

CORPORATION OF THE TOWNSHIP OF RYERSON

MINUTES

SPECIAL MEETING

MONDAY JULY 25, 2016

Village of Burks Falls Council Chambers 5:30 p.m.

A special meeting of Council of the Corporation of the Township of Ryerson was held Monday evening July 25, 2016 at 5:30 p.m. at the Village of Burks Falls Council Chambers.

In attendance from Ryerson Township: Reeve Glen Miller, Councillors Rosalind Hall, Doug Weddell, George Sterling, Barb Marlow and CAO/Clerk Judy Kosowan; and from Burks Falls: Reeve Cathy Still, Councillors Lewis Hodgson, Lisa Morrison, Jarvis Osborne and Nicky Kunkel, Clerk and Treasurer Allan Holder. Regrets: Councillor Rex Smith.

The Village of Burks Falls invited Ryerson Township to this meeting to discuss cost sharing for the shared services.

The meeting was called to order at 5:30 p.m.

DECLARATION OF PECUNIARY INTEREST: None Declared.

ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION:

1. Shared Services

Judy Kosowan CAO/Clerk Ryerson read a letter from Reeve Miller outlining Ryerson's position on shared services. This brought forward the following discussions:

- a) How will amalgamation affect shared services? Burk's Falls Council replied that there are discussions and research being completed; no decision will be made in this term of Council. It will be a future Council who will review the data collected to make an informed decision. There was discussion on that fact that now that the talks are not specific to moving forward with a specific development, will Ryerson be included in the amalgamation talks? This will be brought to the meeting on September 7th, 2016. Ryerson indicated that with this information it was worth carrying on the discussions for shared services.
- b) If amalgamation were to occur all the shared services would be divided between all ratepayers and property owners in a consistent manner and the question was posed, why can't that be the case now with shared services?
- c) There was discussion on the lack of communication for each shared service. It was recommended that a system of Advisory Committees be established or that Tri Council meets more often to improve communication.
- d) Discussion occurred regarding opening the current Shared Services Agreement in 2017. Both Councils agreed that they are not in favour of opening the agreement and will continue to work on its renewal for its expiry in 2018.
- e) The formula for renewal was discussed at length.
 - i. The formula concept of core costs and variable costs was reviewed and neither Council is in favour of this model. The advantage of a shared service is efficiency and core costs would be different for each

municipality if they were offering the service as a standalone community. This formula, as presented, is not sustainable.

- ii. The idea of eliminating \$200,000 out of budgets was thought to be short sighted as the costs increase every year and capital works will still affect each municipality. While level of services can be reviewed to find reduction, it is not a long term solution to reduce the budget in order to manage current costs.
- iii. A review of formulas included:
 - a) In 1970 Ryerson was at 11% now at 25%
 - b) Burk's Falls at one renewal period took a percentage mark from each of the other two for proximity in order to continue discussions
 - c) Armour has also offered to take 50% and leave the remaining amount for Burk's Falls and Ryerson to determine.
 - d) All parties have each stepped up throughout the years to ensure the shared services continue
 - e) Ryerson and Burk's Falls Councils indicated their desire to continue with shared services
- iv. The factors for the formula were considered
 - a) As both Councils agreed the 1/3 core costs and variable costs formula is not agreeable to them. Other factors were considered.
 - b) Burk's Falls indicated any reasonable formula presented should be considered and discussed.
 - c) Ability to pay factors such as assessment, plus households and population have been used in other provincial or regional services formula and are considered valid for this exercise as well.
 - d) Fire department budget may also include properties and/or structures as it is a service that every property owner benefits from. The higher the population, the higher the households and the more chance of requiring the service.
 - e) In regards to ability to pay it was discussed that when revenue or rebates are offered, such as POA, the higher the assessment the higher the rebate so it should remain a factor for the shared services
 - f) Ryerson presented a formula for the Fire Department without a 1/3 split for core costs. This spreadsheet averaged the percentage for each municipality in relation to the factors (Households, population, assessment, structures, and properties) which indicated that Armour is at 52%, Burk's Falls is 22% and Ryerson is 26%.
 - g) When considering all the factors if Armour is required to pay more than 50%, as the numbers prove they are 52% of the service formula, then they would want more voting members.
 - h) It was then discussed that in other jurisdictions that just because the percentage is higher doesn't mean that the voting power is higher. Sequin Township was brought up as an example.
 - i) The formula was presented for Fire services. Another formula may be required for each of the other services. Ryerson indicated that they may not be willing to apply the same formula for economic development as it directly benefits the other two more than their ratepayers.
 - j) Both Councils agreed that finding a formula that can be written into the agreement will assist future Councils in renewing the agreement. The practice of assigning percentages is not working. A clear formula that can be reviewed every five years to keep in line with the changes in the formula factors (increases/decreases) is highly recommended.
 - k) It is clear that the formula and the factors are going to be difficult to reach a consensus on. Therefore, both Councils suggested a third

party chairperson should be hired to assist in this process. This person would be neutral and most of the number work has already been completed by staff.

f) Action Items

- i. Ryerson and Burk's Falls Reeves will address a letter to Armour Council prior to the next shared services meeting indicating that:
 - i. Their concept of paying 50% of the variable costs in the core cost 1/3 split formula is not acceptable to the other Councils.
 - ii. That they are not agreeable to opening the existing agreement prior to the 2018 expiry.
 - iii. That to date the current formula is acceptable and if Armour Council stands that they would like the formula changed that a third party chairperson be contracted to assist with the process to ensure we have a productive process and a long term formula in time for the renewal date.

The meeting adjourned at 6:30 pm.

Reeve

Clerk