has made it difficult for them to recruit qualified staff. Most public servants enter government to serve their community and work on programs and services that they think are important. They don’t want to spend time filling out spreadsheets, or entering data into antiquated provincial portals.

3. THE PURPOSE OF REPORTING IS OFTEN UNCLEAR

In addition to the excessive amount of reporting that municipalities are subject to, research respondents also frequently acknowledged that they often didn’t know the purpose of reporting. While the process of reporting can help municipalities become aware of inefficiencies, measure their progress, inform program decisions, or learn more about potential problems with the programs and services they deliver, our research suggests that this is the exception rather than the rule. Respondents painted a clear picture: in most instances municipalities derive little benefit from the reporting that they do, rarely have a good sense of what it is being used for, and are deeply sceptical that the information is actually being used.

Respondents also voiced very clearly that they wish the information that they were reporting was useful for the work that they do. In fact, many respondents indicated that they would be more enthusiastic about reporting if there was mutual benefit for both the province and municipality. However, as seen in Figure 6, public servants consider reporting to bring little or no value to their work, with only 21% of respondents selecting affirmative options.

One of the reasons why reporting brings little value to municipalities, is that the information reported to the province is rarely shared back with them. Numerous respondents indicated that it would be really helpful for them if data that they report to the province was published or shared in some form, so that they could benchmark or compare themselves against other municipalities. Even in the limited number of circumstances where data is shared back with the sector, many municipal public servants feel that the data is inconsistent, preventing true “apples to apples” comparisons.

FIGURE 6: RATE THE VALUE THAT REPORTING GENERALLY BRINGS TO YOUR WORK

---

"It is more the case that reporting to the province is done because it is mandatory, not because it generates value. If municipalities saw the value of the data they collect for reporting, they would be eager to coordinate, participate, and find the utility of the reporting."

— FOCUS GROUP PARTICIPANT
However, perhaps a more significant problem underlying the municipal-provincial reporting relationship is that most municipal public servants don’t know how the data the province is collecting is being used, or why it is being collected. This perception is confirmed by survey data, which shows that 81% of respondents agree that it is unclear how the data they submit as part of provincial reports is being used (Figure 7).

One interview participant noted that while there are circumstances where it seems like data the province collects is being used for program decisions, in other circumstances reporting seems to be used more for “surveillance” and accountability. The Drummond Report reached a similar conclusion, noting that “information reported is often not used at the other end to influence changes in policy or service delivery” (Drummond et al., 2012, 127).

4. MUNICIPAL-PROVINCIAL REPORTING IS HIGHLY FRAGMENTED

One possible reason why the province has been unable to communicate the value of reporting is that it is so fragmented that the even the province doesn’t have a clear picture of the scale and scope of municipal reporting. Municipalities submit reports to at least 34 different ministries and agencies. Many ministries and agencies approach reporting in different ways, sometimes resulting in redundant requests for the same information. For example, data required for reporting on long-term care homes is duplicated in the Ontario Healthcare Reporting Standards and the Long-Term Care Service Accountability agreement, or simply in the quarterly and then annual reports on the same program. This is just one example of many, where municipalities submit the same data to different ministries, or to the same ministry in different reports.

The features of each report can also differ greatly making reporting even more onerous for municipalities. Reports are submitted to different provincial ministries or agencies at different points in time, some monthly, some quarterly, some bi-annually, and others annually or a combination. Provincial bodies do not appear to coordinate or create common standards for reporting results. Respondents described a picture where the government’s left hand often doesn’t know what the right hand is doing. The reporting architecture is so fragmented that municipal staff spend time seeking clarification from various agencies and ministries, reporting the same data multiple times, and constantly grappling with new and inconsistent reporting formats. Simply glancing at the list of reports that we have assembled paints a clear picture of how expansive and fragmented reporting has become.

---

FIGURE 7: IT IS UNCLEAR HOW THE DATA I SUBMIT IS USED

81% AGREE
12% NEITHER
7% DISAGREE

One major struggle is that municipalities don’t always know what the data is used for, and the province doesn’t communicate about the value of the information that is being collected.

— FOCUS GROUP PARTICIPANT
The way that municipalities handle their reporting requirements is also highly varied. Every municipality handles municipal reporting in a slightly different way. Their response largely depends on their size, organizational structure, capacity, knowledge and skills, technological capacity, and annual revenue. In the interviews and focus groups conducted for this report, we discovered that in small municipalities reporting is usually completed by a smaller number of staff, though they still likely have to collect data from other departments. At the other end of the spectrum, larger municipalities used a more decentralized approach to reporting where individual departments were responsible for reporting in their own areas. One commonality was that in more technical areas (such as wastewater), those with the relevant technical experience were most likely to be completing reporting requirements.

5. MUNICIPALITIES THINK REPORTING IS IMPORTANT

Finally, despite all the concerns that respondents expressed, and all the issues currently associated with reporting, there is a strong belief amongst municipal public servants that reporting is important. As seen in Figure 8, 80% of survey respondents agree that reporting is important; only 8% disagree. This message was confirmed in interviews and focus group conversations.

Respondents frequently expressed a recognition that certain reporting requirements are important and necessary, and that as a principle, reporting is an important component of intergovernmental arrangements. Respondents were able to identify a number of reporting processes that offered them opportunities to improve their core business. However, the elements of reporting that are useful are vastly overshadowed by the elements that are illogical and deeply frustrating to municipal officials.

There is no debate about whether or not reporting is important. The question is really to what extent is it useful and productive, and to what extent does it actually lead to worse outcomes for municipalities and the citizens that they serve. As noted by one focus group participant, “most public servants want to serve their communities, not fill out reports.” The important challenge going forward is to identify and preserve the important and productive elements of reporting, and look for opportunities to streamline and improve the duplication and waste.

FIGURE 8: COMPLYING WITH PROVINCIAL REPORTING IS IMPORTANT
The focus of this research project was to better understand the municipal reporting problem in Ontario. Throughout several months of research and conversations with municipal officials, we were also able to identify a series of recommendations that we believe can begin to move this issue forward.

FOR THE PROVINCE:

1. **Establish and maintain a comprehensive list of provincially required reporting for municipalities.** The key to solving any problem is to first understand it. To that end, the province should work towards creating a cross-ministry list that catalogues all the reports that provincial ministries require municipalities to submit. We think that the Treasury Board Policy Suite’s Inventory and Schedule of reports that the federal government is required to produce would be a good model to follow.²

2. **Explore more effective forms of reporting.** There are a number of ways that the government could ensure that it is accomplishing its goals of monitoring policy progress, compliance and accountability at the local level, while not requiring municipalities to fill out an endless number of reports. For example, one option would be to establish a list of priority indicators that municipalities report on, allowing the multiple provincial ministries and external stakeholders to easily access data, and removing the requirement for municipalities to report the same data multiple times to multiple ministries. In the United Kingdom, a single data list exists naming the datasets and each indicator that local governments are required to submit to the central government. Having the list allowed the government to eliminate 81 reporting requirements since summer 2010, and scale down another 34 requirements.³ Another option, is a central data portal, similar to what is being used for TPAM, where municipalities report important data that could then be accessed by provincial ministries.

3. **Recognize the burden and look for opportunities to streamline and reduce the regulatory and reporting regime for Ontario’s municipalities.** The province needs to demonstrate that any new reporting requirements are necessary, and recognize that reporting imposes a heavy burden on municipalities. We urge the government to strike a working group or committee to review and reduce the number of municipal reporting requirements. Ontario should also look to the United Kingdom, where the government developed a New Burden Doctrine, setting out a process for assessing new burdens and ensuring any new burden is fully funded.⁴

The government should also increase the extent to which it consults with the municipal sector, and approach municipal-provincial reporting as a partnership between two levels of government working at a common purpose. The province

² For Inventory, see http://www.tbs-sct.gc.ca/ip-pi/trans/cal-eng.asp


and municipalities should conduct open discussions surrounding current reporting requirements, upcoming changes or the introduction of any new reporting requirements. The government should also develop a review mechanism for any new reporting requirements that it plans to assign municipalities.

4. Communicate the purpose and value of reporting and look for opportunities to share aggregated reporting data with municipalities. For reporting to be successful, both the province and especially municipalities need to understand why data is being collected, or what it is going to be used for. Simply sharing with municipalities what the data is used for and its importance may provide a reporting incentive, helping encourage municipalities to complete reporting on-time and with accuracy. We also heard repeatedly from municipal officials throughout the course of this research that the best way to create buy-in for reporting is to make the data useful for them. One way to do this, is to share an aggregated version of some of the data that is being reported so that municipalities can use it to get a better sense of where they stand compared to other municipalities in the province, and look for opportunities to share best-practices. Municipalities are looking for a joint benefit in reporting, but it is up to the province to create it.

FOR MUNICIPALITIES:

1. Work to understand your municipality’s reporting obligations and practices. If they have not already, municipalities should learn more about and assess their internal reporting responsibilities and practices. While working with the province to improve the nature of municipal reporting, municipalities should also assess their own goals and strengths and look for ways to be more effective in the way that they approach reporting. The research conducted for this study revealed that reporting in most municipalities is decentralized across the organization. While this may make practical sense for the organization, it likely also means that senior municipal officials don’t have a clear picture about how reporting is affecting their community. Municipalities should try and get a comprehensive sense of their reporting systems and practices. Doing so will allow them to look for ways to optimize, and have better conversations with the province about the amount of reporting that they as a municipality are doing.

2. Develop data management approaches to improve quantitative records and optimize qualitative inputs within reporting requirements. Only about 19% of municipalities surveyed for this project indicated that they have a central data management system, while 51% do not (see Figure 9). Those municipalities that have invested in a rigorous centralized data management system find reporting relatively less onerous and program level data easier to obtain than those without one. In addition, staff from municipalities with centralized data management approaches express relatively less agreement with the statement that provincially required reporting impacts their ability to productively deliver services.

It seems clear from our survey results that more municipalities need to think about the way that they manage and operationalize data. One small Ontario municipality reports that they worked to save and find money in their budget to purchase a central software system. The system allows municipal staff to share and access data, which saved them a significant percentage of their budget and now reporting is less burdensome and they can more easily fulfill reporting requirements. A record management and data management system can help municipal staff quickly and easily share reporting data. Systems may be expensive and require planning and investment, but will likely see cost savings from better coordination and access to needed data.
CONCLUSION

Understanding the characteristics of provincial-municipal reporting presented in this report is an important step towards a modernized reporting regime. This report reveals that municipalities view reporting as negatively impacting service delivery, onerous, burdensome, fragmented, without a clearly defined or communicated purpose, but nevertheless important.

Recognizing and making changes to improve municipal reporting will not automatically solve the bigger policy issues that municipalities are tasked with, but it will give them the opportunity to mitigate barriers to effective service delivery. It will allow them to move away from focusing on historic activities and free up staff time and resources to develop innovative solutions that improve the lives of their citizens.
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Grey County Building Task Force – Administration Building
November 22, 2018 – 3:15 p.m.
Heritage Room

Present: Chair Dwight Burley; Warden Stewart Halliday; Councillors Greenfield, Pringle, Barfoot and Hicks

Staff Present: CAO Kim Wingrove; Directors Anne Marie Shaw, Kevin Weppler; staff Rob Hatten and Penny Colton – Recording Secretary

Regrets: Aaron Whitney

Call to Order

Chair Burley called the meeting to order at 3:15 pm

Declaration of Pecuniary Interest

There was none.

Minutes of Meeting

Grey County Building Task Force – Administration Building minutes dated July 26, 2018

The minutes were reviewed.
Reports

HDR-BTF-21-18 Administration Addition and Renovation Summary Report

Mr. Weppler summarized the report for finality and dissolution of the task force. The Chair noted special thanks to staff for their efforts to complete the build and end with a surplus. Thanks to committee and council for their support of the project.

BTF-06-18  Moved by: Councillor Barfoot  Seconded by: Councillor Pringle

THAT Report HDR-BTF-21-18 regarding the Administration Addition and Renovation Summary Report be received for information; and

THAT the draft borrowing by-law attached to Report HDR-BTF-21-18 be brought forward for Council’s consideration; and

THAT the Building Task Force Committee now be dissolved.

Carried.

Other Business

The group reviewed the flow of the Provincial Offences layout in their new location. Councillor Pringle indicated he is in favour of the old stair case remaining in place.

Staff will prepare a press release advising of the final details of the Grey County Administration Building addition and renovation project.

On motion by Councillor Pringle the meeting adjourned at 3:30 p.m.
Grey County Cycling and Trails Master Plan
Notice of Study Commencement

ABOUT THE PLAN...

Grey County is developing a long-term, comprehensive Cycling and Trails Master Plan to guide future planning and decision-making to enhance cycling and trail opportunities within the County and its local municipalities. The plan is meant to be used by County staff, decision makers and community partners to support and provide direction for future investments in cycling and active transportation infrastructure by identifying a network and programs that supports commuter cycling, cycle tourism and recreational trail use.

The County has retained WSP Canada Group Limited (WSP) to support the development of the Cycling and Trails Master Plan. The plan will incorporate previous work completed by the County and its partners including on-going projects such as the Recreational Trails Strategy. The plan will be developed using a three-phased process and is expected to be completed by Spring 2019.

Over the course of the study, the County will consult and engage with members of the public, businesses, stakeholders and local municipal staff to help inform the development of the Cycling and Trails Master Plan. Your input will be used to shape the outcomes, strategies and the recommended cycling and trails network contained in the plan.
Grey County Cycling and Trails Master Plan
Notice of Study Commencement

HOW TO GET INVOLVED…

There are a number of ways that you can get involved. The following are some of the ways that you can provide your input over the course of the study:

► Visit the project website for information about the study and about cycling and trails in Grey County:
  https://www.grey.ca/programs-initiatives/grey-county-cycling-and-trails-master-plan
► Attend public events and provide your input. Check the project website regularly for updates on dates and times of events.
► Email or contact one of the study team representatives - please use their contact information below:

**Bryan Plumstead**  
Manager of Tourism  
Grey County  
519-376-3365 ext. 6110  
bplumstead@visitgrey.ca

**Cristina Valente**  
Senior Project Planner  
WSP  
647-730-7154  
cristina.valente@wsp.com

For additional information and updates visit the project website. If you require this information in an alternate format please contact the County representative noted above.
Recommendation

1. That Report FR-CW-01-19 regarding the 2019 Insurance Renewal be received; and

Executive Summary

- Annual renewal of the County’s Municipal Insurance Program.
- Positive renewal for 2019.
- Procure the County’s 2020 Municipal General Insurance and Risk Management Services Program in 2019.

Background and Discussion

Insurance is the transfer of risk from one entity to another. The County transfers the risk of future unknown losses to its insurance company.

The cost of purchasing this transfer of risk is the insurance premium that is paid annually to the insurance company. The County purchases or insures several areas of coverage including Casualty (General Liability), Property, Automobile and Excess, and new for 2019 Cyber Liability.

Grey County has contracted its municipal insurance program with the Frank Cowan Company Limited since 2009. For the years 2004 to 2008 the County participated in the Ontario Municipal Insurance Exchange (OMEX) Reciprocal Insurance Program. Previous to this period of time the County participated from 1999 to 2007 under the Rural Ontario Municipal Association (ROMA) Special Underwriting Group (SUG) Reciprocal Insurance Program. Under these Reciprocal Agreements, members are eligible to receive a portion of surplus premiums, if they exist, and are responsible for paying a supplementary assessment, if underwriting periods have deficits.

The purpose of this report is to advise Council on the costs relating to the County’s 2019 insurance
policy renewal with the Frank Cowan Company. Staff met with the County Insurance Broker, Nicol Insurance to review the 2019 insurance renewal and any changes to the insurance program.

As per the Renewal Report, the total cost of the Frank Cowan Company insurance renewal for 2019 excluding taxes equals $1,121,788. This compares to the 2018 annual premium of $1,245,975 or a decrease of $124,187.

The County has had positive renewal experiences for the past five years as a result of work done by staff in managing risk, as well as the County having a positive loss ratio.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Premium</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>$1,179,694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>$1,199,760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>$1,198,387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>$1,208,906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>$1,199,360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019*</td>
<td>$1,121,788</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes addition to the Administration Building, the Business Innovation Hub (Sydenham School) and Cyber Liability.

County staff is currently quite satisfied with the insurance program and services that the Frank Cowan Company provides. As well, the Frank Cowan Company provides program coverage enhancements to the County such as a 25-year true replacement cost on fleet and other enhancements that are appreciated. In saying this, the County currently is in a good position to market the County’s insurance needs as the County has been fortunate to have a positive loss ratio over the past five years.

**Legal and Legislated Requirements**

None

**Financial and Resource Implications**

The 2019 budget has been drafted utilizing the 2019 insurance renewal that was received on December 4, 2018.

**Relevant Consultation**

[X] Internal – CAO and Finance

____ External (list)

**Appendices and Attachments**

None
Recommendation

1. That SSR-CW-01-19 regarding the EarlyON Community Based Capital Project (CBCP) proposed within the Dundalk Arena and Community Centre be received; and

2. That the Warden and Clerk be authorized to execute an agreement with the Township of Southgate to flow $302,500 CBCP funds for the renovation of the second floor of the Dundalk Arena and Community Centre to create an accessible EarlyON Centre; and

3. That as per Section 25.6 (b) of the Procedural By-law, Committee of the Whole authorize, staff to proceed in advance of Council approval of the 2019 Grey County budget.

Executive Summary

The Community Based Capital Project (CBCP) program, operated through the Ministry of Education (MEDU), provides capital for renovation, retrofitting, and additions to existing buildings in order to create new space for EarlyON initiatives.

Following up from SSR-CW-14-18; staff is recommending that Grey County enter into an agreement with the Township of Southgate regarding the onetime CBCP funding allocation from MEDU to renovate the second floor of the Dundalk Arena and Community Centre to create an accessible EarlyON Centre. When the project is completed, the existing EarlyON operated by Kids & Us Community Childcare and Family Education Centres (Kids & Us) since February 2018 at the Old Town Hall, will be relocated to the Dundalk Arena and Community Centre.

Grey County Council’s approval of the CBCP – Dundalk Arena and Community Centre EarlyON project will result in a total of $302,500 ($262,500 capital funds plus $40,000 for unique site costs) for a
renovation and retrofit to create a new site for the existing EarlyON. This project is 100% funded by MEDU.

Background and Discussion

Community Based Capital Projects (CBCP) – Dundalk Arena and Community Centre

On April 5, 2018 the County of Grey (as the Consolidated CMSM) received Ministry approval for the CBCP EarlyON project at the Dundalk Arena and Community Centre.

Kids & Us operates 6 childcare sites in Grey County as well as 4 EarlyON Centres. In Dundalk, the childcare site operates at the Dundalk Proton Community School. With the growth anticipated by this community and the families moving into Southgate, programs such as EarlyON must expand their capacity. The timing of the Ministry funding opportunity meets this need. The multi-phased Flato development and others are anticipated to grow the population significantly over the coming years. This program provides services and supports for children ages 0-6, their parents and caregivers in learning, growing and connecting together. This contributes to children’s learning, development and well-being.

Combining the CBCP funds and Southgate’s funding contribution provides the arena with a significant second floor upgrade including a fully functional EarlyON Centre, and the potential for increased future use options such as sports, recreation and special events.

The key items in the legal agreement with Southgate will address:

1. That Southgate will be the project manager for the renovation project;
2. The CBCP funding will be used specifically for the creation of the EarlyON centre that will consist of three rooms totaling a minimum of 270 square meters;
3. Project items outside of the EarlyON centre will be covered by Southgate;
4. The County will ensure that compliance with MEDU requirements including project milestones and funding flow through; and,
5. Protection of the newly created EarlyON centre location for the four year term of the contract.

Township of Southgate Partnership

Southgate Council will receive Council reports on December 5 & 19, 2018 for the CBCP EarlyON project. As the building is owned by the Township of Southgate, they will be the project manager and they will release the Request for Proposal (RFP) / Request for Tender (RFT). Future reports to Southgate Council will be anticipated regarding procurement.

Further, the Township of Southgate has applied for accessibility funding to enhance the Dundalk Arena and Community Centre EarlyON project. An application was submitted on July 26, 2018 for the Enabling Accessibility Fund (EAF), which provides funding for eligible capital projects that increase accessibility for people with disabilities in Canadian communities and workplaces, creating more opportunities for people with disabilities to participate in community activities, programs and services, or access
employment opportunities. This opportunity provides grant funding of up to $100,000 per project, to support small scale construction, renovation or retrofit projects that increase accessibility in communities or workplaces.

Specifically, as it applies to the project, the EAF application is intended to fund an elevator lift and washroom upgrades to access the second floor of the site. This specific application is for a project costing $175,000, with EAF being $100,000.00, leaving the Township of Southgate funding requirement as $75,000. If the Township of Southgate’s submission is not successful, they will be required to fund this through their 2019 municipal budget.

Legal and Legislated Requirements

The Ministry of Education provides funding to Grey County Social Services under the legislative authority of the Child Care and Early Years Act, 2014.

An agreement is under development with the Township of Southgate to facilitate the funding of a renovation and retrofit capital project that will create a community-based EarlyON Child and Family Centre located within the Dundalk Community Centre and Arena.

Financial and Resource Implications

The CBCP – Dundalk Arena EarlyON funds approved by MEDU are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CBCP EarlyON Funds</th>
<th>$262,500</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unique Site Costs</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total CBCP Funds</strong></td>
<td><strong>$302,500</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enabling Accessibility Funds (EAF)</td>
<td>$100,000 (decision pending)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southgate EAF Contribution</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Project Funds</strong></td>
<td><strong>$477,500</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Southgate is pending notification of the EAF application. If the EAF application is not successful, the Township of Southgate will cover the accessibility retrofit costs through its 2019 budget. Additionally, any costs unrelated to the EarlyON project shall be covered by the Township of Southgate.

The CBCP capital program will not include any increases to the Grey County levy and will not have any additional impacts beyond what was approved in the 2018 Children’s Services budget.

County staff resources will be required for the CBCP financial controls in order to coordinate capital funding from the province and as a project team member.
Potential Risk

The remaining 34% of the project funds for this EarlyON capital project will be provided by the province upon tendering of the project before March 1, 2019. If the County does not meet the conditions as contained in the Community Based Capital Program for this project by March 1, 2019, the subsequent cash flow to the County of Grey will be forfeited, and the ministry will recover the initial cash flow.

Any additional project costs for the Dundalk Community Centre and Arena upgrades, which are outside of the EarlyON project scope, will be addressed in the Township of Southgate’s 2019 capital budget approval process.

Relevant Consultation

☒ Internal

- Grey County Clerk’s Office
- Grey County Solicitor
- Grey County Finance Department
- Grey County Planning Department (Planning Data Analysis Coordinator)

☒ External

- Township of Southgate
- Licensed child care centres in Grey County
- EarlyON Centres in Grey County
Recommendation

1. That SSR-CW-02-19 regarding the EarlyON Community Based Capital Project (CBCP) proposed within Grey County’s Sydenham building be received; and

2. That Council authorizes staff to procure the design and renovation of the former Sydenham school building to provide EarlyON and childcare services; and

3. That staff, in accordance with Section 3.3 b) of the Purchasing Procedure, bring back a report to a future meeting seeking Council approval to award the project.

Executive Summary

There is a growing need for child care services and education and support for caregivers in Grey County. Addressing the situation is challenging due to a shortage of registered early childhood educators (RECEs) to staff available licensed childcare spaces. An investment in the development of a unique childcare and EarlyON centre at the Regional Skills Training, Trades and Innovation Centre (RSTTIC) adjacent to Georgian College’s Owen Sound campus is proposed to enhance the ECE program experience, as well as provide flexible on-site childcare services.

Background and Discussion

Grey County Children’s Services is the designated Consolidated Municipal Service Manager (CMSM) for planning and managing licensed child care services throughout the County. Grey County Children’s Services is also responsible for the local management of all EarlyON Centres. EarlyON Centres are intended to support all children ages 0-6, parents and caregivers in learning, growing and connecting together.
Within the County of Grey, parents have challenges when accessing either child care and/or EarlyON services. Economic conditions require some parents to undertake longer commutes in harsher conditions, irregular work hours (including split and rotating shift-work), limited child care and EarlyON options. There is an expanding childcare waitlist.

Across Ontario there is also a critical shortage of registered ECEs. For Grey County, recent statistics indicate an ECE shortage of approximately 30% (73 individuals) to fully staff all licensed spaces to Ministry legislated child to educator ratios. To begin addressing this shortage locally, a strategy would be to support the ECE program at Georgian College’s Owen Sound Campus in attracting students and increasing graduate numbers. Georgian has capacity for 45 students each year. In 2018, 15 graduated and 26 students have registered their intent to graduate in May 2019.

Grey County has a diverse and changing population with unmet needs across age groups. Dedicated space at Sydenham is proposed to be renovated to serve as an EarlyON center offering inclusive supports and programming to meet the needs of our growing population.

There have been expressions of interest from local service providers to form a partnership at the RSTTIC. Early in 2019, Grey County will consult with providers to determine the best programming fit for the project.

**Community Based Capital Projects (CBCP) – Sydenham**

Funding in the amount of $257,500 was approved by MEDU earlier in 2018 in support of a project to accommodate the EarlyON centre at the former Sydenham school, conditional on the County purchasing the building. That purchase was completed in October 2018. The County is required by the Ministry to submit an attestation form by March 1, 2019 which confirms that the County has tendered the renovation project. The latest date that the CBCP EarlyON Centre is required to open at Sydenham is December 31, 2020.

It should be noted that East Ridge which is a school within close proximity provides both EarlyON and child care services. The intent is not to replicate services but rather complement existing services with niche services for certain segments of the Grey County population.

**Legal and Legislated Requirements**

The Ministry of Education (MEDU) provides funding to Grey County Social Services under the legislative authority of the Child Care and Early Years Act, 2014.

EarlyON and childcare centres are operated under a transfer payment agreement with the province and as set out in the Ontario Early Years Child and Family Centres (2018): Business Practices and Funding Guidelines for Service System Managers.

The County is required by the Ministry to submit an attestation form by March 1, 2019 which confirms that the County has tendered the renovation project.

**Financial and Resource Implications**

The CBCP – Sydenham EarlyON funds approved by MEDU are:
The CBCP capital program will not include any increases to the Grey County levy and will not have any additional impacts beyond what was approved in the 2018 Children’s Services budget.

County staff resources will be required for activities such as project accounting, project management, and administration in order to coordinate capital funding from the province.

Potential Risk

Grey County has not received the initial 66% of funds for this project that were due when the purchase of the Sydenham property closed. Staff are working with MEDU to confirm the flow of funding. Until this is received, no significant commitments will be entered into or expenditures incurred.

The Ministry deadline to tender the Sydenham EarlyON project is before March 1, 2019. If the County does not meet these conditions as contained in the Community Based Capital Program, then certain portions of the funding may be clawed back or forfeited.

Relevant Consultation

☒ Internal

- Grey County Finance Department
- Grey County Economic Development
- Grey County Business Enterprise Centre
- Grey County Planning Department
- Grey County Solicitor
- Grey County Clerk’s Office

☒ External

- Georgian College
- Bluewater District School Board (BWDSB)
- City of Owen Sound
- Licensed Child Care Providers in Grey County
- EarlyON Service Providers in Grey County
To: Warden Hicks and Members of Grey County Council  
Committee Date: December 20, 2018  
Subject / Report No: CCR-CW-01-19  
Title: Agency, Board and Committee Appointments for 2019  
Prepared by: Heather Morrison  
Reviewed by: Kim Wingrove  
Lower Tier(s) Affected:  
Status:  

Recommendation

1. That Report CCR-CW-01-19 be received and the following appointments be confirmed:
   a. Owen Sound Community Advisory Committee for Georgian College-Warden Hicks;

2. That the Board of Health, Long-Term Care Committee of Management, Tourism Advisory Committee and Economic Development and Planning Advisory Committee be voted on by a single vote by show of hands; and

3. That all other required appointments noted in Report CCR-CW-01-19 be endorsed.

Executive Summary

This report is to confirm the membership on agencies, boards and committees for 2019. Grey County has a number of internal committees and responsibility to sit on several external committees. There are mandatory requirements for membership to include County Councillors on the Board of Health and Long Term Care Committee of Management. There are no requirements for councillors to sit on committees nor is there a limit to the number of committees a councillor can be a member of.

Background and Discussion

In late November, staff sent out a request to council members for their first and second choices related to available appointments for agencies, boards and committees for the 2019 year.

The following chart indicates the preferences of council members and the required number of appointments per committee:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appointment</th>
<th>Membership Required</th>
<th>Interested Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development and Planning Advisory Committee</td>
<td>2 councillors plus Warden</td>
<td>Shirley Keaveney, Sue Carleton, John Woodbury, Odette Bartnicki, Aakash Desai, Ian Boddy, Warden Hicks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Election Required</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism Advisory</td>
<td>2 councillors</td>
<td>Shirley Keaveney, Sue Carleton, Ian Boddy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Election Required</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board of Health</td>
<td>3 councillors plus Warden</td>
<td>Sue Paterson, Brian Milne, Barb Clumpus, Brian O'Leary, Warden Hicks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Election Required</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development and Planning Advisory Committee</td>
<td>2 councillors plus Warden</td>
<td>Shirley Keaveney, Sue Carleton, John Woodbury, Odette Bartnicki, Aakash Desai, Ian Boddy, Warden Hicks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Election Required</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stewardship Grey Bruce (formerly Grey County Forest</td>
<td>1 councillor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stewardship Network)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grey County Federation of Agriculture</td>
<td>1 councillor plus alternate</td>
<td>Paul McQueen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Alcohol and Drug Strategy</td>
<td>2 councillors</td>
<td>Scott Mackey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility Advisory Committee</td>
<td>1 councillor</td>
<td>Dwight Burley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Term Care Committee of Management</td>
<td>4 councillors plus Warden</td>
<td>Dwight Burley, Sue Paterson, Tom Hutchinson, Barb Clumpus, John Woodbury, Scott Mackey, Aakash Desai, Warden Hicks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Election Required</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grey County-Blue Mountains Task Force</td>
<td>3 councillors plus Warden</td>
<td>Paul McQueen, Odette Bartnicki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAO Objectives and Evaluation Committee</td>
<td>4 councillors plus Warden</td>
<td>Brian Milne, Tom Hutchinson, Warden Hicks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Elections will be required for the following appointments:
Board of Health (3 councillors plus Warden)-interested councillors-Sue Paterson, Brian Milne, Barb Clumpus, Brian O’Leary.

Economic Development and Planning Advisory Committee (2 councillors plus Warden)-interested councillors-Shirley Keaveney, Sue Carleton, John Woodbury, Odette Bartnicki, Aakash Desai.

Tourism Advisory Committee (2 councillors)-interested councillors-Shirley Keaveney, Sue Carleton, Ian Boddy

Long Term Care Committee of Management (4 councillors plus Warden)-interested councillors-Dwight Burley, Sue Paterson, Tom Hutchinson, Scott Mackey, Barb Clumpus, John Woodbury, Aakash Desai.

Report CCR-CC-32-16 confirmed that the appointment to the Owen Sound Community Advisory Committee for Georgian College be the Warden. As well, Report CCR-CC-32-16 recommended that at the end of the 2015-2018 term of Council, the Non Union Job Evaluation Committee be comprised of staff only as it is administrative in nature.

Legal and Legislated Requirements

Municipalities with a population over 10,000 are required to have an Accessibility Advisory Committee in compliance with the Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act (AODA). Recently County Council endorsed a recommendation to have a Joint Accessibility Advisory Committee and member municipalities that wished to participate were invited to become a member in order to achieve compliance and share best practices.

Financial and Resource Implications

Per diems are paid to member of council that attends agency, board and sub-committee meetings.

Relevant Consultation

☐ Internal none
☐ External none

Appendices and Attachments

CCR-CC-32-16
November 20, 2018

To the Head & Members of Council:

Pursuant to Policy B-008 of the Ontario Good Roads Association, the Nominating Committee shall report to the Annual Conference its nominations for directors.

The OGRA Board of Directors is committed to achieving a diverse leadership team. We encourage women and individuals from diverse backgrounds to put their names forward for these positions.

The following members will serve on the 2019-2020 Board of Directors in the following capacity:

President
1st Vice-President
2nd Vice-President
Immediate Past President
Directors

Rick Kester, CAO, City of Belleville
Rick Harms, Project Engineer, City of Thunder Bay
Dave Burton, Mayor, Municipality of Highlands East
Chris Traini, County Engineer, County of Middlesex
Paul Ainslie, Councillor, City of Toronto
Antoine Boucher, Director of Public Works & Engineering, Municipality of East Ferris
Steven Kodama, Director, Transportation Services, City of Toronto
Bryan Lewis, Councillor, Town of Halton Hills
Paul Schoppmann, Mayor, Municipality of St.-Charles
Michael Touw, Manager of Operations, County of Peterborough

Those nominated by the Nominating Committee shall be selected from OGRA’s municipal or First Nations membership pursuant to the requirements for geographic representation contained in Section 12 of the Constitution, and so far as possible meeting the criteria established in Policy B-008. A full copy of the Constitution can be viewed on the OGRA web-site. Those elected shall serve for a two (2) year term ending on February 24, 2021.

The following vacancies need to be filled:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>South West Zone</th>
<th>Two (2) Vacancies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South Central Zone</td>
<td>Two (2) Vacancies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Zone</td>
<td>One (1) Vacancy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Southwest Zone consists of the municipalities in and including the Counties of Brant, Bruce, Elgin, Essex, Haldimand, Huron, Lambton, Middlesex, Norfolk, Oxford, and Perth, the municipality of Chatham-Kent, and municipalities in and including the Regional Municipality of Waterloo.
The South Central Zone consists of the municipalities in and including the Counties of Dufferin, Grey, Simcoe, and Wellington, and municipalities in and including the Regional Municipalities of Durham, Halton, Niagara, Peel and York, and the City of Hamilton.

The Northern Zone consists of the municipalities in the Districts of Algoma, Cochrane, Kenora, Manitoulin Island, Nipissing, Parry Sound, Rainy River, Sudbury, Thunder Bay and Timiskaming, municipalities in and including the District of Muskoka and the City of Greater Sudbury.

Any member of Council or a permanent full time staff from an OGRA member municipality or First Nations interested in being considered as a candidate for a position on the Board of Directors must complete the attached Nomination Consent form and submit it along with their résumé to the attention of the Chair of the Nominating Committee by no later than December 21, 2018 at 2:00 p.m. Fax your information to 289-291-6477, e-mail to info@ogra.org or mail to OGRA, 1525 Cornwall Road, Unit 22, Oakville, Ontario L6J 0B2

The Nominating Committee will meet in January to recommend a slate of candidates to the membership. The members of the Committee are:

Chair: Ken Lauppé, Immediate Past President  
Vice Chair: Robert Burlie, OGRA Past President  
Members: Paul Ainslie, OGRA Director  
          Dave Burton, OGRA 3rd Vice-President  
          Paul Schoppmann, OGRA Director

Any questions regarding the Nomination process or serving on the Board of Directors can be directed to the undersigned at joe@ogra.org.

Yours truly,

[Signature]

J. W. Tiernay,  
Executive Director

c: Ken Lauppé, Chair, Nominating Committee
Ontario Good Roads Association
Board of Directors
Nomination and Consent Form

We hereby nominate the following to the Board of Directors of the Ontario Good Roads Association for the 2019/21 term of office (2 year term):

Name of Candidate

Name:__________________________________________________________

Position:________________________________________________________

Municipality:____________________________________________________

Moved by:______________________________________________________

Seconded by:___________________________________________________

(Candidates must be nominated by two eligible members of OGRA. A resolution of Council is acceptable but not mandatory)

-----

Candidate Consent

The candidate nominated above must sign below indicating they consent to the Nomination and agree to let their name stand for office.

I, ___________________________ hereby consent to the Nomination
(Name of Candidate)
to the Board of Directors of the Ontario Good Roads Association.

Signature ___________________________ Date ___________________________

Submit completed form and candidate’s résumé by fax or e-mail to the attention of Ken Lauppé, Chair, OGRA Nominating Committee
Fax: 289-291-6477
E-mail: info@ogra.org