

CORPORATION OF THE TOWNSHIP OF RYERSON

TRI-COUNCIL MEETING MONDAY June 27, 2016

SENIOR'S CENTRE BURKS FALLS – 7:00 P.M.

MINUTES

A Tri-Council meeting with the Village of Burk's Falls, Township of Armour and Township of Ryerson was held at the Young at Heart Senior's Centre, 136 Yonge Street, Burk's Falls, Monday June 27, 2016 at 7:00 p.m.

In attendance: Burks Falls Council: Cathy Still, Lisa Morrison, Jarve Osborne. Armour Council: Bob MacPhail, Marina Hammond, Rod Blakelock, Jerry Brandt, Pat Hayes. Ryerson Township Council: Glenn Miller, Barbara Marlow, Rosalind Hall and Doug Weddel.

Members of the public and some members of the municipal staff were also in attendance.

The Village of Burks Falls hosted the meeting and Reeve Cathy Still called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

Reeve Still reviewed several assumptions: all three municipalities want the shared services; Armour wants to see a drop in their costs, which would cause an increase to Burks Falls and Ryerson; we will look at core costs and the user pay portions according to factors such as population, households, assessments, total properties, structures.

We will meet with open minds to find a fair level of service at a fair price.

The scenarios were based on the same source documents for statistics for population, households, assessments, properties and structures.

Burk's Falls Treasurer Alan Holder presented spreadsheets with costing scenarios including: core costs and variable split 80/20; 70/30; 50/50. Proportionate factors considered included population, households and assessment.

Reeve MacPhail asked what the actual division (as a percent) between core services and usage are for the fire department. 88/12 is the reality, which he then rounded to 90/10.

Reeve Still indicated that we have to do something better than that.

Reeve MacPhail stated that the fact is someone has to pay more, Armour is willing to step up and pay more but not 50%.

Reeve Miller indicated that he would like to hear all the presentations before having a discussion.

Councillor Weddel expressed the need to include all structures, to account for commercial properties.

Ryerson Deputy Clerk also did similar scenarios as the ones just presented including Core 50% and remainder proportioned by households and then structures, therefore these were not outlined in detail. A second concept was presented moving away from the core and variables to looking at the entire budget divided by households or number of structures. This method provides a cost per household.

John Therieault, Treasurer for Armour stated that he had calculated similar scenarios and a handout was provided.

A discussion ensued:

Reeve MacPhail stated that to simplify the 'user pay' portion, that Armour will pay fifty percent and Burks Falls and Ryerson could sort out the remainder.

Councillor Hayes' opinion was that the fire department looks after all structures including commercial in addition to vacant land and that cost sharing is not based on ability to pay.

Armour has the most population so odds are that there will be more fire calls to Armour, more trips to the library, arena, etc.

Councillor Osborne noted that perhaps we should look at the historical use for statistics, not just one year.

Armour clarified that they will pay fifty percent of whatever is not core costs and core costs at one third each.

Reeve Miller noted that Armour doesn't consider the needs of all three municipalities and yet they are in favour of the regional fire initiatives, so why can't they look at what is best for all three of our municipalities. Armour representatives indicated that Reeve Miller defeated his own argument as regional fire is divided equally between seven municipalities and works because all agree they want the service equally, not on ability to pay. [Post-meeting information: note that Regional Fire is divided among five fire departments not seven municipalities, so Burks Falls, Armour and Ryerson only pay their cost sharing amounts.]

Further scenarios and proportions were discussed. Councillor Osborne indicated that when looking at core costs Burk's Falls does not need all that equipment, so paying toward ninety percent of core costs doesn't make sense.

Reeve MacPhail proposed that if we are stuck at this point, then we should take the summer off and meet again in September. He suggested that Ryerson pick a number, a bottom line and work it backwards. If that number can't be reached then we need to keep cutting the shared services budgets until we get to a number that we can agree on. Let's move forward on looking at cutting each of the budgets.

Do all agree that we will continue looking at core costs at one third each, we each need the service so it makes sense to share the costs equally. Would we apply the same formula to each of the other shared services?

When we look at scenarios 90/10 and 50/50 are off the table.

All the budgets will be reviewed to determine cost savings or increases in revenues.

Reeve MacPhail stated that when we implement this new cost sharing arrangement, even though the current agreement runs until January 1, 2018, he requires the new agreement to be in effect in 2017. Entering into an agreement will depend on that. If we wait and expect it to not renew until 2018 then Armour will decide what the impact of that will be and will change what they will pay.

Amalgamation discussions between Armour and Burk's Falls have been on hold, a meeting will be held July 6, 2016 to revisit this matter.

Reeve Still handed out a cost sharing proposal provided by a Burk's Falls resident, John Wilson.

Reeve Still would like to see all three municipalities working as a team.

Next meetings:

Cost Sharing: Monday September 26, 2016, hosted by Armour at the Senior Centre in Burks Falls at 7:00 p.m.

Tri-Council: Monday October 24, 2016, hosted by Ryerson at the Senior Centre in Burks Falls at 7:00 p.m. Shared services reports and draft 2017 budgets.

The meeting adjourned at 8:05 p.m.

Reeve

Clerk