

MINUTES
OF THE
MUNICIPAL COUNCIL OF THE CORPORATION
OF THE
COUNTY OF OXFORD

County Council Chamber
Woodstock
March 29, 2006

MEETING #10

Oxford County Council meets in special session this twenty-ninth day of March 2006, in the Council Chamber, County Building, Woodstock.

1. CALL TO ORDER:

7:10 p.m., with Warden Woolcott in the chair.

All members of Council present except Councillors Holbrough and Nadalin.

Staff Present: K. J. Whiteford, Chief Administrative Officer/Clerk
P. D. Beaton, Manager of Social Services and Housing
L. S. Buchner, Director of Corporate Services
R. G. Walton, Director of Public Works

2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA:

RESOLUTION NO. 1:

Moved by: Stephen Molnar
Seconded by: William Semeniuk

That the Agenda be approved.

DISPOSITION: Motion Carried

3. DISCLOSURES OF PECUNIARY INTEREST AND THE GENERAL NATURE THEREOF:

NIL

4. ADOPTION OF COUNCIL MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING:

NIL

5. PUBLIC MEETINGS:

RESOLUTION NO. 2:

Moved by: Stephen Molnar
Seconded by: William Semeniuk

That Council rise and go into a public meeting pursuant to Section 244/02 under the Municipal Act 2001, to consider 2006 water and wastewater rates, landfill and waste management rates, and development review fees, and that the Warden chair the public meeting.

DISPOSITION: Motion Carried (7:11 p.m.)

1. County of Oxford Water and Wastewater Systems –
2006 Water and Wastewater Rates
Landfill Charges, Bag Tag Fee Increase and New Fee for
Development Review

The Chair asks Robert Walton, Director of Public Works for the County, to present to Council and those in attendance in the gallery the proposals for the 2006 water and wastewater rate increases and changes in landfill charges as well as proposals for waste management rate increases and new development review fees.

R. Walton, by means of a 47-screen PowerPoint presentation, presents the proposals of the Public Works Department. R. Walton explains that the public meeting tonight was organized under the Municipal Act, 2001 which stipulates a minimum of 21 days notice has to be provided prior to consumers incurring changes to rates established by municipalities. Piggy-backing this public meeting, the Public Works Department is also putting forward changes in the landfill tipping fees, the waste management fees (bag tags) and introducing new fees associated with the review of development proposals by the Public Works Department, since a public meeting would be required for those changes as well.

R. Walton introduces some Public Works staff that are in attendance for the public meeting. Deb Goudreau, Acting Manager of Water Services; Brenda Smith, Public Works Services Coordinator and Clayton Sampson, Waste Management Supervisor are introduced.

Speaking to the water and wastewater rates, R. Walton emphasizes that various new regulations have impacted operations and capital costs for water and wastewater systems, including the Sustainable Water and Wastewater Infrastructure Act and the Nutrient Management Act, as well as Regulation 170/03 of the Ontario Water Resources Act. Reference is also made to the fact that the water/wastewater rates do not include the capital cost associated with Regulation 170/03 upgrades since these costs are separately identified as part of the current rate structure. The development of new rates and charges, as required under Bill 175, is to be completed in 2006/2007 by means of a special water and wastewater rate study. The anticipated outcome of this study will be the development of sustainable rates applied with a consistent structure of policy and charges for all systems serviced by the County.

R. Walton proceeds to display the new water/wastewater rates effective June 1, 2006. In the case of water systems, there will be a 10% increase effective on June 1st. Various percentage increases are displayed for the wastewater systems which are usually based on a percent of the water charge. As an example, the Woodstock percentage is 92% of the water charge, Tillsonburg is 100% and Ingersoll is graduated based on 117% residential, 123% commercial and 129% industrial.

Warden Woolcott enquires of R. Walton regarding an explanation for the variance between the rates applicable to the village of Tavistock as opposed to the village of Plattsville. R. Walton responds that the residential rate is a flat rate in Tavistock. There are no meters in either community. There is also a flat rate sewage charge in Plattsville, according to R. Walton. These factors combine to account for the differentiation between these two villages.

Councillor McKay enquires as to whether R. Walton has any idea of what the rates would be for Embro and Innerkip with the proposed new systems. R. Walton mentions that \$40 per month was referred to in the Embro study and he is unable to recall the number for Innerkip.

After Council reviews a number of graphs showing consumption charges in comparison to other communities in Southwestern Ontario for both sewer use and water use, Councillor Semeniuk questions the comparison of sewer use charges with other municipalities since the charges may include bundled formulae that are not accounted for in the comparisons. R. Walton agrees that some of the comparisons would not be totally accurate due to various system differences.

R. Walton refers to a chart showing the water system expenditures in the small and medium systems in the County, as well as the Ingersoll, Tillsonburg and Woodstock systems. R. Walton highlights some of the capital projects that are to be undertaken with respect to the water systems.

Councillor Harding enquires as to the schedule for the installation of water meters in the City of Woodstock. R. Walton responds that the plan is for that project to commence in the late fall of 2006. Councillor Harding follows up with the question as to whether the type of meter has been selected. R. Walton indicates that no decision has been made on the meter type since discussions are still ongoing with Woodstock Hydro regarding various compatibility issues.

R. Walton then displays the wastewater system expenditures chart. Various projects are again highlighted especially in Ingersoll and Tillsonburg.

Jeff Robson, representing Oak Country Homes, is in the gallery and enquires of R. Walton about the capacity of the Ingersoll wastewater treatment plant. R. Walton responds that the plant has a capacity of 10,000 cubic metres and is currently operating at around 7,000. J. Robson follows up with a question regarding the consumption of the standard residence in Ingersoll. R. Walton indicates that the number would be about .8 cubic metres per day.

R. Walton very quickly reviews the details of the rate adjustments proposed for both water and wastewater systems in the various County communities. With respect to some of the miscellaneous charges, R. Walton notes that the disconnect fee, has been lowered to \$45.

R. Walton moves on to the 2006 proposed landfill budget and associated rates and charges. Tipping fees at the Oxford County landfill site were last set in March 2004 to increase the fees from \$30 per tonne, in two increments, to \$40 per tonne. R. Walton emphasizes the need for the County to remain proactive in setting the tipping fee at the landfill site to ensure that the landfill site operation and equipment requirements are covered by the tipping fees and to ensure that a sufficient reserve account for the landfill site is in place to address future expansion or relocation of the landfill site. A chart is displayed of the proposed landfill tipping fees showing a graduated increase to \$60 per tonne beginning as of January 1, 2008 and, thereafter, at the first of each year, the increase would be based on the CPI index.

John Lessif, a resident of Tillsonburg, enquires as to what the accumulated reserves totalled for the landfill. R. Walton indicates that the amount is just less than \$10 million.

R. Walton also displays a graph indicating the comparison of the tipping fee applicable to Oxford in relation to tipping fees charged by other counties and independent cities in Southwestern Ontario.

The presentation then moves on to the 2006 proposed waste management budget and its related rates and charges. R. Walton indicates that the Public Works Department would like to deal with waste management expenditures in the same way as the landfill. In other words, the costs would be accounted for independently and reserves would be established for waste management. In 2006, total revenues for waste management were \$2.885 million whereas operational expenditures were \$5.658 million. The total dollars required from taxation were \$2.773 million.

Staff are proposing that the bag tag fee be increased to \$1.25 per tag. This increase is being recommended so that the waste management revenue can match inflation and increase to offset program costs implemented through program changes. The current program has been effective in

raising waste diversion from 20% to 48%. The increase in bag tag fees will be used to directly reduce the overall property tax burden.

R. Walton displays a proposed schedule of application review fees to be established by the Public Works Department with the concurrence of Council. As an example, the department would charge \$100 to review an Official Plan Amendment application. In the case of Plans of Subdivision, the charge would be \$75 per lot to a maximum of \$1,500. In total, there are seven different categories of charges that would be imposed by the Public Works Department as part of the review process.

Councillor Harding enquires about the proposed by-law to implement the new development review fees that is intended to be considered by Council on April 12th. He comments that there is no indication in the by-law that the Public Works Department intends to roll some of the fees into the fees collected by the Planning Office at the time of submission of applications. Warden Woolcott notes that the text of the by-law should make it clear that the collected charges by Public Works will, in fact, be part of the Community and Strategic Planning Office fee. R. Walton agrees that this change should occur and mentions the fact that the Public Works and Planning fees, in the future, would be changed at the same time in approximately November/December of each year.

Councillor Semeniuk comments about the high development charges already in existence in the village of Thamesford. These fees are a concern to him and he indicates that he would like to know the impact before he's prepared to endorse the new development review charges. R. Walton clarifies how development charges fees work and the fact that none of the funds collected for development charges actually goes towards the review of applications. Jeff Robson, representing Oak Country Homes and a developer in the Ingersoll area, comments that he is quite satisfied with the fee schedule proposed by the Public Works Department since he sees these fees as one way to support and encourage a faster approval process.

An error on Application Type No. 7 is pointed out on the chart of new development review fees. In the second line of No. 7, the word "per" should be "peer".

Councillor Semeniuk enquires as to whether the potential OSTAR funding is accounted for in the budgetary figures for water/wastewater shown tonight. The answer is affirmative.

Councillor Semeniuk wonders whether or not the County Council needs to revisit the allocations in the OSTAR application. R. Walton explains that the County made one application for the water systems to the Province and the Federal government. At that time, County Council decided to apply one rate to everyone in the interests of the OSTAR application process.

Jeff Robson enquires as to when upgrades of the County water and wastewater systems are initiated. R. Walton responds that 85 to 90% of the system capacity is usually the trigger point to consider upgrades.

Councillor Molnar enquires as to when notice was given to local municipalities of the charges that have been described tonight. R. Walton responds and indicates that the local municipalities would have been advised at the same time as the general public through the newspaper notices and the website. He did stress, however, that the potential bag tag increase has been discussed at Waste Management Steering Committee meetings dating back to November or December, 2005.

Councillor Molnar also enquires as to whether tonight's meeting was a "public" meeting and also wonders what role County Council is playing. R. Walton responds and indicates that everything put forward tonight is simply being "proposed" until the Council reviews and considers the implementing by-laws at the April 12th session.

Councillor Molnar enquires as to the number of water customers in the County and the number provided is 28,000.

Councillor Molnar enquires about the utilization of non-potable water for industrial uses and whether the County has looked at this issue. R. Walton responds and indicates that the sewer use by-law states that water that is non-potable can only be used in closed systems. With respect to most

industries in the County, their process streams are very much linked and, therefore, there is already some use of non-potable water.

Councillor Molnar enquires about the lifespan of the landfill site. When established, the lifespan was 25 years and, as of now, the County is still looking at 18-19 years of remaining lifespan.

Councillor Molnar refers to figures that he has gleaned from the information available, indicating that there is \$10.8 million in the landfill reserves with \$2 million to be used in 2006. By 2024, the reserve is expected to grow to \$50 million.

Councillor Molnar enquires as to whether there are any other operating County landfills. R. Walton indicates that there are no other operating landfill sites in the County but there are a number of closed sites which have modest costs to monitor.

Councillor Molnar comments on the bag tag proposal and the fact that it is a very modest change whereas in the original documentation a few years ago on bag tags, the difference discussed at that time was \$1.00 per tag or \$2.00 per tag. However, there has been no information provided as to the variation between these two fees in terms of diversion. R. Walton clearly indicates that diversion is not going to change due to a 25¢ increase and that there are a number of other ways in which the 60% diversion rate established by the Province can be achieved. The 25¢ increase is solely an inflationary factor in terms of the bag tag fee.

RESOLUTION NO. 3:

Moved by: Michael Harding
Seconded by: Don McKay

That Council adjourn the public meeting and reconvene as Oxford County Council with the Warden in the chair.

DISPOSITION: Motion Carried (8:25 p.m.)

D-2 2006-30
Re: County of Oxford Water and Wastewater Systems –
2006 Water and Wastewater Rates
Landfill Charges, Bag Tag Fee Increase and New Fee for Development Review

RESOLUTION NO. 4:

Moved by: Stephen Molnar
Seconded by: Susan Hampson

That Recommendation No. 3, contained in Report No. D-2 2006-30, pertaining to “bag tag fees” be divided from the Report and voted on separately.

DISPOSITION: Motion Carried

RESOLUTION NO. 5:

Moved by: William Semeniuk
Seconded by: Stephen Molnar

That Recommendation No. 4, contained in Report No. D-2 2006-30, pertaining to “new fees for development review” be divided from the Report and voted on separately.

DISPOSITION: Motion Carried

RESOLUTION NO. 6:

Moved by: Michael Harding
Seconded by: Don McKay

That Recommendations No. 1 and No. 2 contained in Report No. D-2 2006-30, titled "County of Oxford Water and Wastewater Systems – 2006 Water and Wastewater Rates, Landfill Charges, Bag Tag Fee Increase and New Fee for Development Review", be adopted.

DISPOSITION: Motion Carried

Recommendations Contained in Report No. D-2 2006-30:

1. That a by-law be raised to set the 2006 water and wastewater rates as outlined in Attachment No. 1 to Report D-2 2006-30;
2. That a by-law be raised to set charges at the County landfill site as outlined in Attachment No. 2 to Report D-2 2006-30;
3. That a by-law be raised to increase the fee for garbage bag tags as outlined in Attachment No. 3 to Report D-2 2006-30; and
4. That a by-law be raised to set new fees for development review as outlined in Attachment No. 4 to Report D-2 2006-30.

RESOLUTION NO. 7:

Moved by: William Semeniuk
Seconded by: Stephen Molnar

That the Public Works Department be asked to do a report on the impact of new fees for development review for presentation at a future meeting.

DISPOSITION: Motion Carried

RESOLUTION NO. 8:

Moved by: Stephen Molnar
Seconded by: William Semeniuk

That the information introduced at the March 29, 2006 Public Meeting relative to bag tag fees be received and that a review of By-law No. 4257-2002 be conducted and submitted to Council after a special session of Council dedicated to solid waste management and recycling.

DISPOSITION: Motion Carried

6. DELEGATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS:

NIL

7. CONSIDERATION OF DELEGATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS:

Not Required

8. CONSIDERATION OF CORRESPONDENCE:

NIL

9. REPORTS FROM DEPARTMENTS:

A CORPORATE SERVICES

A-1 2006-22

Re: Norwich Library/Child Care Building Project Tender Award

RESOLUTION NO. 9:

Moved by: William Semeniuk

Seconded by: Susan Hampson

That the recommendation contained in Report No. A-1 2006-22, titled "Norwich Library/Child Care Building Project Tender Award", be adopted.

DISPOSITION: Motion Carried

Recommendation Contained in Report No. A-1 2006-22:

THAT County Council approves the recommendation of the Oxford County Library Board to award general contracting of the Norwich Library/Child Care Building Project to PM Contracting Ltd. of Kitchener, for the lowest tendered bid in the amount of \$1,039,000;

AND THAT the total project costs of \$1,270,000 be shared on a 65/35 allocation for the Norwich Library and the Child Care Centre respectively.

B SOCIAL SERVICES AND HOUSING

NIL

C COMMUNITY AND STRATEGIC PLANNING

NIL

D PUBLIC WORKS

D-1 2005-86

Re: Waste Management – Agreement for Provision
of Customer Service for Waste Management

The above Report, deferred from the February 16, 2006 Council meeting, is further deferred to a special session of Council to be held on Wednesday, April 19, 2006 at 1:00 p.m., resulting from Resolution No. 8.

D-2 2006-30

Re: County of Oxford Water and Wastewater Systems –
2006 Water and Wastewater Rates
Landfill Charges, Bag Tag Fee Increase and New Fee for Development Review

Report dealt with under Public Meetings.

E HUMAN RESOURCES

NIL

F C.A.O./CLERK

NIL

G PUBLIC HEALTH AND EMERGENCY SERVICES

NIL

10. UNFINISHED BUSINESS:

NIL

11. NOTICE OF MOTIONS:

NIL

12. NEW BUSINESS/ENQUIRIES/COMMENTS:

It is decided that a special meeting of Council will be held on Wednesday, April 19, 2006 at 9:00 a.m. to conduct second interviews of the short-listed firms regarding the construction of a new County Administration Building.

13. CLOSED SESSION:

NIL

14. CONSIDERATION OF MATTERS ARISING FROM THE CLOSED SESSION:

Not Required

15. BY-LAWS:

The following By-laws were proposed for the April 12, 2006 meeting by Report No. D-2 2006-30:

BY-LAW NO. 4667-2006

Being a By-law to repeal By-law No. 4529-2005 and to establish new water and sewerage rates for various systems in Oxford County.

BY-LAW NO. 4668-2006

Being a By-law to repeal By-law No. 4628-2005 and to adopt a new schedule of fees for the disposing of waste at the County Landfill Site at Salford.

BY-LAW NO. 4669-2006

Being a By-law to repeal By-law No. 4257-2002 and to set a new fee for the municipal waste collection residential waste.

BY-LAW NO. 4670-2006

Being a By-law to set a tariff of fees for technical review of certain development applications.

16. ADJOURNMENT:

Council adjourns its proceedings until the next meeting scheduled for Wednesday, April 12, 2006 at 9:30 a.m.

9:28 p.m.

Minutes adopted on April 12, 2006 by Resolution No. 2

WARDEN

CLERK