Chair, Deputy Reeve Brian Campbell

1. CALL TO ORDER

2. AMENDMENTS/APPROVAL OF AGENDA

3. DISCLOSURE OF PECUNIARY INTEREST AND GENERAL NATURE THEREOF

4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PUBLIC MEETINGS


      Suggested Recommendation:
      “THAT, the minutes of the Zoning By-Law Amendment Public Meeting held on June 20th, 2017, be approved.”


      Suggested Recommendation:
      “THAT, the minutes of the Fees and Charges Public Meeting held on June 20th, 2017, be approved.”


      Suggested Recommendation:
      “THAT, the minutes of the Waste & Recycling Collection Public Information Session held on June 24th, 2017, be received for information.”
5. **DELEGATIONS & PRESENTATIONS**

None.

6. **PRIORITY ISSUES**


Noelle Reeve, Planner

Suggested Recommendation to Council:

“**THAT**, the Council of Tay Valley Township recommend to the Land Division Committee of Lanark County that the Poitras Severance Application #B17/034 (Part Lot 6 & 7, Concession 8, geographic Township of South Sherbrooke) for a lot addition be approved subject to the following conditions:

1. That, the balance of any outstanding taxes, including penalties and interest, and any local improvement charges, if applicable shall be paid to the Township;

2. That, the applicant pay any outstanding fees to the Township prior to final approval;

3. That, two (2) copies of an acceptable reference plan (or legal description) and transfer document be submitted to the Township;

4. That, the consolidated property be rezoned to Limited Services Exception to recognize an undersized frontage of 47.2 m and area of 3,416 m².”


Noelle Reeve, Planner

Suggested Recommendation to Council:

“**THAT**, the Council of Tay Valley Township recommend to the Land Division Committee of Lanark County that the Stevenson (2386274 ONTARIO INC.) Severance Applications #B17/016 and #B17/017 (Part Lot 27, Concession 3, geographic Township of Bathurst) be approved subject to the following conditions:

1. That, the balance of any outstanding taxes, including penalties and interest, and any local improvement charges, if applicable shall be paid to the Township;

2. That, the applicant pay any outstanding fees to the Township prior to final approval;

3. That, two (2) copies of an acceptable reference plan (or legal description) and transfer document be submitted to the Township;
4. That, payment of $200.00 for Cash-In-Lieu of Parklands for each new parcel shall be made to Tay Valley Township;

5. That, a Development Agreement be placed on title for the two lots to identify (i) the Significant Valleyland, as determined by the Environmental Impact Study on both lots; (ii) in the case of #B17/017, potential woodland amphibian breeding habitat; and (iii) the mitigation measures proposed for the Provincially Significant Wetland and wildlife habitat;

6. That, sufficient lands shall be dedicated to Tay Valley Township along the frontage of the lots to be severed to meet the Township’s road widening requirements, at no cost to the Township, if required .”


Noelle Reeve, Planner

Suggested Recommendation to Council:

“**THAT**, Council supports the application for a communication tower by WTC at Miners Point in order to increase access to high speed internet service;

**AND THAT**, Staff write a letter of concurrence.”


Noelle Reeve, Planner

Suggested Recommendation to Council:

“**THAT**, the contract with the Mississippi Valley and Rideau Valley Conservation Authorities to carry out all work required to address the municipal responsibilities under Part IV of the Clean Water Act be renewed;

**AND THAT**, the necessary by-law be brought forward to Council.”

v) **Report #C-2017-14 – Request to Close Unopened Road Allowance - AMYOT – attached, page 63.**

Amanda Mabo, Clerk.

Suggested Recommendation to Council:

“**THAT**, Council declares the portion of the unopened road allowance (approximately 2,991 feet) between Lots 15 & 16, Concession 4, Bathurst, north of Highway 7, surplus to the Township’s needs;

**THAT**, Council agrees to proceed with the application to stop up, close and sell the said portion of the unopened road allowance as per the Road Closing and Sale Policy and call a Public Meeting;
THAT, the purchase price of $0.03 per square foot be accepted should the sale be finalized;

THAT, should the sale be finalized, that Council also agrees to sell the already closed portion of the unopened road allowance (approximately 1,090 feet) between the Bathurst 5th Concession and Lot 15, Concession 4, Bathurst;

AND THAT, this section be sold for the purchase price of $0.03 per square foot.”

Amanda Mabo, Clerk.

Suggested Recommendation to Council:
“THAT, private roads crossing unopened road allowances be exempt from the requirement of entering into a road access agreement or stopping up, closing and buying that portion of the unopened road allowance.”


Suggested Recommendation to Council:
“THAT, the 2017 Budget Review and Forecast as at June 30, 2017 be received for information.”

Proceeds from the Sale of Equipment
Suggested Recommendation to Council:
“THAT, the proceeds of the sale of the 1988 International and the 1995 Ford Service Vehicle (former ambulance) in the amount of $4,986 be reallocated to the Roads Equipment Reserve for future capital needs.”

Recreation Program Surplus
Suggested Recommendation to Council:
“THAT, any recreational program surplus be placed into the Recreation Reserve for any program development/ enhancements in the future.”
viii) **Municipal Disaster Assistance Recovery Program (MDRA).**
Angela Millar, Treasurer.

_Suggested Recommendation to Council:_

_

\*

**THAT**, the Council of the Corporation of Tay Valley Township recently experienced a flood on April 21st, 2017 and has experienced incremental operating and capital costs, the Council of the Corporation of Tay Valley Township hereby requests the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing to activate the Municipal Disaster Recovery Assistance program;

**AND FURTHER THAT**, Angela Millar, Treasurer is given delegated authority to verify and attest to the accuracy of the claim."

Stephen Keeley, Public Works Manager.

_Suggested Recommendation to Council:_

_

\*

**THAT**, the Waste Site Access Form be implemented for shingle disposal;

**AND THAT**, the Glen Tay Waste Site ramps be improved for easier disposal of construction & demolition waste, scrap metal, waste overflow and potentially shingles in 2018.”

Amanda Mabo, Clerk

_Suggested Recommendation to Council:_

_

\*

**THAT**, the temporary Deputy Clerk’s position be extended until December 31st, 2017 to allow the Township to meet legislative requirements/deadlines.”

Noelle Reeve, Planner.

_Suggested Recommendation to Council:_

_

\*

**THAT**, Report #CBO-2017-05– Building Department Report – January to June 2017 be received as information.”

xii) **Tay Valley Township’s 20th Anniversary in 2018.**
Noelle Reeve, Planner.

xiii) **Harvest Festival Participation.**
Amanda Mabo, Clerk.
xiv) **Appointment of Volunteers for the ReUse Centre.**

*Suggested Recommendation to Council:*

“**THAT,** the Council of the Corporation of Tay Valley Township appoint the following persons as volunteers for the ReUse Centre, subject to the Criminal Records Check Policy:

- Madelyn Johnson
- Kendra Parks.”

xv) **Lanark-Leeds Home Builders Association (LLHBA) – Request to Form a Committee.**

Larry Donaldson, Chief Administrative Officer.

7. **CORRESPONDENCE**

i) **17-07-20 Council Communication Package** – *cover sheet attached, page 103.*

*Suggested Recommendation to Council:*

“**THAT,** the 17-07-20 Council Communication Package be received for information.”

ii) **17-07-26 Council Communication Package** – *cover sheet attached, page 105.*

*Suggested Recommendation to Council:*

“**THAT,** the 17-07-26 Council Communication Package be received for information.”

iii) **Municipal Natural Assets Initiative (MNAI) – Call for Expressions of Interest** – *attached, page 106.*

Noelle Reeve, Planner.


*Suggested Recommendation to Council:*

“**THAT,** the 2017 – Waste & Recycling Collection – Survey Results be received for information.”

8. **UPDATES**

i) **Age Friendly Working Group** – *deferred to the next meeting.*

Councillor Judy Farrell.

ii) **Canada 150 Working Group** – *deferred to the next meeting.*

Deputy Reeve Brian Campbell and Councillor Jennifer Dickson.
iii) **Recreation Working Group** – *deferred to the next meeting.*
   Councillor Fred Dobbie and Councillor Judy Farrell.

iv) **Economic Development Working Group** – *deferred to the next meeting.*
    Councillor RoxAnne Darling and Councillor Jennifer Dickson.

v) **Waste Management Working Group** – *deferred to the next meeting.*
    Councillor Mark Burnham.

vi) **Fire Board** – *deferred to the next meeting.*
    Reeve Keith Kerr, Councillor RoxAnne Darling and Councillor Fred Dobbie.

vii) **Library Board.**
    Councillor Jennifer Dickson.

    Library Board Minutes - May 15\(^{th}\), 2017 – [attached, page 128].

viii) **Police Services Board** – *deferred to the next meeting.*
    Deputy Reeve Brian Campbell.

ix) **County of Lanark.**
    Reeve Keith Kerr and Deputy Reeve Brian Campbell.

x) **Lanark County Municipal Trails Corporation**
    Deputy Reeve Brian Campbell.

xi) **Mississippi Valley Conservation Authority Board** – *deferred to the next meeting.*
    Councillor Mark Burnham.

xii) **Rideau Valley Conservation Authority Board** – *deferred to the next meeting.*
    Deputy Reeve Brian Campbell.

xiii) **Rideau Corridor Landscape Strategy.**
    Deputy Reeve Brian Campbell.

xiv) **Municipal Drug Strategy Committee.**
    Councillor Mark Burnham.

xv) **Rural Mayors Forum** – *deferred to the next meeting.*
    Deputy Reeve Brian Campbell.

xvi) **CAO – Active Files.**
    Larry Donaldson, Chief Administrative Officer.
9. CLOSED SESSION

i) CONFIDENTIAL: Acquisition of Land - Glen Tay Waste Site Compliance Issues.

Suggested Recommendation:
“THAT, the Committee move “in camera” at ___ p.m. to address a matter pertaining to a proposed or pending acquisition or dispersion of land by the municipality or local board regarding the Glen Tay Waste Site – Compliance Issues;

AND THAT, the Chief Administrative Officer, Clerk and Public Works Manager remain in the room.”

Suggested Recommendation:
“THAT, the Committee return to open session at ___ p.m.”

• Chair’s Rise and Report

ii) CONFIDENTIAL: Identifiable Individuals.

Suggested Recommendation:
“THAT, the Committee move “in camera” at ___ p.m. to address a matter pertaining to personal matters about an identifiable individual, including municipal or local board employees regarding Identifiable Individuals;

AND THAT, the Chief Administrative Officer and Clerk remain in the room.”

Suggested Recommendation:
“THAT, the Committee return to open session at ___ p.m.”

• Chair’s Rise and Report

10. PENDING ITEMS

*The following items will be discussed at the next and/or future meeting:

• Social Media Policy

• Potential Microfit for Municipal Office

• Memorial Plaque Project

• Mining Fee Policy (Peat Moss Extraction)
• Dark Skies
• Lanark Animal Pound
• Dog Tags
• Glen Tay Waste Site – Weigh Scales
• Access to Township Roads Policy
• Economic Development Report
• Zoning Amendment – General Modifications – Tiny Houses
• Zoning Amendment – General Modifications – Sleep Cabins
• Zoning Amendment – General Modifications – PSW Wetlands
• Zoning Amendment – General Modifications – Homebased Business Size
• Lanark County Neighbours for Truth and Reconciliation
• Mutton’s Road (issues from Public Meeting)
• Waste Sites - Installation of Camera’s & Policy
• Northland Solar Agreement - Outstanding Items
• Pavement Preservation/Pavement Lifecycle Comparison/Paving Shoulders
• Procedural By-Law Brainstorming Session
• Norris Road

11. ADJOURNMENT
TUESDAY, JUNE 20TH, 2017
5:30 p.m.
Tay Valley Municipal Office – 217 Harper Road, Perth, Ontario
Council Chambers

ATTENDANCE:

Members Present: Chair, Councillor Mark Burnham
Reeve Keith Kerr (arrived at 5:34 p.m.)
Deputy Reeve Brian Campbell
Councillor Fred Dobbie
Councillor Judy Farrell
Councillor Jennifer Dickson
Councillor RoxAnne Darling
Councillor Greg Hallam

Staff Present: Larry Donaldson, Chief Administrative Officer (arrived at 5:34 p.m.)
Amanda Mabo, Clerk
Noelle Reeve, Planner

Public Present: Roy and Theresa Kirkham, Neighbours

1. CALL TO ORDER

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

2. INTRODUCTION

The Chairman provided an overview of the Zoning By-Law application review process to be followed, including:

- the purpose of the meeting
- the process of the meeting
- all persons attending were encouraged to make comments in order to preserve their right to comment should the application(s) be referred to the Ontario Municipal Board (OMB)
- the flow and timing of documentation and the process that follows this meeting
- any person wanting a copy of the decision regarding the applications on the agenda was advised to leave their name and mailing address on the sheet provided at the meeting
The Chairman asked if anyone had any questions regarding the meeting and the process to be followed. Given that there were no questions, the meeting proceeded.

3. APPLICATIONS

i) FILE #ZA17-05: Daryl & Judy Maher
   Part Lot 9, Concession 6
   Geographic Township of North Burgess

   a) PLANNER FILE REVIEW & PROPOSED BY-LAW

   The Reeve and Chief Administrative Officer arrived at 5:34 p.m.

   The Planner reviewed the file – *attached, page 4.*

   b) APPLICANT COMMENTS

   None.

   c) PUBLIC COMMENTS

   The neighbours wondered if they could continue to use the private road.

   The Planner informed them that the Township has no authority on the maintenance or who can use the private road.

   d) RECOMMENDATION

   The Planner recommended approval of the proposed zoning amendment. The necessary by-law will come forward at the next Council meeting.

4. ADJOURNMENT

   The public meeting adjourned at 5:39 p.m.
PUBLIC MEETING
PROPOSED FEES AND CHARGES
MINUTES

Tuesday, June 20th, 2017
6:00 p.m.
Tay Valley Municipal Office – 217 Harper Road, Perth, Ontario
Council Chambers

ATTENDANCE:

Members Present: Chair, Councillor Mark Burnham
Reeve Keith Kerr
Deputy Reeve Brian Campbell
Councillor Greg Hallam
Councillor Judy Farrell
Councillor RoxAnne Darling
Councillor Fred Dobbie
Councillor Jennifer Dickson

Staff Present: Larry Donaldson, Chief Administrative Officer
Amanda Mabo, Clerk
Angela Millar, Treasurer
Noelle Reeve, Planner

Public Present: Howard Farrell
Jim Higginson
Mary Elizabeth James

1. CALL TO ORDER

The public meeting was called to order at 6:00 p.m.

2. INTRODUCTION

The Treasurer informed the public that periodically, Township staff review the Township's charges and, if necessary, recommend changes to the Fees and Charges by-law. When such changes are recommended, a public meeting must be held to allow for input from residents before Council can contemplate changes to the by-law.

3. OVERVIEW OF PROPOSED CHANGES

The Treasurer gave a Power Point presentation that was included with the Agenda.
4. **NEXT STEPS**

The proposed changes will be adopted by by-law at the June 27th Council meeting with the fees taking effect July 1st, 2017.

5. **COMMENTS & QUESTIONS**

Jim Higginson
- suggested that the Township may want to look into sending tax receipts by email so that there are no costs with regards to printing duplicate receipts
- enquired as to what services does someone receive for paying for a dog tag
- Staff stated that the information provided on an animal when it is registered allows the Animal Control Officer to search her database if there is a dog running at large and allows the dog to be reunited with its owner fairly easily. Otherwise there is no way to return to dog and the municipality ends up paying pound fees. It is a preventative measure.

Mary Elizabeth James
- suggested to change the process for dog tags whereby a dog would be registered once with one fee and no tags
- suggested to keep fees affordable for recreation programs

6. **ADJOURNMENT**

The public meeting adjourned at 6:23 p.m.
PUBLIC INFORMATION SESSION
WASTE & RECYCLING COLLECTION
MINUTES

Saturday, June 24th, 2017
Waste & Recycling Collection Information Session at 9:30 a.m.
Glen Tay Public School – 155 Harper Road, Perth, Ontario
Gymnasium

ATTENDANCE:

Moderator: Jeff Kohl

Council Members Present: Reeve Keith Kerr
Deputy Reeve Brian Campbell
Councillor Mark Burnham
Councillor RoxAnne Darling
Councillor Greg Hallam
Councillor Judy Farrell
Councillor Jennifer Dickson
Councillor Fred Dobbie

Staff Present: Larry Donaldson, Chief Administrative Officer
Amanda Mabo, Clerk
Stephen Keeley, Public Works Manager
Emilie Richardson, Public Works Administrative Assistant
Chris Fitchett, Clerk’s Assistant (Student)

Public: Approximately 350

1. CALL TO ORDER

The information session was called to order at 9:30 a.m.

2. WASTE & RECYCLING COLLECTION PRESENTATION

The Reeve opened the public session with welcoming everyone.

The Chief Administrative Officer introduced himself, Council, the Public Works Manager and the Moderator.

The purpose of the information session was to provide everyone information on the program that is being proposed. Council has not made a decision at this point whether collection will be implemented or not, they are currently looking for feedback from the public.
The Moderator informed everyone that his role was to keep the peace and keep the session on time. The Public Works Manager gave a PowerPoint presentation – attached, page 12.

3. PUBLIC COMMENT/QUESTION PERIOD

Jordan
- would it be possible to have each member of council give a one or two minute talk?
- majority of crowd said no

Sharon Turner
- Sherbrooke Drive on Bobs Lake off of Crow Lake
- live here for five months in the summer and one month in December
- did not find anything out about this until a month ago
- our taxes are twice of what our home is in Calgary
- love living here and have a lovely home on the lake and want to value that
- one of the things they do enjoy is their weekly trips to the landfill
- assume cottages like theirs pays a significant portion of the taxes
- asked that Council listen to the actual customer experience, the customer does not want curbside
- have approximately 35 cottages on their road, most of them occupied all summer; having trouble understanding where everyone is going to put their garbage on Crow Lake Road; there will be bins of garbage, it will be awful
- finances are not everything; do not make any changes
- if this does go ahead how will recycling be placed at the curbside? Will it be in bins? Will it be open? Is that expected to be up to us?

Public Works Manager
- Drummond/North Elmsley (DNE) they use a blue box; Rideau Lakes they use a blue bag
- have not come to a decision about that yet

Bob Pesket
- Lakewood Road in Burgesswood
- is it possible to see a show of hands who is not in favour of this proposal?; majority of people raised their hands
- is there anybody in favour?; little show of hands
- has lived in DNE before moving to Burgesswood and DNE had pickup
- has friends on Coutts Bay Road
- has no knowledge of anyone who is satisfied with pick-up in DNE
- it was a constant battle of keeping the road in shape
- people who lived on his road still did not do it right
- they tried to put their bags out first thing in the morning and the animals still got into it
- he sat out one morning and crows got into it and threw it everywhere
- if the Township goes to garbage pickup it will have messes along the road somewhere or everywhere
Gordon Hill, Christie Lake Association (CLA)  
- gave a PowerPoint presentation – **attached, page 24.**  
- the Association thinks it is sad that the Township did not inform people and that they learnt about this session through the CLA information  
- do not need to fix what is not broke

**Mike**  
- is very concerned regarding the numbers and in the timing to get around the Township  
- has there been a study to see if it can actually be accomplished in a 5 day schedule?  
- maintenance issues, the trucks may break down; can the Township accomplish pick-up within one week?  
- proposing to close dump; have not factored in the cost to close the site, by the Township’s own omissions it will cost millions of dollars; is there a full financial accounting of the proposal before it goes to Council next month?  
- he is not for or against pick-up, he just wants to see the numbers

**Public Works Manager**  
- the sites are not closed just discontinued  
- both sites the Township is proposing to close are half closed now  
- $35,000 a year goes into a reserve for future closing of the sites  
- each year the auditor looks at that

**Caroline Evans**  
- informed council that she has a strong opinion and multiple questions that the Township will get in writing  
- have said nothing about the future of the Reuse Centre that she believes is important; will it remain open and are people going to use it?

**Public Works Manager**  
- the Reuse Centre is one of the most interesting things Tay Valley has, it is free shopping  
- it will not close but may need to be relocated at some point  
- have been visited from South and North Frontenac to see if they can open a centre like Tay Valley’s

**Brian**  
- Blake Lake Route 11  
- the message is that this is going to save money; think of solar panels, etc. the government has sold us on those and we were going to save money, we all know that was a lie  
- is a 6 month resident on Black Lake  
- issues with many things; if he was a liberal he would be concerned about closing sites and increasing the carbon footprint  
- theoretically questions and comments about “everyone else does it so why don’t we” he would like to see an actual case study on how this will work  
- he will volunteer Route 11 that comes out to the County Road
- everyone calls the County to fix any problems not the Township
- there are seniors
- he would love to see how the Township will have collection on Narrows Lock Road; if the Township can show how collection will work on a small road, with actual details, how it will be picked up and maintained then the Township can look at the longer roads
- it will not work, the costs involved are nowhere near what is shown today
- the Township listened to residents to open the sites on Mondays to accommodate weekends

Brian Johnson
- Blake Lake Route 11
- kept informed and attended the Committee of the Whole meetings and Waste Management Working Goup meetings to try and understand facts
- been working with other lake associations
- based their lakes' survey on the CLA survey
- 85% of private roads opposed to facts as were presented to them; only 1 respondent said they were in favour of the plan
- concerned of smell, garbage strewn by animals
- plan closure of Stanleyville; it will not save environment if have to put it in car to put at end of private road so will not reduce carbon footprint
- many on survey would consider pay as you throw
- a compromise, maybe only public road residents have collection but do not even try collection on private roads

Ted Parkinson
- lives in DNE in Maple Glen, has a cottage on Farren Lake
- make sure well in advance before all material is provided to Council that the ratepayers can review it and inform their Council member prior to a meeting
- has a concern; end of private road collection, with dumping at the end of private roads illegally
- is paying less taxes in DNE and TVT than when he lived in Gloucester so keep comparisons in perspective

Pat Fitzgerald – attached, page 29.
- Black Lake
- why does the Township even deal with garbage, because it poses a health hazard, want to have health as a primary issue to be considered
- flies, diseases they bring, (has given council a submission), a newspaper called the Gaurdain had an article that stated that dump sites pose a health issue for (dump sites are in Africa), mice, lime disease, will also carry ticks to area
Beth Simons
- McLaren Road in Burgesswood
- it seems to be an either or; there is pick-up or there is not
- is everyone going to have to pay a pay as you throw fee if the Township does not go to collection?
- wants status quo, do not want to get rid of the exchange program
- recycles and garbage, would they picked up on the same day?

Public Works Manager
- do not know at this point as to whether it will be pay as you throw; it is being considered as one option
- current consideration is that yes recycling and waste would be picked up on the same day; plastics one week and fibres the next week

Jondi Cheery
- McLaren Lake
- what changes humans need to make, know that water is being taken from the great lakes, taught to value wilderness and extend, take in, take out
- as a seasonal dweller she takes garbage out and back to the city
- need to start thinking about enjoyment living
- do what’s right for Tay Valley
- be true leaders, do not do something just because others are doing it

Brook Briggs
- Christie Lake
- long-time resident
- concerned that Bill 151, sounds better than what return the Township will get
- disappointed that Council accepted staff’s recommendation from staff regarding waste
- also disappointed that Township would not accept debris and waste from recent flooding damage
- propose that a private contractor be approached to conduct collection
- explore possibly of opening up old waste sites to use as collection points

Bob Munro
- Mackay Line Road
- going to be a lot harder for older folks to get a bag of garbage down their laneway in a snowstorm than to the dump
- no advantage to collection
- what percentage of our present taxes goes to Waste Management?

Public Works Manager
- 13% of municipal taxes goes to Waste Management
- does not include the Public Works Managers or the Administrative Assistants time
- collection would be a wash as the increases to provide collection would be covered off by the $50 per household
David
- Scotch Line
- cost of recycling would eventually be passed on to producers so there would be basically no cost to residents
- if you pass on this cost they will pass it on to the consumer and the costs of the products go up
- neighbours across road have pick-up, he ends up doing collection, it ends up on his property
- do not do it

Steve Stewart
- belongs to Kiwanis
- collect alcohol bottles at waste site
- do not want to see this disappear as the money collected goes back into the community

Dan Murphy
- Kenyon Road, Burgesswood
- thousands of dollars have been spent across the province to protect waste sites from critters, now the Township is opening it up everywhere in the Township
- it is not broke do not fix it
- people can do garbage themselves

Carline Rouse Watson
- cottage on Rouse Road on Bennet Lake
- any consideration given to those in wheelchairs and are trying to get to somewhere at the end of a road to throw out their garbage; where will garbage go? Right beside the mailbox, what a smell when getting the mail

Neil Kelly
- cottage on Farren Lake
- during deliberations has the Township at any time sought input from an accredited public health official?

4232 Scotch Line
- against for all the reasons mentioned
- looking to improve the waste sites
- would like to see improvements to the Household Hazardous Waste instead of driving to Middleville
- would like to see more transportation options
- thanked Council for listening today

Lady
- observation, hardly anyone at this session under the age of 50
- concern is that there is a demographic missing
- if have a young family with young teenagers they will produce more garbage and may not be able to afford collection
- was chair of a Local Health integrated network
- it is very important to recognize the needs of those who get older
- need to look at the health implications
- from demographic point of view how is the Township going to prevent people from injuring themselves

Kyla Hailey
- Colin Farmer Road
- share concerns already mentioned
- if the Township is not to able start collection now, is it true that the Township may not be able to take advantage of it in the future?
- in agreement with collection

Pat
- Little Silver Lake
- concerned that the Township is not going to be listening to the public because this is not complete; it would have been if a few people had not put a stop to it

Jim McCann
- 9th Concession of Bathurst
- opposed
- there will be an election and Council can be replaced

Doug Campbell
- Adam Lake
- has the Township looked at intentional non-compliance?
- trucks still have to run the route even if people do not use the service; will this increase costs as they are using the waste sites? Something to look into

Cottage on Bennett Lake
- what percentage of the 130 million dollars does Tay Valley get?

Public Works Manager
- Tay Valley gets in between $45,000 and $96,000 a year currently
- this amount fluctuates depending on the DataCall equation
- if costs are higher for collection there is the potential to obtain more revenue
- there is a cost, tonne and best practice factors

Dan Patterson
- Highway #7
- any consideration for safety concerns on Highway #7?
- already lost mail delivery since it was too dangerous for Canada Post to deliver mail so what about Township staff safety?

Al
- Pike Lake
- private road
- against; high risk, low payback
Moderator
- for some people it is considered a higher level of service

Angela Pearman
- live on Black Lake
- congratulate the Township on how well the session was set up today
- need to take three factors into consideration; environment, community, money
- if go back to demographics, there are people who are here today who are retiring or trying to save money so if this is put into place what is going to happen?
- what is going to happen if the current system stays in place? what is the cost into the future? verses the $50/year for collection.
- which system is cheaper?
- when it comes to money Council needs to take into consideration costs for environmental, compliance costs with blowing garbage, lower incomes of seniors, community
- Tay Valley has a strong base, her kids enjoy Paul’s Emporium

Public Works Manager
- if things stay the same, other than inflation, there will not be any large increases in costs

Otty Lake Side Road
- Little Silver Lake
- commute to Ottawa, people are now wrapping their garbage in blankets
- more work for staff
- snowplows do hit the garbage; cannot see in a snowstorm
- recycles, waste diversion, do not see in any of the plans, how has waste diversion prolonged the life of the dump?
- want to see the cost accounting and the advantages
- maybe should just put in a new landfill
- concerned that in future will move from 2 to 4 to 6 trucks

Bolingbroke
- have 1000 bag tags, wanted to know what he can use them for now
- is he going to get charged for them as he has already paid for them?
- has never used a bag tag

Dave McWhirl
- cottage on Pike Lake, reside in another Province
- has Council gone out on private roads to see what kind of shape they are in? Are they expected to put the garbage across from the Cemetery?
Chief Administrative Officer
- due to the number of private roads in Tay Valley it does make collection a challenge and Staff and Council realize that
- the Township has looked at all of these things and are aware of them
- the Township understands the point of public versus private roads

Moderator
- assuming that if there would ever be a roll out of pickup the Township would work with each private road group to work something out

George Willet
- private road
- what amount of refund is the Township expecting to get from the circular economy act?
- it will be more than $50 per household, everyone is going to have to buy some sort of garbage container with a raccoon proof lid
- it will be quite difficult for people on private roads to put their bag in a large garbage can
- every weekender takes their garbage with them

Black Lake
- permanent resident
- trucks were ordered and then cancelled
- did Council approve the purchase of the trucks?

Chief Administrative Officer
- as part of the discussion that came forward to Council, one of the first things that needed to be done was staff prepared tenders for the trucks
- the trucks were never ordered and therefore never purchased

Bill
1629 Christie Lake Road
- get all the fast food containers in the ditches since only 6 miles from town
- how much has the Township laid aside for employees to go around to all the dump sites and pick up the garbage?

Moderator
- live in Dewitts Corners
- not taking a position
- there are approximately 270 people here which is just under 7% of the Township’s population
- look around the room to see who is here and who is not here, just consider that there are other viewpoints from those that are not here

Chief Administrative Officer
- on August 1st a summary of the public comments and surveys will be provided to Council
- after that Council will be making decisions and the public will be notified of a subsequent date

The Reeve thanked everyone for coming out.

4. **ADJOURNMENT**

The Information Session adjourned at 11:57 a.m.
PRIORITY ISSUES
“THAT, the Council of Tay Valley Township recommend to the Land Division Committee of Lanark County that the Poitras Severance Application #B17/034 (Part Lot 6 & 7 Concession 8, geographic Township of South Sherbrooke) for a lot addition be approved subject to the following conditions:

1. That, the balance of any outstanding taxes, including penalties and interest, (and any local improvement charges, if applicable) shall be paid to the Township.

2. That, the applicant pay any outstanding fees to the Township prior to final approval.

3. That, two (2) copies of an acceptable reference plan (or legal description) and transfer document be submitted to the Township.

4. That the consolidated property be rezoned to Limited Services Exception to recognize an undersized frontage of 47.2m and area of 3,416 m².”

BACKGROUND

The proposal in B17/034 is to sever a 1992 m² parcel of land (Parts 2 and 7) from the land to be retained (Part 12, Clear Lake Lane and the land south and west of the lane) as a lot addition to lands also owned by the applicant (Part 6). The retained lot will not have access on Clear Lake. The application seeks to consolidate and clarify on title the historic use of the cottage property owned by the applicant.

DISCUSSION

Consistent with Provincial Policy Statement Yes
Conforms to Official Plan Yes
Complies with Zoning By-Law No but recommend rezone to RLS-x
Recommend consent for this application Yes
Recommended Conditions:
- Payment of all taxes owing
- Payment of all costs incurred by the Township for review
- Two copies of the Deed/Transfer
- Two copies of the reference plan
- Rezone to Limited Services Residential Special Exception-xx

PROVINCIAL POLICY STATEMENT
No concerns as the severance is clarifying title of lands used for an existing cottage. No new development is proposed.

OFFICIAL PLAN
The property is designated Mineral Resource and Organic Soil on the southern part of retained lot. No development is proposed in this area at this time. The property is designated Rural on the cottage lot which is the subject of the proposed severance. Section 3.6.4.7 describes the policies permitting Limited Services Residential use in the Rural designation. The proposal will meet these requirements.

Section 5.2.3.4 states that lots created by Consent shall generally front onto existing maintained public roads; however Consents may be permitted on existing private roads for waterfront residential lots, subject to rezoning to a Limited Services Residential zone.

ZONING BY-LAW
The lot is split zoned with Rural zoning on the large retained parcel and Seasonal Residential on the cottage property to be severed.

The property will be required to be rezoned to RLS-x as the frontage of 47.2 m resulting from the combined Parts 2, 6 and 7 will not meet the zoning requirement of 60 m and the area will be 3,416 m², slightly under the 4050 m² required by the Zoning By-Law for the Limited Services Residential zone.

Mississippi Valley Conservation Authority (MVCA) – has no objection as long as future development on the retained lands, including a septic system, shall be setback a minimum of 30 m from the wetlands, unnamed waterbody and watercourse. The vegetation along the shoreline of the wetlands, unnamed waterbody and watercourse shall be maintained to a minimum depth of 15 m. Natural drainage patterns on the site shall not be substantially altered, such that additional run-off is directed into the wetlands, unnamed waterbody and watercourse or onto adjacent properties. Future development shall be directed away from wetland areas consisting of organic soils and the wetlands shall remain undisturbed. MVCA notes there is improvement to the size and frontage of the waterfront lot by the lot addition.

Mississippi Rideau Septic System Office (MRSSO) - has no objection as long as any septic system complies with a 30m setback from water on either lot.
CONCLUSION

The Planner recommends that consent be granted to this application, subject to the conditions and advisory notes listed in the Staff Recommendation section above.

ATTACHMENT

Lanark County Land Division Application, cover and map

Prepared and Submitted By: Approved for Submission By:

Original Signed  Original Signed

Noelle Reeve, Larry Donaldson,
Planner Chief Administrative Officer
NOTICE OF APPLICATION FOR CONSENT

Clause 53(1)(a) of the Planning Act
Section 3, O. Reg. 547/06 as amended

To: PRESCRIBED PERSONS/PUBLIC BODIES/INTERESTED PARTIES

File No.: B17/034
Subject Land: Pt. Lot 67 Conc. 8 geographic Township of South Sherbrooke
Municipality: Tay Valley Township
Owner: Kevin Brian Poitras
Agent: Gordon Ullman

TAKE NOTICE: An application for consent to convey an interest in the subject lands has been made to the Lanark County Land Division Committee, the consent granting authority in these matters.

PURPOSE AND EFFECT: A key map showing the location of the subject lands is shown on reverse side and a copy of the application is attached if not already received through the pre-consultation process.
To sever a 1992 sq.m. parcel of land as a lot addition to lands owned by Kevin Poitras (Pt 6 Plan 27R111) and retain a 20.2-ha vacant landholding.

OTHER RELATED APPLICATIONS: n/a

NEED TO MAKE SUBMISSIONS: The Land Division Committee will meet in the near future to determine whether a provisional consent is to be given. In order to assist the Committee in its review of the proposal, you are requested to provide recommendations on or before July 7, 2017. If you are not able to respond by the date specified, please let us know when we may expect to receive your recommendations. If we do not hear from you, the Committee may assume you have no comments or concerns regarding this matter and may proceed to make a decision. If a person or public body that files an appeal of a decision of the Land Division Committee in respect of the proposed consent does not make written submissions to the Land Division Committee before it gives or refuses to give a provisional consent, the Ontario Municipal Board may dismiss the appeal.

PUBLIC MEETING: A public meeting will be scheduled once we have completed our review of the proposal. If you wish to be notified of the public meeting, you must make a written request to the undersigned.

REQUESTING NOTICE OF DECISION: If you wish to be notified of the decision of the Land Division Committee in respect of the proposed consent, you must make a written request to the undersigned.

GETTING ADDITIONAL INFORMATION: Additional information regarding the application is available for public inspection at the Land Division Office by appointment during regular business hours, Monday to Friday, from 8:30 a.m. to 4:00 p.m.

Dated at Bathurst Township this 14th day of June, 2017.

Mary Kirkham, Planning Administrator
Lanark County, 89 Christie Lake Road
Perth ON K7H 3C0

Telephone: 1-613-267-4200 Ext. 1520
Fax: 1-613-267-2964
E-mail: plan@lanarkcounty.ca
The above is for reference purposes only and may not be to scale – complete details are found in the application form.

Landowner: Kevin Brian Poitras
File No.: B17/034
Subject Land: Pt. Lot 6/7 Conc. 8 geographic Township of South Sherbrooke, now in Tay Valley Township.
STAFF RECOMMENDATION

“THAT, the Council of Tay Valley Township recommend to the Land Division Committee of Lanark County that the Severance Applications for 2386274 ONTARIO INC., #B17/016 and B17/017 (Part Lot 27, Concession 3, geographic Township of Bathurst) be approved subject to the following conditions:

1. That, the balance of any outstanding taxes, including penalties and interest, (and any local improvement charges, if applicable) shall be paid to the Township.

2. That, the applicant pay any outstanding fees to the Township prior to final approval.

3. That, two (2) copies of an acceptable reference plan (or legal description) and transfer document be submitted to the Township.

4. That, payment of $200.00 for each new parcel shall be made to Tay Valley Township representing Cash-in-Lieu of Parklands.

5. That a Development Agreement be placed on title for the two lots to identify (i) the Significant Valleyland as determined by the Environmental Impact Study on both lots; (ii) in the case of B17/017, potential woodland amphibian breeding habitat; and (iii) the mitigation measures proposed for the PSW and wildlife habitat.

6. That, sufficient lands shall be dedicated to Tay Valley Township along the frontage of the lots to be severed to meet the Township’s road widening requirements at no cost to the Township, if required.”

BACKGROUND

The proposal in B17/016 and 017 is to sever two residential building lots, 1.2 ha each, and retain an 11.6 ha landholding. The lands to be severed access Clarchris Road.
DISCUSSION

Consistent with Provincial Policy Statement  Yes
Conforms to Official Plan Yes
Complies with Zoning By-Law Yes
Recommend consent for this application Yes

Recommended Conditions for each severance:
  - Payment of all taxes owing
  - Payment of all costs incurred by the Township for review
  - Two copies of the Deed/Transfer
  - Two copies of the reference plan
  - Payment of Cash-in-Lieu of Parklands
  - Development agreement to identify the Significant Valleyland on both lots and the potential woodland amphibian breeding habitat on B17/17 and identify the mitigation measures proposed for the PSW and wildlife habitat.
  - Road widening if required

PROVINCIAL POLICY STATEMENT

Section 1.1.1 states that “Healthy, livable and safe communities are sustained by: a) promoting efficient development and land use patterns which sustain the financial well-being of the Province and municipalities over the long term and c) avoiding development and land use patterns which may cause environmental or public health and safety concerns. The two lots represent infill and therefore satisfy requirement a). An Environmental Impact Statement was undertaken for the two lots and identified mitigation measures to avoid negative environmental impact.

Section 1.1.5.2 Rural Lands in Municipalities states that permitted uses include: “limited residential development.” The two residential lots represent limited development.

Section 2.1.8 Natural Heritage states that “Development and site alteration shall not be permitted on adjacent lands to the natural heritage features and areas identified in policies 2.1.4 2.1.5, 2.1.6 unless the ecological function of the adjacent lands has been evaluated and it has been demonstrated that there will be no negative impacts on the natural features or their ecological functions.”

Section 2.1.4 requires that Significant Wetlands in Ecoregions, 5E, 6E and 7E are to be protected and 2.1.5 states that Significant Valleylands in Ecoregions 6E and 7E are also to be protected. Tay Valley Township contains Ecoregion 6E in the east (where the proposal is located) and 5E in the rest of the Township. An Environmental Impact Statement was undertaken for the property. It identified a 50 m setback from the Provincially Significant Wetland that takes up the rear half of the proposed severance B-17/17 and approximately ¼ of severance B17/16. It also identified a small portion of the rear of both lots as Significant Valleyland and in the case of B17/17, potential woodland amphibian breeding habitat also.
Section 3.1.1 Natural Hazards states that development and site alteration shall not be permitted within: d) a floodway regardless of whether the area of inundation contains high points of land not subject to flooding. There is some floodplain located at the rear of the proposed lots.

A Development Agreement should, therefore, be created for both lots to ensure that future purchasers are aware that the buildable area of the lots is closer to Clarchris road than the rear of the lots.

COUNTY SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITY PLAN

Section 3. Rural Lands Designation - permits a variety of uses including residential.

Section 5.5.1 Provincially Significant Wetlands - requires their protection and for adjacent development demonstration of no ecological harm as a result of the development is required. An EIS was undertaken satisfying both this requirement and that of the 5.5.2.

Section 5.5.2 Natural Heritage - requires the protection of Threatened and Endangered species and requires an Environmental Impact Statement to determine if development can occur.

Section 7.7.3 Flooding - prohibits development in a Floodplain. No development is proposed in the floodplain.

OFFICIAL PLAN

Section 3.6.2 Rural - designation permits residential uses.

Section 3.4.3.2 Provincially Significant Wetlands - states that development or site alteration within 120m of a designated wetland may be permitted if it can be demonstrated that there are no negative impacts on the wetland’s natural features or ecological functions.

Section 2.22.2 covers Fish Habitat, Section 2.22.3 covers Wildlife Habitat and Section 2.22.6 covers Significant Valleylands. All of these natural heritage features were addressed by the Environmental Impact Statement.

Section 2.20.1 Flood Plains - states that lands within and adjacent to lands affected by natural hazards are subject to the Section 28 regulation of the Conservation Authorities Act and that development setbacks may be required in order to provide an additional safety factor. The Official Plan identifies the Flood Plain regulation limit on these properties.

Section 5.2.2.3 Consent - requires safe vehicular access from the proposed lot to the road. Section 5.2.3.3 - states that consents shall not have the effect of creating or extending strip development. In this case the two proposed lots represent in-fill not strip development and safe access has been determined by the township Public Works Department.
Section 5.4 Site Plan – a Site Plan Control Agreement is required for development within 100m of water to address water quality protection measures. As no development is proposed at this time, a Development Agreement is more appropriate to outline the general area of development and mitigation measures identified.

ZONING BY-LAW

Section 10 Rural Zone - permits residential use with a lot area of 1 ha. A lot frontage of 60 m is required as the lots are not proposed in a Hamlet (which has a reduced frontage requirement). Both the area and frontage requirements are met for both lots at 1.2 ha each and 76 m frontage each.

A portion of the rear of the properties is also zoned Environmental Protection with a required setback of 50m from the Provincially Significant Wetland. A small portion of the properties is also zoned Floodplain.

Rideau Valley Conservation Authority (RVCA) - Does not object to the applications as long as their approval requirements for development within the regulated area of a Floodplain and of a Provincially Significant Wetland are met.

Mississippi Rideau Septic System Office (MRSSO) - Supports the applications as long as the septic systems are installed 30 m from surface water.

CONCLUSION

The Planner recommends that consent be granted to these applications, subject to the conditions and advisory notes listed in the Staff Recommendation section above.

ATTACHMENT

Lanark County Land Division Application, cover and map

Prepared and Submitted By: Approved for Submission By:

Original Signed

Noelle Reeve, Larry Donaldson,
Planner Chief Administrative Officer
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NOTICE OF APPLICATION FOR CONSENT

Clause 53(5) (a) of the Planning Act
Section 3, O. Reg. 547/06 as amended

To:  PRESCRIBED PERSONS/PUBLIC BODIES/INTERESTED PARTIES

File No.: B17/016 and B17/017
Subject Land: Pt. Lot 27 Conc. 3 geographic Township of Bathurst
Municipality: Tay Valley Township
Owner: 2396274 Ontario Inc.
Agent: ZanderPlan Inc.

TAKE NOTICE: An application for consent to convey an interest in the subject lands has been made to the Lanark County Land Division Committee, the consent granting authority in these matters.

PURPOSE AND EFFECT: A key map showing the location of the subject lands is shown on reverse side and a copy of the application is attached if not already received through the pre-consultation process.
To sever two (2) residential building lot (1.2-ha each) and retain an 11.6-ha landholding. Lands to be severed access Clarchris Road.

OTHER RELATED APPLICATIONS: Zoning Amendment (contact Tay Valley Twp for details)

NEED TO MAKE SUBMISSIONS: The Land Division Committee will meet in the near future to determine whether a provisional consent is to be given. In order to assist the Committee in its review of the proposal, you are requested to provide recommendations on or before July 7, 2017. If you are not able to respond by the date specified, please let us know when we may expect to receive your recommendations. If we do not hear from you, the Committee may assume you have no comments or concerns regarding this matter and may proceed to make a decision. If a person or public body that files an appeal of a decision of the Land Division Committee in respect of the proposed consent does not make written submissions to the Land Division Committee before it gives or refuses to give a provisional consent, the Ontario Municipal Board may dismiss the appeal.

PUBLIC MEETING: A public meeting will be scheduled once we have completed our review of the proposal. If you wish to be notified of the public meeting, you must make a written request to the undersigned.

REQUESTING NOTICE OF DECISION: If you wish to be notified of the decision of the Land Division Committee in respect of the proposed consent, you must make a written request to the undersigned.

GETTING ADDITIONAL INFORMATION: Additional information regarding the application is available for public inspection at the Land Division Office by appointment during regular business hours, Monday to Friday, from 8:30 a.m. to 4:00 p.m.

Dated at Bathurst Township this 14th day of June, 2017.

Mary Kirkham, Planning Administrator
Lanark County, 99 Christie Lake Road
Perth ON K7H 3C6

Telephone: 1-613-267-4200 Ext. 1520
Fax: 1-613-267-2964
E-mail: plan@lanarkcounty.ca
The above is for reference purposes only and may not be to scale – complete details are found in the application form.

Landowner: 2386274 Ontario Inc.
File No.: B17/016 and B17/017
Subject Land: Pt. Lot 27 Conc. 3 geographic Township of Bathurst, now in Tay Valley Township.

APPLICATION FOR CONSENT
"Sketch Only"
Prepared by Lenark County Planning Dept.
NOT A LEGAL SURVEY
STAFF RECOMMENDATION(S)

It is recommended:

“THAT, the Council pass a resolution in support of the communication tower application to increase access to high speed internet service and direct staff to write a letter of concurrence.”

BACKGROUND

WTC has requested a letter of Municipal Review and Concurrence for an Antenna System as part of the Industry Canada licence process for new communication towers. WTC proposes to install a 42 metre (140 ft) communication tower and a small equipment cabinet within a 6m by 6m (20ft by 20ft) area at 321 Miners Point Rd to provide high speed internet in the area.

WTC notified nearby residents and posted a notice in the Perth Courier. WTC received comments from four residents expressing concern about the tower’s proposed location and twelve letters of support.

DISCUSSION

WTC requires a resolution from the municipality in support of their application and a letter of concurrence with the application as part of the Industry Canada approval process of issuing a licence for the communication tower. If they do not receive the resolution and letter, WTC can petition Industry Canada for a decision.

As part of the public consultation process, some residents expressed concern over the potential visual impact, concern about lights, loss of property value and loss of habitat. WTC responded by stating that they have proposed the smallest possible footprint/height to achieve service; no lights will be required, on the contrary properties without high speed internet access are less valuable than those with it; and the placement is on rock so no real habitat disturbance.
The letters of support emphasized the need for internet service in today’s world as so many services are provided over the internet including: banking, education, telehealth, entertainment, access to employment opportunities, access to goods and services. High speed internet can almost be considered an essential service according to one comment.

WTC has indicated that the siting of this tower will ultimately reduce the number of communication towers needed in the area because of the area of coverage it will provide.

**OPTIONS CONSIDERED**

1) Issue a letter of concurrence – achieves increased connectivity for residents by providing high speed internet connection.

2) Request that the cell tower be moved - attempts to address concerns about the proposed location of the tower. However, WTC has indicated that they cannot achieve the coverage desired if they move the tower.

3) Refuse to issue a letter of concurrence and WTC petitions Industry Canada – may not achieve increased coverage or Industry Canada may make a decision in favour of the cell tower anyway.

**STRATEGIC PLAN LINK**

Strategic Priority #3 – Communications and Connectivity

**FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS**

None

**CONCLUSIONS**

Staff recommend Option 1 to address the majority of the community’s desire for connectivity.

**ATTACHMENTS**

Notice to residents
Miners Point site application
Miners Point images with tower
WTC summary of consultation
Prepared and Submitted By:

Noelle Reeve, Planner

Approved for Submission By:

Larry Donaldson, Chief Administrative Officer
May 24, 2017

Notice to Residents/Property Owners
Proposed Construction of Radiocommunications Facility by WTC Communications

WTC Communications has submitted to Tay Valley Township a proposal for construction of a 140-foot self-supporting radiocommunications tower to provide high-speed internet in the immediate area.

Location: Geographic co-ordinates 44.743195, -76.240095, civic address 321 Miners Point Road, Perth, Ontario. Location shown by red indicator on map below.

![Map of Proposed Location of WTC Internet Tower](image)

Project Description: The proposed site is for the specific purpose of delivering high-speed internet access. The 140-foot, all weld self-supporting tower is to be protected by a climb shield, located with a small equipment cabinet (66.5 inches high by 38.5 inches wide by 37.5 inches deep) and contained within a 20-foot by 20-foot area on WTC-leased portion of the Dunse property. The tower is to be located at the edge of an unused wooded area at the corner of Miners Point Road and Ridge Drive. The adjacent properties are zoned rural residential. Access to the tower is by vehicle from Miners Point Rd.

Public Input: Comments regarding this project will be accepted until June 24, 2017. Please direct any communication to:

Miners Point Tower Project
WTC Communications
PO Box 580
Westport, Ontario KOG 1X0
1-844-507-9000
comments@wtcommunications.ca
WTC Communications

Proposal for Radiocommunications Facility

Miner’s Point Site

Site Information:

Civic Address: 321 Miner’s Point Rd. Perth, Ontario

Geographic Co-Ordinates: 44.743195, -76.240095

Site Description Summary: The proposed fixed wireless Site is for the specific purpose of delivering high speed broadband internet access to the underserved homes in the immediate area as part of the Connecting Canadians Program. The 140 foot, all weld self supporting tower is protected by a climb shield, located with a small equipment cabinet and contained within a 20’ X 20’ area on the WTC leased portion of the Dunse property. The tower is to be located at the edge of an unused wooded area at the corner of Miner’s Point Road and Ridge Drive. The adjacent properties are rural residential.

Proposed Structure:

The Proposed structure is an all steel, all weld, 140 foot self supporting CSA Tower designed and fabricated by Allen Pipe Fab. See drawings in Appendix A.

Proposed Cabinet:

The proposed Cabinet is an all steel secure communications cabinet that sits on a concrete pad beside the tower and is 66.5”H X 38.5”W X 37.5”D. See Drawings in Appendix B.

Access:

Access to the tower is by vehicle from Miner’s Point Rd. and across the defined access path. See Appendix C for details.

Utility Sources:

Electrical service will be sourced from Hydro One Networks. Buried service wire will route from their nearby transformer pole to the cabinet. See Appendix C for details.
**Rationale for Site Selection:**

This is one of 3 new sites that were selected in order to provide coverage to the largest number of underserved homes possible in the Rideau Lakes area. The targeted underserved homes were identified by Industry Canada (ISEDC) as part of the Connecting Canadians Initiative which was implemented to improve connectivity for rural Canadians. This specific site was chosen due to it’s elevation and specific visibility to groups of homes that could not be viably served any other way. The site is located across the Big Rideau Lake from County Rd. 38 providing direct line of site to many Rural homes that cannot otherwise be served. Most homes on Miner’s Point Rd. cannot be served currently due to the large surrounding trees and various elevation changes. The location of this new site in close vicinity to these homes will resolve both of these issues. WTC has an existing relationship with the property owners; The Dunse’s, who expressed interest in helping with the project early on and who have since entered into a long term lease agreement with WTC for the site.

**Co-Location Alternatives:**

There are no Co-Location alternatives that are able to provide the required Coverage to the target customer base. This is an underserved area as identified in the Connecting Canadians Initiative.

**Height Justification:**

The proposed structure height is the minimum required to reach our customer base with competitive broadband speeds. See Appendix D for RF coverage details.

**Co-Location Possibilities:**

WTC is open to Co-Location requests from other providers requiring site access in this area.

**Urban Development:**

The Site is not in an area that would facilitate urban development.

**Design Criteria:**

The Site will comply with the LUA’s preferred design criteria.

**Electronic Device Statement:**

The proposed communications site would not cause a change in impact to electronic devices in the area due to it’s remote location, distance from the limited number of adjacent properties and the low EIRP of the license exempt equipment to be installed.
Lot Photos:
Please see the Appendix E folder for color photographs showing the current lot and that with the tower superimposed.

Transport Canada:
Please see Appendix F for transport Canada approval and requirements.

Attestation by Professional Engineer:

Registered Survey:
For further information regarding the subject property please see Appendix H for the registered survey of the property.
Expected RF signal distribution from 140-foot WTC tower at 321 Miners Point Road
Before and after (concept)
Background: Miners Point Highspeed Internet Tower Project

WTC Communications was selected by the Canadian government agency Innovation, Science and Economic Development to provide highspeed internet in under-served rural locations throughout our service area. Within Tay Valley Township the area commonly known as "Miners Point" was identified as having inadequate internet options and thus targeted through the government's Connecting Canadians program as an area requiring attention.

After researching numerous potential tower sites, WTC identified the most suitable location as being on an unused wooded portion of the Dunse property at 231 Miners Point Road. The owners of the property were agreeable to allowing WTC access to build and maintain a highspeed internet tower on this land.

As a component of Tay Valley Township's approval process, WTC distributed written notice (reproduced on page 3) to all landowners within a defined radius of the tower and invited public input for 30 days closing on June 24, 2017. In addition, we voluntarily met on-site with landowners to more fully address their concerns and clarify some misconceptions about the project.

A summary of all comments received follows, along with WTC's response or remedy, if warranted. Comments are presented chronologically, and are colour-coded. Light blue indicates that the landowner presented a concern; and light yellow indicates that the landowner expressed support of the project.

I trust this meets with your approval, and respectfully request a Letter of Concurrence from Tay Valley Township at its earliest convenience so that we may begin this highly-anticipated project.

Regards,

K Christy
Kevin Christy
Wireless Manager
WTC Communications
1-866-547-6939 x 110
kevin@wtccommunications.ca
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Property Owner/Address</th>
<th>Yr-Round Resident</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| June 16, 2017 | Don Roux  
950 Lakethore Blvd            | Yes               | **On-site meeting with landowners:** Supports project. No issues or questions. |
| June 16, 2017 | Ian Stackel  
206 Miners Point Road         | No                | **On-site meeting with landowners:** Only concern is visual, as the tower is located across the road from the entrance to his property. Does not object to having better internet, but asked if WTC could consider ways to camouflage the tower so it isn’t “in your face”.  
**WTC response:** This site was selected after careful consideration of many factors. Unfortunately, there is not an alternate location which is suitable and also allows us to deliver the scope of the project as outlined by the government outline. WTC will, of course, make every reasonable effort to minimize visual impact while maintaining the viability of the project. |
| June 16, 2017 | Cheryl & Malcolm Dewey  
405 Miners Point Road          | Yes               | **Letter, delivered via Alex Dunse and on-site meeting with landowners:** An permanent residents of Miners Point we would like to support the Tower Project proposed by WTC Communications.  
In keeping the Government’s policy of connecting the rural communities to the world wide web we feel that this would indeed improve our being able to connect to the cyber world with much more efficiency. Communications in rural areas is spotty for the most part and we feel this would improve our chances of being able to communicate much more readily.  
As many of us are now finding out we must be able to communicate in the cyber space as the world is moving towards using the internet for more and more things. We use the internet to do our banking, pay bills online, order things on line, communicate with all governments, local, provincial and federal as well as our families and friends. Thank you for taking the time to read this letter of support. |
| June 19, 2017 | James McMillan  
228 Miners Point Road           | No                | **Via email:** Thank you again for meeting with us last Friday.  
I wanted to follow up on the suggestion to move the tower down along Ridge Road and have a few additional extensions placed on the tower so that the elevation level at the top is similar to the elevation level at the top of this proposed 140’ tower  
By doing so you continue to have the range you require and it would significantly address the visual issues that were raised. It is recognized that this would add to the initial capital costs; however, as Randy Jones emphasized you merely have to build out the profitability projections a bit farther.  
You mentioned that all comments are relayed to the land authority, and I would suggest that you have two costings available for discussion at the township. As we determined in our meeting, there is more than one solution and our expectation is that WTC will present these to the Township.  
You undertook to respond shortly to my initial comments and I look forward to hearing back from you in due course.  
**WTC response:** Unfortunately, moving the tower site is not feasible and will have negative environmental, technical and financial implications. Not only would it have to cut down a number of trees near the waterfront but this suggestion would entail a complete re-engineering of the tower design and function, thereby delaying the project and potentially risking its cancellation should we be unable to meet the terms of the government contract. As stated previously, we will make every attempt to minimize the visual impact of the tower to the local residents. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Property Owner/Address</th>
<th>Y-Round Resident</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| June 16, 2017 | Randy Jones  
208 Miners Point Road | No               | **On-site meeting with landowners:** Stated that aesthetics of highspeed tower will negatively affect property values between $20,000 and $40,000 per property.  
**WTC response:** The tower will be visible from the road directly in front of the site. Its presence will not impact the enjoyment of the local landscape, except when driving by the tower site when it will be briefly visible among the bush. As for property value, WTC has consistently observed the opposite effect in similar scenarios. When highspeed is available in a more rural location, it tends to increase property desirability. This was supported by another attendee, Paul Gordon (418 Miners Point Rd) who is a real estate agent in the area and spoke of the importance to buyers of highspeed internet in rural locations and the inherent benefit to the property value. |
| June 16, 2017 | Doug Menagh  
907 Lakeshore Blvd | Yes              | **On-site meeting with landowners:** Supports building of tower. |
| June 16, 2017 | Steve Cameron  
603 Miners Point Road | Yes              | **On-site meeting with landowners:** No issues with project. In support of more internet options. |
| June 16, 2017 | Paul Gordon  
418 Miners Point Road | No               | **On-site meeting with landowners:** Supports project. As a real estate agent, advised that access to highspeed internet is among the most important features for rural properties. Disputed Randy Jones’s assertion that property values would drop, and instead predicted that property values would be enhanced by this project. |
| June 16, 2017 | James McMillan  
228 Miners Point Road | No               | **On-site meeting with landowners:** Discussed issues from his email of June 12, and the concern that WTC was not following the process as set out by Innovation, Science and Economic Development Canada, Industry Canada, or others.  
**WTC response:** EED processes are to be used in the absence of a defined process of the local kind, user authority. Since we are in full compliance with the processes of Bay Valley Township, there is no failure on WTC’s part to follow defined guidelines.  
Wanted to explore whether we could move the tower back from the road to minimize its visibility when driving past. Also asked if we could devise a way to make the tower less visually intrusive, such as painting it in a camouflage pattern.  
**WTC response:** Moving the tower back would require a number of trees to be cut down, which is not desirable environmentally. It would also reduce the tower’s elevation, thereby reducing the reach of the signal, which is dependent on height. Unfortunately, this suggestion has environmental, technical and financial implications which render it not a viable option. |
| June 16, 2017 | Fred Pain  
936 Lakeshore Blvd | Yes              | **On-site meeting with landowners:** Firmly in favour of project. Has been waiting for 20 years for usable highspeed. Has a small business that needs access to dependable internet. Believes it will increase his property value. |
| June 16, 2017 | Alex and Rosie Durie  
321 Miners Point Rd | Yes              | **On-site meeting with landowners:** In favour of project. Feels there is a need for better internet in the area. |
| June 16, 2017 | Peter Fife  
112 Bass Bay Road | No               | **On-site meeting with landowners:** In favour of project. Has home-based business and needs better internet. |
| June 16, 2017 | Bill McCargar  
198 Ridge Drive | No               | **On-site meeting with landowners:** No concerns, feels there is a need for more highspeed in the area. |
June 12, 2017 | James McMillan 228 Miners Point Road | No | continued...

that must be included in your notice only two were adequately addressed. It may be that some notices are not applicable, in any event it would be helpful to see all twelve addressed.

When we received your notice, we contacted the Land Use Authority, our elected Tay Valley Township Representative, who indicated she had spoken to the Chief Administration Officer and at that point they were not in receipt of any application from WCT. We have subsequently written to the Township asking about process and to date we have received no communication, notwithstanding Industry Canada has mandated a clear Land Use Authority Consultation process. In a nutshell, we understand that WCT must consult with the Township with the aim of the consultation to discuss site options; ensure processes are respected; address reasonable and relevant concerns by both the Township and the Community; obtain written Township authority in writing.

The Township is encouraged to establish a consulting process that includes formal public consultation and where there are specific concerns the Township is expected to discuss reasonable alternatives or mitigation measures.

The Township may not have a formal process however Industry Canada has defined the Default process which essentially included the foregoing aims.

We are unaware of the criteria used to select this site however, as residents we are generally not in possession of digital elevation models, and it is therefore difficult to assess other options. The site location is immediate to the road and just feet from neighboring residences which is not acceptable.

Industry Canada refers to seasonal residences and it is expected that proponents (WCT) will work with the community to find less alternatives. The site is at a corner of Miners Point Road and Ridge Road and it may be that relocating the tower along Ridge Road, approximately 100 meters, (same owner) may address both visual concerns from residences walking in the country and also eliminates the concern of adjacent residences that, as they look out their back yard, they look directly at the tower. By relocating inland the result is that most residences on the peninsula will be similarly impacted, if at all. As mentioned earlier, if we were in possession of digital elevation models we would be able to assess if there is any material change in elevation.

We note there is a power source close to the proposed site and understand that some form of service would be needed when other sites are considered. In conclusion we feel the visual impact on the adjacent lake front properties, those who pay the highest taxes, will be felt the most and it is imperative that Tay Valley Township work with the proponents to find a more acceptable solution. The towers, is a good idea especially for the year round residences; it is simply a matter of considering alternate sites that are less intrusive. Thank you for giving us another opportunity to respond, we look forward to meeting you this Friday and also to receiving a written response to the issues raised in our comments.

**WTC response:** We did not reply to this in writing, but did address Mr. McMillan’s concerns at the on-site meeting. Please see notes for June 16th for details. Please also see Appendix 1, page 10, for a detailed response to Mr. McMillan’s queries.

### Via email:

While we are in favour of improving the Internet access in the area we are concerned about two issues:

1. The Process: It is evident that some activity in preparation for this tower has already been started. Public input into the project should have been obtained prior to this work.

   **WTC response:** Any work has if the property has been cleared by the landowners and not by us at the direction of WTC. We have not requested any activity on the property to date.

2. The Location: Although the tower will be protected by a climp shield, it will be in a very visible location, along which cottagers often travel either by car or foot. It is not a piece of land in the same proximity and at similar elevation, that would not be so close to this road.

   **WTC response:** This site was selected after careful consideration of many factors. Unfortunately, there is not an alternate location which is suitable and also allows us to deliver the scope of the project as dictated by the Connecting Canadians program. WTC will make every effort to minimize visual impact while maintaining the viability of the project.

We look forward to meeting with you on-site on Friday, June 16, 2017.

**WTC response:** The Merkley’s were unable to attend the meeting of June 16th. They have been included in the distribution of this report.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Property Owner/Address</th>
<th>Yr-Round Resident</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>June 8, 2017</td>
<td>Gord Atkinson 109 Mica Point</td>
<td>No</td>
<td><strong>Viaemail:</strong> We have a cottage at 109 Mica Point close to the proposed town and we support the tower application. High Speed internet is a necessity in today's world and we would spend more time at our cottage and possible move permanently if we had reliable high speed. I am confident that many rural residents in this area would appreciate this service that urban residents take for granted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 11, 2017</td>
<td>William McCargar 198 Ridge Drive</td>
<td>No</td>
<td><strong>Viaemail:</strong> Re the proposed tower on miners point. We will not be subscribing to your services however we have no objections to the tower as it should do nothing but increase the value of our properties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 12, 2017</td>
<td>Fred Bain 936 Lakeshore Blvd</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td><strong>Viaemail:</strong> I have heard a rumour for a long time now about a new tower going up in my area. And now I hear that there is opposition to the tower. How can there be opposition, we have been waiting for high speed internet for years. It's not that the high speed is requested, it's ESSENTIAL. Finally we have conned, a high speed link to the world and there is opposition, give me a break. This tower has to go up for our area to move forward in this changing world. Business and families HAVE to have it here. Put the tower up.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| June 12, 2017| James McMillan 228 Miners Point Road          | No                | **Viaemail:** We refer to your notice and provide comments:  
In our discussions with Innovation, Science and Economic Development Canada, they provided the following list that any notification must include:  
- the proposed antenna system's purpose, the reasons why existing antenna systems or other infrastructure cannot be used;  
- a list of other structures that were considered unsuitable and future sharing possibilities for the proposal;  
- the proposed location within the community, the geographic coordinates and the specific property  
- an attestation that the general public will be protected in compliance with Health Canada's Safety Code 6 including combined effects within the local radio environment at all times  
- identification of areas accessible to the general public and the access/demarcation measures to control public access  
- information on the environmental status of the project, including any requirements under the Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, 2012  
- a description of the proposed antenna system including its height and dimensions  
- a description of any antenna that may be mounted on the supporting structure and simulated images of the proposal  
- Transport Canada's aeronautical obstruction marking requirements (whether painting, lighting or both) if available, if not available, the proponent's expectation of Transport Canada's requirements together with an undertaking to provide Transport Canada's requirements once they become available  
- an attestation that the installation will respect good engineering practices including structural adequacy  
- reference to any applicable local land-use requirements such as local processes, protocols, etc  
- notice that general information relating to antenna systems is available on Industry Canada's Spectrum Management and Telecommunications website (http://www.ic.gc.ca/towers)  
- contact information for the proponent, land-use authorities and the local Industry Canada office and  
- closing date for submission of written public comments (not less than 30 days from receipt of notification).  
Rather the respond seriouly to the listed items, it would appear that of the twelve areas
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Property Owner/Address</th>
<th>Y-Round Resident</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| May 29, 2017 | Randy Jones, 208 Miners Point Rd | No               | *Randy Jones, via email:*  
As a property owner at 208 Miners Point Rd adjacent to the proposed tower site, I'm writing to register my opposition to the proposal. My position is based upon the following points:  
- Loss of natural habitat/environment:  
- Risk of light pollution:  
- Loss of natural aesthetic:  
- Risk of reduction in property value:  
- Lack of interest in additional communication services:  
I respectfully ask WTC to abandon the project or consider alternate tower locations which have reduced risk of impacting existing properties like mine. |
| WTC, June 6, 2017 |                             |                  | Thank you for your comments regarding our proposed project at Miners Point Road. I will address your concerns individually to the best of my ability.  
- Loss of natural habitat/environment:  
  Our tower is to be installed on a rocky section of ground so as not to impact local wetlands or habitat. No hazardous materials are to be used permanently or during construction at the site, so we foresee no risk to the local environment.  
- Risk of light pollution:  
  There will be no lights at this site, so light pollution will not be an issue.  
- Loss of natural aesthetic:  
  We are proposing a tower with the smallest footprint possible to safely support the equipment required. Unlike a large cell phone tower, ours will be a smaller, self-supporting structure tucked into the corner of a wooded lot. We expect that the tower will not be visible from the home located at 208 Miners Point Rd, or from most vantage points other than directly across from the tower itself. The tower itself is positioned to be hidden by trees when viewed from most directions. This natural camouflage was carefully considered when selecting the location.  
I trust this addresses your concerns, Mr. Jones. If you have further comments, please reply before June 28, 2017. Thank you for your interest in this project, and please let me know if we can help you in any other way. |
| Randy Jones, June 7, 2017 |                             |                  | Thank you for taking the time to respond to my feedback.  
I'm glad to hear there will be no lights at the site. It's unclear how the tower will conform to aviation navigation regulation, but I'm happy to hear there are no lights. I respectfully disagree with your other points. Your feedback suggests the tower will not be noticeable. That would be the case if residents stay inside their dwellings, but the bulk of the residents, like us, reside in that area because of its natural outdoor beauty. We get outside a lot and enjoy roaming along the Miners Point road and its many tributaries. Where trees used to exist there will now be a 140’ tall man made hunk of metal at the proposed site. This will reduce the value of the area for those of us who reside there for its natural beauty.  
Additionally, you neglected to respond to my feedback regarding the risk of reduced property value. Not WTC's problem? The residents do not feel that way.  
Respectfully, please find another site further away from existing developed properties.  
At this point, WTC suggested an on-site meeting to address Mr. Jones's concerns. He advised that he would be bringing other concerned residents and we agreed to meet with anyone who had questions. Please refer to the notes of June 16th for details of feedback from this meeting with landowners. |
| June 6, 2017  | Ken Moms, 900 Lakeshore Blvd | Yes              | *Via email:*  
News of the WTC tower to be located at 321 Miners Point Road is very welcome. The broadband service availability in the area is very limited and what is currently available at my home is very slow and unreliable.  
I will switch to WTC as soon as the service is available. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Property Owner/Address</th>
<th>Yr-Round Resident</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>June 20, 2017</td>
<td>Don &amp; Carolyn Roux 950 Lakeshore Blvd</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td><strong>Via email:</strong> I live at 950 Lakeshore Boulevard, in Tay Valley Township on a property that is across the intersection from the proposed tower site at Miners Point Road and Ridge Drive. I am aware of the proposed tower project and support it completely as outlined in the letter received from WTC Communications. Rural areas like that shown in the map provided by WTC are currently very underserved. There is no broadband wired capability in our area today and no wired broadband service is currently planned for our area. Servicing rural areas with undulating topographies and dense tree coverage presents a very significant challenge. Traditional wired approaches are not cost effective. Wireless technology options become the only effective way to service these communities. We need to have broadband service to support today’s applications for online services including banking, education, access to government services, library programming, a large variety of entertainment opportunities, researching a multitude of information repositories, access to employment opportunities, teleworking, telemedicine, online access to products and services and the list goes on and on! Access to broadband technology is now an essential service! It is expected that you have access and know how to use the technology in today’s world. WTC is proposing to have both 900 MHz and 2.4 GHz radio service on the tower allowing as many homes as possible to connect to the new tower. We strongly believe that this service combination residing on a 140 foot tower will deliver most people in the area with a broadband internet option. Removing either service or lowering the tower height could cause a serious negative impact to the delivery of broadband service to many homes. We accept that the tower will exist in our community as they now exist in many of Canada’s connected communities. I have complete confidence that WTC will do their best to ensure that the tower fits into the site with the least possible negative impact on the surrounding landscape. <strong>Public Commenting period closed.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 24, 2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
STAFF RECOMMENDATION(S)

It is recommended:

“THAT, the contract with the Mississippi Valley and Rideau Valley Conservation Authorities to carry out all work required to address the municipal responsibilities under Part IV of the *Clean Water Act* be renewed;

AND THAT, the necessary by-law be brought forward to Council.”

BACKGROUND

The *Clean Water Act* was passed by the Ontario legislature to implement some of the recommendations of the public inquiry into the Walkerton tainted water tragedy; specifically that municipal drinking water is protected at its source. To meet the requirements of the *Clean Water Act*, an Assessment Report to map the vulnerable areas around municipal drinking water sources, and a Source Protection Plan which contains policies to protect these vulnerable areas, were completed for the Mississippi-Rideau region.

The Mississippi Valley Conservation Authority (MVCA) and the Rideau Valley Conservation Authority (RVCA) have existing, qualified, trained regulatory staff, extensive experience with resource protection and a thorough understanding of the *Clean Water Act* and the *Mississippi-Rideau Source Protection Plan*. The Conservation Authorities can provide the Part IV enforcement service at minimal cost to municipalities by accessing the MOE Source Protection Municipal Implementation Funding to address existing drinking water threat activities and by charging a user fee to ensure new proposals comply with Part IV requirements where required.

DISCUSSION

The Part IV Policies state that the *Mississippi-Rideau Source Protection Plan* must address “significant drinking water threat” activities as defined under the *Clean Water Act*. Therefore, among other types of policies, the *Mississippi-Rideau Source Protection Plan*
contains policies that:

- Prohibit some drinking water threat activities under Part IV, Section 57 of the Clean Water Act
- Manage certain other drinking water threat activities through Risk Management Plans under Part IV, Section 58 of the Clean Water Act; and
- Require a notice from a Risk Management Official under Part IV, Section 59 of the Clean Water Act, before Planning or Building applications may proceed within certain vulnerable drinking water areas

Under the Clean Water Act, a municipality may transfer its enforcement authority to another body, such as a “Source Protection Authority”, which is a Conservation Authority serving in its legislated role under the Clean Water Act.

The Part IV Enforcement Authority is responsible for appointing appropriately trained Risk Management Official(s)/Inspector(s) and setting up all logistical and procedural aspects, such as administrative and communication materials, fees schedules, inspection procedures and information management systems. The Risk Management Official and Inspector review Risk Assessments and exercise various powers under the Clean Water Act to deal with non-compliance / enforcement issues. There are also prescribed requirements for record keeping, an annual report to the MOECC and the possibility of attending Environmental Review Tribunal proceedings.

If the Township were to provide the service, then a new individual would have to be hired and fully trained at the expense of the Township or the Building Official would have to be trained for a week in Toronto and take on extra duties. In 2014 the Township contracted a “Source Protection Authority” for the occasions during which it is in need of a Risk Management Official and Inspector, as the Township would save money compared to maintaining a Risk Management Official on staff since one is not needed very often. Staff do not believe the Risk Management Official role necessitates a full time resource on staff.

**OPTIONS CONSIDERED**

**Option #1 – (Recommended)** Tay Valley Township renew the contract with the Mississippi Valley and the Rideau Valley Conservation Authorities to provide services when required to carry out all work required to address the municipal responsibilities under Part IV of the Clean Water Act. User fees would be used to recover costs.

**Option #2** - The Township hires, trains, and prepares an individual to carry out all work required to address the municipal responsibilities under Part IV of the Clean Water Act. This option is expected to cost more than option #1.

**FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS**

The proposed Option 1 is designed to minimize costs to the municipality, minimize fees for affected people, and address existing drinking water threats. A user fee will be charged to address new and future proposed drinking water threats.
The Municipality would be expected to cover any extraordinary costs consisting of the occasional cost of non-routine enforcement related work, such as issuing warrants and attending tribunal hearings.

**STRATEGIC PLAN LINK**

There is no direct link to the Strategic Plan, a Risk Management Official is required to address the municipal responsibilities under Part IV of the Clean Water Act.

**CONCLUSIONS**

Staff believe contracting with the Mississippi Valley and Rideau Valley Conservation Authorities to carry out all work required to address the municipal responsibilities under Part IV of the Clean Water Act is the most logical approach. This will save the municipality from paying unnecessarily in order to meet the requirements of the Clean Water Act and, in addition, it will ensure that all requirements are appropriately met to ensure clean drinking water directly from its source.

**ATTACHMENTS**

i) Proposal for Part IV Enforcement Authority (Schedule A)

*Prepared and Submitted By:* Noelle Reeve, Planner  
*Approved for Submission By:* Larry Donaldson, Chief Administrative Officer
Schedule ‘A’

Background for Part IV Enforcement Agreement between Municipalities and Conservation Authorities & Communications Protocol
1.0 Background
Under the Clean Water Act a municipality may transfer its enforcement authority to another body such as a “Source Protection Authority” (which is a Conservation Authority serving in its legislated role under the Clean Water Act). The Conservation Authority (in its capacity as a Source Protection Authority) perform the duties and enforcement responsibilities of Part IV of the Clean Water Act on behalf of the Municipality on all lands located in the Municipality.

1.1 Part IV Policies
The Mississippi-Rideau Source Protection Plan must address “significant drinking water threat” activities as defined under the Clean Water Act. Among other types of policies, the Source Protection Plan contains policies that:

- prohibit some drinking water threat activities under Part IV, Section 57 of the Clean Water Act (note that no existing activities are prohibited);
- manage certain other drinking water threat activities through Risk Management Plans under Part IV, Section 58 of the Clean Water Act; and
- require a notice from a Risk Management Official under Part IV, Section 59 of the Clean Water Act (before Planning or Building applications may proceed within certain vulnerable drinking water areas).

These sections of the Act appear in Part IV: Regulation of Drinking Water Threats. Under Part IV, any single, upper or lower tier municipality that has the authority to pass by-laws under the Municipal Act for the production, treatment and storage of water is the enforcement authority. This means that the municipality is the enforcement authority for these policies on lands within its municipal boundaries even if it does not have or operate the drinking water system.

The Conservation Authority provides the Part IV enforcement service at minimal cost to municipalities. The liability and risk associated with delivery of the program is assumed by the Conservation Authority and assured by employing competent, qualified staff with extensive experience with resource protection and a thorough understanding of the Clean Water Act and the Mississippi-Rideau Source Protection Plan and maintaining adequate liability insurance coverage. The Conservation Authority is committed to providing this service in a responsive, knowledgeable and courteous manner.
2.0 Details

2.1 Part IV Enforcement Responsibilities
The Part IV Enforcement Authority is responsible for appointing appropriately trained Risk Management Official(s) / Inspector(s), setting up, and maintaining all logistical and procedural aspects (such as administrative and communication materials, fee schedule, inspection procedures and information management system). The Risk Management Official and Inspector implement the policies which involves issuing notices, negotiating Risk Management Plans, reviewing Risk Assessments and exercising various powers under the *Clean Water Act* to deal with non-compliance / enforcement issues. There are also prescribed requirements for record keeping, an annual report to the MOECC and the possibility of Environmental Review Tribunal proceedings.

Table 1 summarizes these responsibilities.

2.2 Tasks and Cost Recovery
Continue to provide the service which will involve the following tasks:

2. Review planning and building applications and issue clearance notices on an as needed basis.
3. Negotiate Risk Management Plans and review Risk Assessments for new proposed drinking water threat activities on an as needed basis.
4. Conduct compliance and tribunal related activities on an as needed basis.
5. Prepare and submit annual reporting to the MOECC.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ongoing Cost Recovery – MUNICIPALITY TO PAY ANY EXTRAORDINARY COSTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Addressing new (future) proposed drinking water threats – user fees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraordinary costs – municipalities to cover the cost of occasional, non-routine enforcement related work such as issuing warrants and attending tribunal hearings (Conservation Authority will consult with the municipality prior to these expenditures)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual reporting – Conservation Authority (as part of overall source protection reporting, for policies not related to Part IV)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| General program needs | Sections 47 and 55 | • Monitor staffing needs, select and send staff for MOECC training  
• Appoint Risk Management Officials (RMO) and Inspectors (RMI) and issue certificates as needed  
• Fee schedule under Section 55  
• Prepare administrative material (forms, inspection checklists, standard notices, etc.)  
• Maintain application screening protocol with municipal Planning / Building departments | Maintaining a regulatory program requires some decision making, effort, and ongoing maintenance. |
| Review applications and issue notices | Sections 57 and 59 | • RMO reviews planning or building applications sent to him/her by municipal staff  
• RMO issues a notice under Section 59 if the application may proceed  
• RMO does not issue a Section 59 notice if the proposal involves an activity that is prohibited under Section 57 | The Section 59 policy helps municipalities avoid inadvertently approving an application without complying with source protection policies first. The policy allows for municipal staff to "screen out" simple applications that clearly do not involve a drinking water threat activity. An application screening procedure is agreed on with municipal staff and can be modified at any time. |
| Risk Management Plans | Section 58 | • RMO / RMI negotiates Risk Management Plans | A Risk Management Plan is a document that outlines the actions required to address an activity that has the potential to contaminate drinking water. It is a customized, site-specific plan developed in consultation with the person engaging in the activity. |
| Risk Assessments | Section 60 | • RMO reviews and, if appropriate, accepts Risk Assessments | A person whose activities are affected by Part IV policies has the option to prepare and submit a Risk Assessment concluding that the activity is not a significant drinking water threat. |
| Compliance activities Tribunal | Sections 61-80 | • RMO / RMI may exercise various powers and follow various procedures related to compliance with Part IV policies  
• RMO will notify the affected person of their right of appeal to the Environmental Review Tribunal  
• RMO/RMI will prepare documentation and attend Environmental Review Tribunal hearings | The RMO and RMI have various powers and options related to compliance.  
Affected people have Environmental Review Tribunal rights. |
| Record keeping Reporting | Sections 53, 54, 81 | • RMO maintains records and files annual reports to the MOECC. | There are Part IV record keeping and reporting requirements in the Clean Water Act |
2.3 Implications for Municipal Staff / Application Screening Procedure
Municipal staff have an important role in the implementation of Part IV policies, specifically to ensure that applications under the Planning Act or Building Code Act within certain vulnerable drinking water areas do not proceed without first ensuring that source protection requirements are met (including a Section 59 notice from the Risk Management Official in some cases).

The wording of the Section 59 policy allows for municipal staff to use their discretion to screen out applications that clearly do not involve a drinking water threat activity so that in many cases a referral to the Risk Management Official for a Section 59 notice will not be needed. Alternatively, the municipality may choose to refer all planning and building applications in the vulnerable drinking water areas to the Risk Management Official as a standard practice.

The agreed upon screening procedure should reflect the needs, wishes and comfort level of the municipal staff and can be flexible to ensure that applications are dealt with efficiently, effectively and fairly.

2.4 Anticipated Workload
Over time, there may be some additional work created by re-negotiating Risk Management Plans due to change of property ownership. This is because Risk Management Plans are not transferable between owners; they must be negotiated between the Risk Management Official and the person engaging in the drinking water threat activity. Some additional work may also be created as a result of verification activities.

The number of future proposed drinking water threat activities subject to Part IV policies is anticipated to be low. This is because the areas with the highest vulnerability scores where the majority of the Part IV policies apply are small and/or are in areas where land use changes are infrequent and/or development pressure is low.

2.5 Customer Service
The Conservation Authority will endeavor to make the process of complying with Part IV policies straight-forward, non-threatening and fair. Specifically, affected people are provided with:

- Communication material that simply and clearly outlines their rights and responsibilities under the Clean Water Act
- A clear explanation of the process and options including information on various risk mitigation measures, project alternatives and funding programs (if any)
- Advice and discussion opportunity provided on-site as required
- Prompt, courteous and knowledgeable service
- No permit fee for Risk Management Plans for existing activities

The Conservation Authority will provide over the counter, drop-in service for people affected by Part IV policies. Communication material and forms will be made available at the Conservation Authority office, on the source water protection website as well as from the Risk Management Inspector during site visits.
2.6 Information Management
The Conservation Authority will maintain records containing information on the review of Planning and Building applications, inspections, approvals, violations and enforcement activities. This information will be made available to the public (when required by legislation to do so) and to the municipality upon request.

If desired by the municipality, links could be created over time between the Part IV enforcement files and the municipality’s permit / approvals record system. The Conservation Authority will endeavor to meet the municipality’s specific needs in terms of data attributes and formats.

3.0 Communications Protocol

3.1 Direct Notification

a) The Authorities shall provide notice and communications to the Municipality regarding the administration and enforcement of Part IV of the Act for the following matters, in the following form and within the following timelines:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class/Type of Matter</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i RISK MANAGEMENT PLAN TO BE DEVELOPED/AMENDED – existing or future activity requires a risk management plan and one is to be developed and/or amended</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Within 10 days of requirement for a Risk Management Plan/Amendment being identified and 10 days preceding its approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii EXISTING ACTIVITY: Notice that a Risk Management Plan is in place (or is not needed due to a Risk Assessment that has been accepted by the Risk Management Official or a Prescribed Instrument that already regulates the activity)</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>10 days from date Risk Management Plan is completed or deemed unnecessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii FUTURE ACTIVITY: Section 59 notice:</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>When issued</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b) The content of notices shall be in compliance with the Clean Water Act and regulations and mutually agreed upon by the Authorities and the Municipality.

c) Notices shall be provided in the form indicated, unless otherwise requested by the Municipality.
3.2 Third Party Municipal Notification

a) The Authorities shall provide a copy of the notification related to the items above, within the same timeline, to third party municipalities as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Notice related to:</th>
<th>Located Within:</th>
<th>A copy will be provided to:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drummond North Elmsley</td>
<td>Perth IPZ</td>
<td>Town of Perth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Smiths Falls IPZ</td>
<td>Town of Smiths Falls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montague</td>
<td>Smiths Falls IPZ</td>
<td>Town of Smiths Falls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Merrickville-Wolford WHPA</td>
<td>Village of Merrickville-Wolford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tay Valley</td>
<td>Perth IPZ</td>
<td>Town of Perth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rideau Lakes</td>
<td>Smiths Falls IPZ</td>
<td>Town of Smiths Falls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Westport WHPA</td>
<td>Village of Westport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beckwith</td>
<td>Carleton Place IPZ</td>
<td>Town of Carleton Place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi Mills</td>
<td>Carleton Place IPZ</td>
<td>Town of Carleton Place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smiths Falls</td>
<td>Merrickville-Wolford WHPA</td>
<td>Village of Merrickville-Wolford</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.3 Enforcement Consultation

a) Before the following enforcement actions are undertaken by the Authorities, the Authorities shall contact the designated Municipal staff person, by telephone to explain the purpose, process and possible cost of the action.

b) Applicable enforcement actions:
   i) Order under section 58 establishing or amending a Risk Management Plan
   ii) Orders under Section 61 (to provide a report on activity), 63 (enforcement order), 67 (order to pay) or 80 (order to permit access)
   iii) Notice requiring hearing by Tribunal (served by a person who has received an order listed in i) or ii) above)
   iv) Prosecution for an offence under Part IV

3.4 Municipal Contacts

a) A list of contacts shall be maintained for each Municipality to provide notification as indicated above, with the Municipality being responsible to ensure updates and/or changes to the contact information is provided to the Authorities without delay.
REQUEST TO CLOSE UNOPENED ROAD ALLOWANCE – AMYOT

STAFF RECOMMENDATION(S)

“THAT, Council declares the portion of the unopened road allowance (approximately 2,991 feet) between Lots 15 & 16, Concession 4, Bathurst, north of Highway 7, surplus to the Township’s needs;

THAT, Council agrees to proceed with the application to stop up, close and sell the said portion of the unopened road allowance as per the Road Closing and Sale Policy and call a Public Meeting;

THAT, the purchase price of $0.03 per square foot be accepted should the sale be finalized;

THAT, should the sale be finalized, that Council also agrees to sell the already closed portion of the unopened road allowance (approximately 1,090 feet) between the Bathurst 5th Concession and Lot 15, Concession 4, Bathurst;

AND THAT, this section be sold for the purchase price of $0.03 per square foot.”

BACKGROUND

A written request (attached) was received from Mike and Marie Amyot requesting the closure of the identified portion of the unopened road allowance.

DISCUSSION

The Clerk undertook a preliminary review.

The Applicants are requesting to close this section to facilitate a severance – see attached map.

The request is to purchase a portion of the unopened road allowance that is closed but owned by Tay Valley Township for access purposes to their property, it runs from the Bathurst 5th Concession to their property. They would also like to stop up, close and
purchase the portion of the unopened road allowance that runs through their property. If Council agrees to proceed then the Applicant’s will also be submitting a severance application and the road closing will be a condition of severance.

The Planner and Public Works Department were also consulted and have no issues with this request.

Staff recommends proceeding with selling the already closed portion of the unopened road allowance and also closing the portion of the unopened road allowance requested as there are no Planning or Public Works concerns or future anticipated municipal uses.

The requestor will be required to pay all costs associated with the application, including purchase price, legal and advertising costs. A reference plan/survey will be undertaken by the Applicant that will include the closure as well as the proposed severance. A purchase price of $0.03 per square foot is recommended for both sections.

ATTACHMENTS

i) Written Request
ii) Map

Prepared and Submitted By: Amada Mabo, Clerk

Approved for Submission By: Larry Donaldson, Chief Administrative Officer
June 23, 2017

Re: Road Closure - Bathurst - Concession 4 - Part of Road Allowance, Part of Lot 15 & Part of Lot 16 (Amyot)

My wife and I would like to sever a piece of our property at 190323 Highway #7 (yellow outline). Realizing that access off of Highway #7 will most likely not be granted, we would like to obtain access off of the Bathurst 5th Concession on the Township owned land (yellow arrow). As a result we are requesting to purchase this piece of Township owned property. In addition, we would like to stop up, close and buy the unopened road allowance that crosses our property (blue arrows).

Mike and Marie Amyot
091191601546000
Section of unopened road allowance is closed, owned by Tay Valley Township – Request to purchase by Applicants

Section of unopened road allowance to be stopped up, closed and

Potential New Lot (Severance)

Land owned by Applicant
PRIVATE ROADS CROSSING UNOPENED ROAD ALLOWANCES

STAFF RECOMMENDATION(S)

“THAT, private roads crossing unopened road allowances be exempt from the requirement of entering into a road access agreement or stopping up, closing and buying that portion of the unopened road allowance.”

BACKGROUND

A recent situation of a naturally severed lot required the applicant to sever right-of-way over two private roads in order to have legal access over them. This application brought to Staff’s attention that the private road crossed an unopened road allowance. Given the complexity of this particular situation the recommendation was to have the applicant enter into a road access agreement as a condition of the severance. Council asked that Staff bring back information on the requirement for road access agreements for further discussion before proceeding with this particular situation.

DISCUSSION

On the advice of the Township solicitor, when Staff become aware of a situation where a private road crosses an unopened road allowance or if a request is made to use a portion of an unopened road allowance for access purposes (driveway) – see attached maps for examples, the applicant, depending on the individual circumstances of the application, is provided the option to either stop up, close and buy the section of the unopened road allowance or to enter into a road access agreement. The purpose of this is to remove liability from the Township.

Being a rural Township there are many instances where private roads cross an unopened road allowance. These have been in place for many years. Given that the risk of liability is considerably lower when a private road just crosses an unopened road allowances, as opposed to when a private road travels (for any distance) along an unopened road allowance, since the chance of an accident or issue occurring on a private road at the exact point that it crosses an unopened road allowance is rare, Council may wish to exempt the requirement for
a road access agreement or to stop up, close and purchase that portion of the unopened road allowance in those circumstance. However, the requirement to enter into a road access agreement or to stop up, close and buy an unopened road allowance or any portion thereof would remain in place for individuals requesting the use of unopened road allowances for access purposes.

OPTIONS CONSIDERED

1. **Option #1 – Exemption (Recommended)** – That private roads directly crossing unopened road allowances be exempt from the requirement of entering into a road access agreement or stopping up, closing and buying that portion of the unopened road allowance.

2. **Option #2 – Status Quo** - Continue to require road access agreements or to stop up, close and buy that portion of the unopened road allowance when it is brought to Staff’s attention that a private road crosses an unopened road allowance during a development application process.

STRATEGIC PLAN LINK

None.

FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS

Council, in turn the Township, would be assuming the liability for the portion of a private road that crosses an unopened road allowance.

CONCLUSIONS

Given the lower risk of liability, it is recommended to remove the requirement for road access agreements or stopping up, closing and buying the portion of the unopened road allowance for situations where a private road directly crosses an unopened road allowance.

ATTACHMENTS

iii) Maps

Prepared and Submitted By: Amanda Mabo, Clerk

Approved for Submission By: Larry Donaldson, Chief Administrative Officer
Example of Private Road crossing an Unopened Road Allowance
Example of an Unopened Road Allowance for Access Purposes (a driveway)
2017 BUDGET REVIEW AND FORECAST AS AT JUNE 30, 2017

STAFF RECOMMENDATION(S)

It is recommended:

“THAT, the 2017 Budget Review and Forecast as at June 30, 2017 be received for information.”

It is recommended:

“THAT, the proceeds of the sale of the 1988 International and the 1995 Ford Service Vehicle (former ambulance) in the amount of $4,986 be reallocated to the Roads Equipment Reserve for future capital needs.”

It is recommended:

“THAT, any recreational program surplus be placed into the Recreation Reserve for any program development/ enhancements in the future.”

BACKGROUND

Prudent fiscal management requires periodic reviews of corporate revenues and expenditures each fiscal year. The forecasts resulting from the reviews are key components of our fiscal management program. This review is the first of two to be presented to Council. The next report will be as at September 30th and included with the draft 2018 budget documents in November.

Management has analyzed the year-to-date operations and projected revenues and expenditures to the end of the year. The main intent of the process is to identify areas of concern in Township operations and to make recommendations and/or provide options to consider if corrective action is required.
DISCUSSION

Operating Budget Review
The budget review at June 30, 2017 is currently forecasting a deficit of $252,034 at the end of the year. There are a number of contributing factors that have caused this variance. Some of the major variances are as follows:

Revenues:
- Grants – as Council is aware we will receive $723,600 from the Ontario Municipal Partnership Fund (OMPF) for 2017 which is higher than the amount included in the budget. Council agreed to place the additional $11,200 into the Infrastructure Reserve for future capital needs. We were unsuccessful in being awarded funding through the Canada 150 Funding streams for the following projects: Events Coordinator $21,750; Tay Valley Roots Festival $28,250; Memorial Wall $12,600 and Tennis Court Repairs $19,600. Although, we recently received a follow-up questionnaire regarding remaining funding available for the Tennis Court Repair project which would suggest that we may receive more information regarding this funding stream in the future. Tay Valley was successful in obtaining a small grant from Celebrate Canada in the amount of $2,000 to enhance the Fallbrook Canada Day Celebrations.
- We have been successful in receiving partial funding through Valley Heartland Community Futures Development Corporation / Eastern Ontario Development Program (EODP) to conduct a Feasibility Study regarding Community Hubs in the amount of $10,000. Further funding announcements from the Rural Economic Development (RED) Program are pending at this time to assist with this same initiative. This project has not been included in the attached Variance Analysis until all project details have been confirmed. (i.e. total costs of the study are estimated at $30,000 and depending on the amount of funding received will determine the Township’s contribution toward the project).
- The Township was not successful this year in obtaining student funding resulting in $2,600 reduced revenue;
- Soccer registration was higher this year than the previous year and has exceeded the budget amount by $200 and Hockey registrations are already being received. The Recreation programs are funded within themselves and if there is a program surplus at year end, the recreation surplus is combined with the overall township surplus and placed into the Contingency Reserve. Staff would propose that a policy be established to place any recreational program surplus into the Recreation Reserve for any program development/ enhancements in the future. This would ensure that the Recreation programs remain funded within themselves in the future.
- Revenues have been included for the sales of the publication of *At Home in Tay Valley* and donations toward the scholarship and these proceeds will go directly toward the scholarship fund.
- Proceeds of the sale of the 1988 International and the 1995 Ford Service Vehicle (former ambulance) in the amount of $4,986 has been allocated to other revenues temporarily. These proceeds may be reallocated to the Roads Equipment Reserve for future capital needs. This would be consistent with asset management practices of other municipalities.
Expenses:

- The projects that were included in the budget but were dependent on achieving funding (as per above unsuccessful grants) will not proceed until possible future funding can be secured (i.e. Events Coordinator, Tay Valley Roots Festival and Memorial Wall).
- Administration expenses are anticipated to be higher due to the approved six month extension of the Deputy Clerk contract.
- Expenses related to the flooding are anticipated to exceed $150,000. In order to be eligible for Municipal Disaster Recovery Assistance Program the total expenses incurred must exceed a threshold of $136,290 (The threshold being three percent of our own purpose taxation levy as recorded on our latest Financial Information Return). The program will reimburse the municipality at 75% up to the threshold amount and then at 95% for expenses that exceed the threshold of $136,290. The program will only cover repairs that are necessary during the disaster and capital costs to return property or infrastructure to pre-disaster condition.
- Transportation Services forecast projects a deficit of $41,300. This is largely attributed to the winter control activities. Due to the winter conditions at the beginning of 2017, the costs for sand & salt exceeded the 2017 budget allocation and additional sand and salt will be required to re-stock the supply before year end.
- The expense for the insurance deductible for the 2016 Western Star has been allocated to the truck repair account. There is a reserve for insurance claim deductible expenses but the balance of that reserve is $30,000 and the deductible for this incident was $10,000.
- Waste expenses are higher due to Ministry of Environment (MOE) requirements.
- Planning expenses are higher due to the costs related to Ontario Municipal Board (OMB) hearings.

Capital Budget Review

The capital and special programs are funded primarily by reserves and grants. Therefore, the over or under expenditures of individual projects or in total have a minimal, if any impact upon the year-end bottom line.

The following briefly provides an update on each capital project:

- **Official Plan/Zoning By-law Update** – no expense are anticipated for 2017.
- **Postage Machine** – a Request for Quotation is expected to be issued within the next few weeks.
- **Website Enhancements** – online registration forms have been developed and are now available on our website. Financial software integration is the next component of this project.
- **Tennis Court Repairs / Refurbishment** – possible further funding announcements are pending.
- **Otty Lake Side Road (Shared Project)** – a Request for Proposal will be issued in the next few weeks for an Engineering Consultant to complete the design.
The following Capital items / projects are still to be completed:

- Replacement of the 2001 Sterling Tandem
- Backhoe Replacement
- Purchase a Covered Trailer
- Road Deficiency Elimination Program
- Sommerville Drive
- Various Bridge Analysis and Repairs
- Noonan Side Road Bridge
- Menzie’s Munro Side Road Bridge
- Annual Bridge Guardrail Replacements
- Burgess & Bathurst Garage Floor Drains
- Glen Tay Waste Site Compactor #2 – this replacement is also currently under review to ensure this unit is best suited to meet the future needs of the municipality. This is based on the discussions and options under consideration.
- Fencing – McVeigh Pit

Capital Projects carried forward from 2016:

- Replacement of the 2000 Sterling Tandem
- Asset Management Plan – Long Term Financial Plan – the Treasurer is currently working with the Auditor with the expectation to have this completed and presented to Council prior to the 2018 Budget discussions.

OPTIONS CONSIDERED

Staff will continue to review and monitor their budgets and make the necessary corrective actions in order to eliminate the forecasted deficit.

STRATEGIC PLAN LINK

There is no direct link to the Strategic Plan but by conducting the Budget Review and Forecast process early in the year; Council and staff are provided an opportunity to mitigate any potential/projected shortfalls, thus, ensuring the Township’s financial sustainability.

FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS

It is recommended that the proceeds of the sale of the 1988 International and the 1995 Ford Service Vehicle (former ambulance) in the amount of $4,986 be reallocated to the Roads Equipment Reserve for future capital needs.

It is also recommended that the insurance deductible expense for the 2016 Western Star remain allocated to the truck repair expense accounts rather than funding from the Insurance Reserve as the balance of the reserve is not excessive.
As previously stated, it is proposed that a policy be established to place any recreational program surplus into the Recreation Reserve for any program development/enhancements in the future. This would ensure that the Recreation programs remain funded within themselves in the future.

Since the 2017 budget was approved, a number of items have occurred or approved that warranted an update of the position of our reserves. See attached 2017 Draft Reserves and Deferred Revenue details.

2016 operations resulted in a year-end surplus of $206,202, all of which was transferred to the Contingency Reserve. The year-end financial result is always made up of a combination of over and under budget situations in both revenues and expenditures. The table below identifies some of the significant variances from budget (amounts in brackets are savings or additional revenue):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenues:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Taxes and P&amp;I's</td>
<td>(35,751)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OMPF</td>
<td>(33,100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building permits</td>
<td>(13,836)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provincial Offences Act</td>
<td>22,169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax penalties</td>
<td>(24,310)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recycling grant</td>
<td>31,527</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenses:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gen. Govt - Council (training, other)</td>
<td>(19,698)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corp Admin - (administration, contracted services)</td>
<td>(19,811)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Public Works garages maint/re-supply</td>
<td>(16,365)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PW vehicle &amp; equip fuel</td>
<td>(35,925)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge &amp; culvert maint</td>
<td>(34,057)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste Operations</td>
<td>41,886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation savings (programs and facilities)</td>
<td>(15,653)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Services</td>
<td>(16,756)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection Services (fire, OPP, Cons Auth., Civic addressing, Risk Management)</td>
<td>(21,485)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CONCLUSIONS**

It is important that staff review their variances early in the fiscal year in order to have time to implement any necessary actions to mitigate potential shortfalls. It is also important for Council to be updated on the Township’s financial position in order to assist in their decision making processes.

**ATTACHMENTS**

i) 2017 Budget Review and Forecast as at June 30, 2017
ii) 2017 Draft Reserves and Deferred Revenues
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prepared and Submitted By:</th>
<th>Approved for Submission By:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Original Signed</td>
<td>Original Signed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angela Millar, Treasurer</td>
<td>Larry Donaldson, Chief Administrative Officer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Tay Valley Township
#### 2017 Budget Review and Forecast
##### At June 30, 2017
##### Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2017 Budget</th>
<th>June 30, 2017</th>
<th>June 30, 2017</th>
<th>VARIANCE AT</th>
<th>Percentage of Budget</th>
<th>Year-End Forecast</th>
<th>Surplus/(Deficit)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revenues:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>Variance At</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxes</td>
<td>5,274,761</td>
<td>5,280,396</td>
<td>5,635</td>
<td>5,274,761</td>
<td>100.11%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants</td>
<td>910,200</td>
<td>1,829,778</td>
<td>(490,014)</td>
<td>858,268</td>
<td>201.03%</td>
<td></td>
<td>(51,932)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fees and Service Charges</td>
<td>167,800</td>
<td>87,688</td>
<td>(80,102)</td>
<td>167,779</td>
<td>52.26%</td>
<td></td>
<td>(21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Revenue</td>
<td>601,430</td>
<td>230,149</td>
<td>(371,281)</td>
<td>638,288</td>
<td>38.27%</td>
<td></td>
<td>36,888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers from Operating Reserves</td>
<td>46,500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(46,500)</td>
<td>46,343</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td>(157)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenues</strong></td>
<td>7,000,691</td>
<td>7,428,021</td>
<td>(982,262)</td>
<td>6,985,439</td>
<td>106.10%</td>
<td></td>
<td>(15,252)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>Variance At</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expenditures:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Government</td>
<td>1,065,575</td>
<td>541,341</td>
<td>524,234</td>
<td>1,058,786</td>
<td>50.80%</td>
<td></td>
<td>6,789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection Services</td>
<td>1,882,886</td>
<td>712,262</td>
<td>1,170,624</td>
<td>2,024,140</td>
<td>37.63%</td>
<td></td>
<td>(141,254)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Services</td>
<td>1,547,400</td>
<td>1,008,286</td>
<td>539,114</td>
<td>1,588,700</td>
<td>65.16%</td>
<td></td>
<td>(41,300)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Services</td>
<td>756,630</td>
<td>283,805</td>
<td>472,825</td>
<td>775,385</td>
<td>37.51%</td>
<td></td>
<td>(18,755)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation and Cultural Services</td>
<td>458,720</td>
<td>221,462</td>
<td>236,758</td>
<td>451,242</td>
<td>48.28%</td>
<td></td>
<td>6,978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning and Development</td>
<td>281,500</td>
<td>151,686</td>
<td>129,814</td>
<td>306,940</td>
<td>53.88%</td>
<td></td>
<td>(25,440)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers to Reserves</td>
<td>852,880</td>
<td>852,880</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>863,880</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td>(11,200)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenses out of Reserves</td>
<td>42,200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td>(12,800)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt financing</td>
<td>63,100</td>
<td>31,509</td>
<td>31,591</td>
<td>63,100</td>
<td>49.94%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenditures</strong></td>
<td>6,950,691</td>
<td>3,803,031</td>
<td>3,114,660</td>
<td>7,132,173</td>
<td>54.71%</td>
<td></td>
<td>(236,782)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Infrastructure Replacement Program:
- Capital Program: 853,750 (0) 853,750 0.00% 1,269,750 (415,000)
- Transfers from Infrastructure Reserve: (803,750) (0) (803,750) 0.00% (1,218,750) (415,000)
- Net Infra Replacement Costs: 50,000 (0) 50,000 50,000 0

Forecasted Surplus/(Deficit): 0 (252,034)
## REVENUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2017 BUDGET</th>
<th>ACTUAL AS AT June 30, 2017</th>
<th>VARIANCE AT June 30, 2017</th>
<th>Percentage of Budget to Date</th>
<th>YEAR END FORECAST SURPLUS/ (DEFICIT)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Taxes and PIL's</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>5,274,761</td>
<td>5,280,396</td>
<td>5,635</td>
<td>100.11% 5,274,761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grants:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ont Municipal Partnership Fund</td>
<td>712,400</td>
<td>361,800</td>
<td>(350,600)</td>
<td>50.79% 723,600</td>
<td>-11,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ontario Trillium Grant</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livestock Losses</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>1,250</td>
<td>(10,750)</td>
<td>10.42% 12,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recycling</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(50,000)</td>
<td>0.00% 50,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources Development</td>
<td>2,600</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(2,600)</td>
<td>0.00% 0</td>
<td>(2,600)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drainage Superintendent</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,068</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>106.80% 1,068</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Provincial Grants (OCIF - Otty)</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100.00% 50,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Grants (Celebrate Canada, Canadian)</td>
<td>82,200</td>
<td>6,068</td>
<td>(76,132)</td>
<td>7.38% 21,600</td>
<td>(50,600)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCIF - Joint Project</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,409,592</td>
<td>1,409,592</td>
<td>201.03% 858,268</td>
<td>(51,932)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>910,200</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,829,778</strong></td>
<td><strong>(490,014)</strong></td>
<td><strong>201.03%</strong> 858,268</td>
<td><strong>(51,932)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fees and Service Charges:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax Certificates</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>3,520</td>
<td>(1,980)</td>
<td>64.00% 5,500</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning Compliance Certificates</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>140.00% 250</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic Addressing Fees</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>1,760</td>
<td>(1,740)</td>
<td>50.29% 3,500</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Permits and Other</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>(800)</td>
<td>33.33% 1,200</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste Disposal Fees &amp; Charges</td>
<td>64,750</td>
<td>29,080</td>
<td>(35,670)</td>
<td>44.91% 64,750</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation Program Fees</td>
<td>26,500</td>
<td>8,417</td>
<td>(18,083)</td>
<td>31.76% 26,500</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning &amp; Zoning Fees &amp; Charges</td>
<td>54,000</td>
<td>34,755</td>
<td>(19,245)</td>
<td>64.36% 54,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tile Drainage</td>
<td>12,100</td>
<td>9,416</td>
<td>(2,684)</td>
<td>77.82% 12,079</td>
<td>(21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>167,800</strong></td>
<td><strong>87,698</strong></td>
<td><strong>(80,102)</strong></td>
<td><strong>52.26%</strong> 167,779</td>
<td><strong>(21)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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TAY VALLEY TOWNSHIP  
2017 BUDGET REVIEW AND FORECAST  
AT JUNE 30, 2017

REVENUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ACTUAL 2017 AS AT June 30, 2017</th>
<th>VARIANCE AT June 30, 2017</th>
<th>Percentage of Budget to Date</th>
<th>YEAR-END FORECAST</th>
<th>SURPLUS/ (DEFICIT)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal Gas Tax</td>
<td>169,380</td>
<td>2,999 (166,381)</td>
<td>1.77%</td>
<td>172,379</td>
<td>2,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recycling Sales</td>
<td>25,200</td>
<td>6,476 (18,724)</td>
<td>25.70%</td>
<td>25,200</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog Licences, Fines, etc.</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>445 (155)</td>
<td>74.17%</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Permits</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>47,317 (32,683)</td>
<td>59.15%</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refreshment Vehicle License</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0 (300)</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Hall Rentals</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>1,380 (1,120)</td>
<td>55.20%</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle &amp; Equipment Rentals</td>
<td>8,500</td>
<td>7,128 (1,374)</td>
<td>83.83%</td>
<td>8,500</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Septic Permits</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>18,790 (10,210)</td>
<td>69.67%</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPP Provincial Offences</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>0 (60,000)</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPP service charges</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>4,370 (630)</td>
<td>87.41%</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIDE Program</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>6,627 627</td>
<td>110.45%</td>
<td>6,627</td>
<td>627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donations for PSB Activities</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>475 (475)</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>False Alarm Charges</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax Penalties</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>69,517 (50,483)</td>
<td>57.93%</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment Income</td>
<td>79,000</td>
<td>22,272 (56,728)</td>
<td>28.19%</td>
<td>79,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comm. tower land lease</td>
<td>3,600</td>
<td>1,507 (2,093)</td>
<td>41.85%</td>
<td>3,600</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax sale cost recoveries</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>3,511 (1,489)</td>
<td>70.21%</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livestock cost recovery</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>30 (570)</td>
<td>5.00%</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pits &amp; quarries royalties</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>0 (2,000)</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commissioner of Oath Fees</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>140 (110)</td>
<td>56.00%</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200th Anniversary Scholarship - Donations</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,050</td>
<td>1,050</td>
<td>1,050</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200th Anniversary Scholarship Proceeds</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200th Anniversary - Book Sales</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,900</td>
<td>2,900</td>
<td>2,900</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200th Anniversary - Clothing Sales &amp; Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legacy Cottage Signs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11,418 (11,418)</td>
<td>11,418</td>
<td>11,418</td>
<td>11,418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>19,654 16,154 (3,501)</td>
<td>561.55%</td>
<td>19,654</td>
<td>16,154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>601,430</td>
<td>230,149 (371,281)</td>
<td>38.27%</td>
<td>638,288</td>
<td>36,858</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Transfers from Reserves:

Expenses out of Reserves:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenses out of Reserves:</th>
<th>ACTUAL 2017 AS AT June 30, 2017</th>
<th>VARIANCE AT June 30, 2017</th>
<th>Percentage of Budget to Date</th>
<th>YEAR-END FORECAST</th>
<th>SURPLUS/ (DEFICIT)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contingency - tax reduction</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>0 (25,000)</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elections</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>0 (1,500)</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>1,343</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source Water Protection</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>0 (10,000)</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance Consultant Project</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>0 (10,000)</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Official Plan / Zoning By-law</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>0 (10,000)</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0 (10,000)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46,500</td>
<td>0 (46,500)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>46,343</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## TAY VALLEY TOWNSHIP
### 2017 BUDGET REVIEW AND FORECAST
### AT JUNE 30, 2017

### REVENUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transfers from Reserves (cont):</th>
<th>2017 ACTUAL</th>
<th>VARIANCE</th>
<th>Percentage of Budget to Date</th>
<th>YEAR-END FORECAST</th>
<th>FORECAST SURPLUS/ (DEFICIT)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Infrastructure Replacement:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vehicles &amp; Equipment:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replace 2001 Sterling Tandem (#9)</td>
<td>235,000</td>
<td>(235,000)</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>235,000</td>
<td>(235,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase Covered Trailer (replaces cube)</td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td>(13,000)</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td>(13,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Backhoe Replacement (approved Res #C)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>170,000</td>
<td>(170,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Roads:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otty Lake Side Road (shared)</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(50,000) 0.00%</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less OCIF - Formula Based Funding</td>
<td>(50,000)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50,000 0.00%</td>
<td>(50,000)</td>
<td>(50,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deficiencies Elimination Prgm</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>60,000 0.00%</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sommerville Drive (2)</td>
<td>129,200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>129,200 0.00%</td>
<td>129,200</td>
<td>129,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bridges:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Various analyses/repairs</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50,000 0.00%</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noonan Side Road Bridge</td>
<td>110,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>110,000 0.00%</td>
<td>110,000</td>
<td>110,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menzie's Munro Side Road Bridge</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18,000 0.00%</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>18,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replace Bridge Guardrails - 5 yr project</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50,000 0.00%</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Building:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burgess Garage - Drain</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30,000 0.00%</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bathurst Garage - Drain</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30,000 0.00%</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Office Equipment:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage Machine</td>
<td>6,650</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6,650 0.00%</td>
<td>6,650</td>
<td>6,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parkland Reserve</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis Court / Outdoor Rink Upgrades -  p</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20,000 0.00%</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Waste Sites:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glen Tay Compactor(additional)</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40,000 0.00%</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Special Contingency:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website Enhancements</td>
<td>6,400</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6,400 0.00%</td>
<td>6,400</td>
<td>6,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fencing - McVeigh Pit - required</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5,500 0.00%</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>5,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2016 Projects Carried Forward</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicles &amp; Equipment:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replace 2000 Sterling Tandem</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>235,000</td>
<td>(235,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asset Management Reserve</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>(10,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Term Financial Plan</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Infra Replacement</td>
<td>803,760</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(803,760) 0.00%</td>
<td>1,218,760</td>
<td>(416,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenues</strong></td>
<td>7,804,441</td>
<td>7,428,021</td>
<td>(1,786,012) 95.18%</td>
<td>8,204,189</td>
<td>(430,252)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## TAY VALLEY TOWNSHIP
### 2017 BUDGET REVIEW AND FORECAST
#### AT JUNE 30, 2017
### EXPENDITURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ACTUAL 2017</th>
<th>VARIANCE AS AT June 30, 2017</th>
<th>VARIANCE AT June 30, 2017</th>
<th>Percentage of Budget to Date</th>
<th>YEAR-END FORECAST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Government:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council</td>
<td>159,750</td>
<td>78,715</td>
<td>81,035</td>
<td>49.27%</td>
<td>159,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elections</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,343</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>89.55%</td>
<td>1,543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Relations</td>
<td>26,250</td>
<td>21,521</td>
<td>4,729</td>
<td>81.98%</td>
<td>26,290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Planning</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appreciation dinners</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200th Anniversary Bursary &amp; Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,467</td>
<td>(1,467)</td>
<td>4,950</td>
<td>(4,950)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Events &amp; Promo. - pending grant</td>
<td>21,750</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21,750</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>21,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada 150th Celebrations</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>1,102</td>
<td>898</td>
<td>55.12%</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TVT Roots Festival - pending grant</td>
<td>28,250</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28,250</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>28,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legacy Cottage Signs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>891</td>
<td>(891)</td>
<td>11,418</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>241,500</td>
<td>105,039</td>
<td>136,461</td>
<td>43.49%</td>
<td>207,711</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Corporate Management -** |            |                             |                          |                              |                   |
| Administration          | 672,575    | 373,528                     | 299,047                  | 55.54%                       | 699,575           | (27,000)          |
| Contracted Services     | 71,800     | 43,593                      | 28,207                   | 60.71%                       | 71,800            | 0                 |
| Computer Services       | 35,200     | 6,510                       | 26,690                   | 24.17%                       | 35,200            | 0                 |
| Township Office Building| 37,000     | 9,940                       | 27,060                   | 28.88%                       | 37,000            | 0                 |
| Land Sale for Arrears   | 5,000      | 733                         | 4,267                    | 14.55%                       | 5,000             | 0                 |
| Records Management Initiatives | 2,500 | 0                             | 2,500                   | 0.00%                        | 2,500             | 0                 |
|                         | 824,075    | 436,302                     | 387,773                  | 52.94%                       | 851,075           | (27,000)          |

| **Total General Government** | 1,065,575 | 541,341                     | 524,234                  | 50.80%                       | 1,058,786         | 6,789             |

| **Protection Services:** |            |                             |                          |                              |                   |
| Cost-shared Fire Department | 513,700  | 129,391                     | 384,309                  | 25.19%                       | 515,710           | (2,010)           |
| **Police -**              |            |                             |                          |                              |                   |
| Ontario Provincial Police Contrac | 1,070,746 | 444,224                     | 626,522                  | 41.49%                       | 1,070,746         | 0                 |
| RIDE Program              | 6,000      | 1,938                       | 4,062                    | 32.29%                       | 6,000             | 0                 |
| Police Services Board     | 9,500      | 4,051                       | 5,440                    | 42.74%                       | 9,500             | 0                 |
|                         | 1,086,246  | 450,223                     | 636,023                  | 41.45%                       | 1,086,246         | 0                 |
| Building Inspection -     | 111,350    | 47,145                      | 64,205                   | 42.34%                       | 105,850           | 5,500             |
TAY VALLEY TOWNSHIP
2017 BUDGET REVIEW AND FORECAST
AT JUNE 30, 2017
EXPENDITURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conservation Authorities -</th>
<th>2017 ACTUAL</th>
<th>VARIANCE AT</th>
<th>Percentage of Budget to Date</th>
<th>YEAR-END FORECAST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi Valley</td>
<td>18,305</td>
<td>18,078</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>18,078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rideau Valley</td>
<td>43,360</td>
<td>42,856</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>42,856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>61,665</td>
<td>60,934</td>
<td>731</td>
<td>60,934</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Emergency Measures -     | 2,000       | 0           | 2,000                       | 2,000            |

| Disaster Recovery (Flood) | 0           | 16,642      | 0%                          | 150,000          |
|                          |             | (16,642)    |                             | (150,000)        |

| Other -                  |             |             |                             |                  |
| Animal Control           | 18,425      | 5,212       | 13,213                      | 28.29%           |
| Livestock Losses         | 14,900      | 0           | 14,900                      | 0                |
| Civic Addressing         | 6,600       | 2,716       | 3,884                       | 41.15%           |
| Risk Mgt Officer (source water) | 3,000 | 0           | 3,000                       | 0                |
| Source Water (Grant Exp) | 10,000      | 0           | 10,000                      | 0                |
| Septic Inspections       | 35,000      | 0           | 35,000                      | 0                |
| Septic Re-inspection Program | 20,000 | 0           | 20,000                      | 0                |
|                          | 107,925     | 7,928       | 99,997                      | 7.35%            |
| Total Protection Services| 1,882,886   | 712,262     | 1,170,624                   | 37.83%           |
|                          |             |             | 2,024,140                   | (141,254)        |

Transportation Services:

| Public Works Overhead - Administration | 385,870 | 198,914 | 186,956 | 51.55% | 385,000 | 870 |
| Garages                              | 52,830  | 22,017  | 30,813  | 41.68% | 45,000  | 7,830 |
| Vehicles & Equipment Maintenance     | 269,000 | 151,022 | 117,978 | 56.14% | 269,000 | 0   |
|                                     | 707,700 | 371,953 | 335,747 | 52.56% | 699,000 | 6,700 |

Roadways -

| Bridges & Culverts | 52,000 | 10,167 | 41,833 | 0.00% | 52,000 | 0   |
| Roadside Maintenance | 54,800 | 5,516  | 49,284 | 10.06% | 54,800 | 0   |
| Hardtop Maintenance | 56,000 | 28,228 | 27,772 | 50.41% | 56,000 | 0   |
| Loosestop Maintenance | 414,900 | 338,435 | 76,465 | 81.57% | 414,900 | 0 |
| Traffic Control      | 28,200 | 11,922 | 16,278 | 42.28% | 28,200 | 0   |
|                       | 605,900 | 394,268 | 211,632 | 65.07% | 605,900 | 0   |

Winter Control -

| Snowplowing | 45,000 | 18,788 | 26,212 | 41.75% |
|            |       |        |        | 45,000 |
### TAY VALLEY TOWNSHIP
#### 2017 BUDGET REVIEW AND FORECAST
##### AT JUNE 30, 2017

#### EXPENDITURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2017 BUDGET</th>
<th>ACTUAL AS AT June 30, 2017</th>
<th>VARIANCE AT June 30, 2017</th>
<th>Percentage of Budget to Date</th>
<th>YEAR-END FORECAST</th>
<th>FORECAST SURPLUS/ (DEFICIT)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sanding &amp; Salting</td>
<td>180,000</td>
<td>221,184</td>
<td>(41,184)</td>
<td>122.88%</td>
<td>230,000</td>
<td>(50,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culvert Thawing</td>
<td>4,100</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>3,655</td>
<td>10.88%</td>
<td>4,100</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>229,100</td>
<td>240,418</td>
<td>104.94%</td>
<td>279,100</td>
<td>(50,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Lighting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4,700</td>
<td>1,647</td>
<td>3,053</td>
<td>35.04%</td>
<td>4,700</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Transportation Services</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,547,400</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,008,286</strong></td>
<td><strong>539,114</strong></td>
<td><strong>65.16%</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,588,700</strong></td>
<td><strong>(41,300)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Environmental Services:**

| Waste Disposal -       |             |                          |                          |                            |                  |                            |
| Glen Tay               | 320,800     | 129,808                  | 190,992                  | 40.46%                     | 320,800          | 0                          |
| Stanleyville           | 95,755      | 31,464                   | 64,291                   | 32.86%                     | 95,755           | 0                          |
| Maberly                | 96,675      | 29,813                   | 66,862                   | 30.87%                     | 96,675           | 0                          |
| Closed Waste Sites Monitoring | 12,600       | 3,077                    | 9,523                    | 24.42%                     | 12,600           | 0                          |
| Other                  | 42,900      | 23,931                   | 18,969                   | 55.76%                     | 61,655           | (18,755)                   |
|                        |             | 568,630                  | 218,893                  | 350,737                    | 587,385          | (18,755)                   |

| Recycling -            |             |                          |                          |                            |                  |                            |
| Glen Tay               | 134,000     | 47,693                   | 86,307                   | 35.59%                     | 134,000          | 0                          |
| Stanleyville           | 29,500      | 11,145                   | 18,355                   | 37.78%                     | 29,500           | 0                          |
| Maberly                | 18,000      | 6,873                    | 11,127                   | 38.18%                     | 18,000           | 0                          |
| Other                  | 6,500       | 0                        | 6,500                    | 0.00%                      | 6,500            | 0                          |
|                        | 188,000     | 65,712                   | 122,288                  | 34.95%                     | 188,000          | 0                          |

| **Total Environmental Services** | **756,630** | **283,805** | **472,825** | **37.51%** | **775,385** | **(18,755)** |

**Recreation, Cultural & Social Services:**

| Recreation Programs -  |             |                          |                          |                            |                  |                            |
| Administration         | 9,375       | 8,521                    | 854                      | 90.89%                     | 7,000            | 2,375                      |
| Soccer Program         | 2,500       | 1,854                    | 646                      | 74.15%                     | 2,000            | 500                        |
| Hockey Program         | 15,000      | 5,784                    | 9,216                    | 38.56%                     | 15,000           | 0                          |
| Karate Program         | 1,950       | 1,470                    | 480                      | 75.40%                     | 1,950            | 0                          |
| Intergenerational Choir | 5,000       | 3,164                    | 1,836                    | 63.27%                     | 5,000            | 0                          |
|                        | 33,825      | 20,792                   | 13,033                   | 61.47%                     | 30,950           | 2,875                      |
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## TAY VALLEY TOWNSHIP
### 2017 BUDGET REVIEW AND FORECAST
#### AT JUNE 30, 2017
#### EXPENDITURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2017 ACTUAL</th>
<th>2017 VARIANCE</th>
<th>Percentage of Budget to Date</th>
<th>YEAR-END FORECAST</th>
<th>2017 FORECAST</th>
<th>SURPLUS/DEFICIT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AS AT</td>
<td>AT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation Facilities -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maberly Rink</td>
<td>4,465</td>
<td>2,219</td>
<td>2,246</td>
<td>49.70%</td>
<td>4,465</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maberly Hall</td>
<td>27,330</td>
<td>6,796</td>
<td>20,534</td>
<td>24.87%</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>2,330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballfields and Parks</td>
<td>27,700</td>
<td>12,565</td>
<td>15,135</td>
<td>45.36%</td>
<td>27,700</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glen Tay Rink</td>
<td>2,050</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>1,588</td>
<td>22.52%</td>
<td>2,050</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burgess Hall</td>
<td>7,825</td>
<td>2,538</td>
<td>5,287</td>
<td>32.43%</td>
<td>7,825</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perth Facilities Agreement</td>
<td>188,265</td>
<td>94,133</td>
<td>94,133</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>188,265</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lanark Community Centre</td>
<td>4,100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,100</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>4,100</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>261,735</strong></td>
<td><strong>118,713</strong></td>
<td><strong>143,022</strong></td>
<td><strong>45.36%</strong></td>
<td><strong>259,405</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,330</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Libraries -       |           |               |                              |                   |               |                 |
| Perth             | 159,600   | 78,930        | 80,671                       | 49.45%            | 157,860       | 1,740           |
| Lanark            | 3,000     | 3,027         | 33                           | 98.92%            | 3,027         | 33              |
| **Total**         | **162,600** | **81,957**   | **80,704**                   | **50.39%**        | **160,887**   | **1,773**       |

| Municipal Drug Strategy | 500   | 0   | 500 | 0.00% | 500 | 0    |

| **Total Rec, Cult & Soc Services** | 458,720 | 221,462 | 236,758 | 48.28% | 451,242 | 6,978 |

### Planning and Development:

#### Land-use Planning & Zoning -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>Percentage to Date</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Planning</td>
<td>210,300</td>
<td>102,208</td>
<td>108,092</td>
<td>48.60%</td>
<td>210,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OMB Hearings</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25,440</td>
<td>(25,440)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee of Adjustment</td>
<td>4,800</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>4,280</td>
<td>10.83%</td>
<td>4,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning Amendment Applications</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>729</td>
<td>6,271</td>
<td>10.42%</td>
<td>7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Plan Applications</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>3,837</td>
<td>4,163</td>
<td>47.96%</td>
<td>8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>230,100</strong></td>
<td><strong>132,734</strong></td>
<td><strong>97,366</strong></td>
<td><strong>57.69%</strong></td>
<td><strong>255,540</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Municipal Drains -  | 5,500    | 2,219    | 3,281              | 40.34%   | 5,500    |

| Tile Drainage Debt Payments- | 12,100 | 5,258 | 6,842 | 43.46% | 12,100 |

### Other Planning -

| Tourism & Economic Developme | 3,800 | 500 | 3,300 | 13.16% | 3,800 |
| Road Closure Applications   | 5,000 | 4,310 | 690 | 86.19% | 5,000 |
| Septic Consent Applications | 5,000 | 0 | 5,000 | 0.00% | 5,000 |
| Miscellaneous Road Activities | 20,000 | 4,604 | 15,196 | 24.02% | 20,000 |
| Rideau Bluffs Subdivision   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Tay Side Subdivision        | 0 | 1,862 | (1,862) | 0 | 0 |
| **Total**                    | **33,800** | **11,476** | **22,324** | **33.95%** | **33,800** | 0 |
## TAY VALLEY TOWNSHIP
### 2017 BUDGET REVIEW AND FORECAST
### AT JUNE 30, 2017

#### EXPENDITURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTUAL</th>
<th>VARIANCE</th>
<th>Percentage of Budget</th>
<th>YEAR-END</th>
<th>FORECAST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY17</td>
<td>FY16</td>
<td>AT June 30, 2017</td>
<td>June 30, 2017</td>
<td>to Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>281,500</td>
<td>151,686</td>
<td>129,814</td>
<td>53.88%</td>
<td>306,940</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Transfers to Reserves:

- **Official Plan (3yrs@$10k/yr)**
  - 10,000
  - 10,000
  - 0
  - 100.00%
  - 10,000
  - 0

- **Asset Management Plan**
  - 5,000
  - 5,000
  - 0
  - 100.00%
  - 5,000
  - 0

- **Infrastructure**
  - 0
  - 0
  - 0
  - 11,200
  - (11,200)

- **Bridge Replacement**
  - 129,500
  - 129,500
  - 0
  - 100.00%
  - 129,500
  - 0

- **Burgess Garage/Hall**
  - 5,200
  - 5,200
  - 0
  - 100.00%
  - 5,200
  - 0

- **Cemetery**
  - 500
  - 500
  - 0
  - 100.00%
  - 500
  - 0

- **Contingency**
  - 0
  - 0
  - 0
  - 0
  - 0
  - 0

- **Elections**
  - 8,500
  - 8,500
  - 0
  - 100.00%
  - 8,500
  - 0

- **Federal Gas Tax**
  - 169,380
  - 169,380
  - 0
  - 100.00%
  - 169,380
  - 0

- **Improve Municipal Building Access**
  - 0
  - 0
  - 0
  - 0
  - 0
  - 0

- **Maberly Hall**
  - 5,200
  - 5,200
  - 0
  - 100.00%
  - 5,200
  - 0

- **Office Equipment**
  - 10,500
  - 10,500
  - 0
  - 100.00%
  - 10,500
  - 0

- **Recreation Program**
  - 2,100
  - 2,100
  - 0
  - 100.00%
  - 2,100
  - 0

- **Recreation Capital/Equipment**
  - 11,200
  - 11,200
  - 0
  - 100.00%
  - 11,200
  - 0

- **Road Replacement**
  - 287,500
  - 287,500
  - 0
  - 100.00%
  - 287,500
  - 0

- **S.S. Fire Department**
  - 52,300
  - 52,300
  - 0
  - 100.00%
  - 52,300
  - 0

- **Salt Sheds**
  - 10,400
  - 10,400
  - 0
  - 100.00%
  - 10,400
  - 0

- **Sherbrooke Garage**
  - 0
  - 0
  - 0
  - 0
  - 0
  - 0

- **Special Cont. (Perth boundary)**
  - 0
  - 0
  - 0
  - 0
  - 0
  - 0

- **Township Offices/Garage**
  - 10,500
  - 10,500
  - 0
  - 100.00%
  - 10,500
  - 0

- **Vehicles & Equipment**
  - 131,800
  - 131,800
  - 0
  - 100.00%
  - 131,800
  - 0

- **Waste-sites**
  - 3,100
  - 3,100
  - 0
  - 100.00%
  - 3,100
  - 0

- **Total**: 852,680
  - 852,680
  - 0
  - 100.00%
  - 863,880
  - (11,200)

### Capital Program:

#### Capital out of Revenue or Other:

- **Canada 150 - Memorial Wall - pe**
  - 12,600
  - 12,600
  - 0.00%
  - 0
  - (12,600)

- **Canada 150 - tennis courts - pen**
  - 19,600
  - 19,600
  - 0.00%
  - 19,600
  - 0

- **Insurance Consultant Project**
  - 0
  - 0
  - 0
  - 10,000
  - 10,000

- **Official Plan / Zoning By-law**
  - 10,000
  - 0
  - 10,000
  - 0
  - (10,000)

- **Total**: 42,200
  - 42,200
  - 0
  - 29,800
  - (12,600)

### Infrastructure Replacement:
### TAY VALLEY TOWNSHIP
#### 2017 BUDGET REVIEW AND FORECAST
#### AT JUNE 30, 2017
#### EXPENDITURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>2017 BUDGET</th>
<th>ACTUAL AS AT June 30, 2017</th>
<th>VARIANCE AT June 30, 2017</th>
<th>Percentage of Budget to Date</th>
<th>YEAR-END FORECAST</th>
<th>FORECAST SURPLUS/ (DEFICIT)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vehicles &amp; Equipment:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replace 2001 Sterling Tandem</td>
<td>235,000</td>
<td>235,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>235,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase Covered Trailer (replacemen)</td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Backhoe Replacement (approved C 2017-03-1)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>170,000</td>
<td>170,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roads:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otty Lake Side Road (shared)</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deficiencies Elimination Prgm</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sommerville Drive (2)</td>
<td>129,200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>129,200</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>129,200</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridges:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Various analyses/repairs</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noonan Side Road Bridge</td>
<td>110,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>110,000</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>110,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menzie's Munro Side Road Brc</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replace Bridge Guardrails - 5 y</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burgess Garage - Drain</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bathurst Garage - Drain</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Equipment:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage Machine</td>
<td>6,650</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6,650</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>6,650</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkland Reserve</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis Court / Outdoor Rink Up</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste Sites:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glen Tay Compactor(additional)</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Contingency:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website Enhancements</td>
<td>6,400</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6,400</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>6,400</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fencing - McVeigh Pit - require</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2016 Projects Carried Forward</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicles &amp; Equipment:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replace 2000 Sterling Tandem</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>235,000</td>
<td>235,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asset Management Reserve</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Term Financial Plan</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>1,298,350</td>
<td>402,400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Infra Replacement: 853,750 - 853,750 0.00% 1,268,750 415,000

Total Capital: 895,950 - 895,950 0.00% 1,298,350 402,400
## TAY VALLEY TOWNSHIP
### 2017 BUDGET REVIEW AND FORECAST
#### AT JUNE 30, 2017

### EXPENDITURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2017 ACTUAL</th>
<th>2017 VARIANCE</th>
<th>Percentage of Budget to Date</th>
<th>YEAR-END FORECAST</th>
<th>FORECAST SURPLUS/DEFICIT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AS AT</td>
<td>AT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Financing</td>
<td>63,100</td>
<td>31,509</td>
<td>31,591</td>
<td>49.94%</td>
<td>63,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenditures</td>
<td>7,804,441</td>
<td>3,803,031</td>
<td>4,000,910</td>
<td>48.73%</td>
<td>8,430,523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure Reserve Funds &amp; Reserves</td>
<td>Balance at Dec 31 '16</td>
<td>2017 Revenue</td>
<td>Anticipated Expenses for 2017</td>
<td>Estimated Balance at Dec 31 '17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Gas Tax Reserve Fund</td>
<td>357,105</td>
<td>169,380</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>526,485</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northland Solar Farm Reserve</td>
<td>136,676</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>136,676</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure Reserve</td>
<td>923</td>
<td>11,200</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12,123</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve Municipal Building Access Reserve</td>
<td>34,129</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>34,129</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Equipment Reserve</td>
<td>7,997</td>
<td>10,500</td>
<td>6,650</td>
<td>11,847</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maberly Community Hall</td>
<td>43,391</td>
<td>5,200</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>48,591</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation Program Reserve</td>
<td>35,131</td>
<td>2,100</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>37,231</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation Equipment Reserve</td>
<td>11,200</td>
<td>11,200</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>22,400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation Fund Raising Reserve</td>
<td>4,219</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4,219</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Sharbrooke Fire Department Reserve</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>52,300</td>
<td>52,300</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste Sites Reserve</td>
<td>48,542</td>
<td>3,100</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>11,642</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Equipment Reserve</td>
<td>544,677</td>
<td>131,800</td>
<td>653,000</td>
<td>23,477</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Construction Reserve</td>
<td>635,304</td>
<td>287,500</td>
<td>189,200</td>
<td>733,604</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cemetery Reserve</td>
<td>8,253</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8,753</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge Construction</td>
<td>597,873</td>
<td>129,500</td>
<td>228,000</td>
<td>499,373</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Township Office / Garage Reserve</td>
<td>66,641</td>
<td>10,500</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>47,141</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burgess Hall / Garage Reserve</td>
<td>51,337</td>
<td>5,200</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>26,537</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sherbrooke Garage Reserve</td>
<td>50,761</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>50,761</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt Sheds Reserve</td>
<td>94,813</td>
<td>10,400</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>105,213</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,728,970</strong></td>
<td><strong>840,380</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,229,150</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,340,200</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operating Reserves</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>200th Anniversary Reserve</td>
<td>2,708</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asset Management Plan Reserve</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Election Reserve</td>
<td>13,703</td>
<td>8,500</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>20,703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Official Plan / Zoning By-Law Reserve</td>
<td>21,581</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>31,581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source Water Protection</td>
<td>18,391</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>8,391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance Reserve</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Funds</td>
<td>450,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>450,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>561,383</strong></td>
<td><strong>23,500</strong></td>
<td><strong>21,500</strong></td>
<td><strong>563,383</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contingency Reserves</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>597,241</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>562,241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Contingency Reserve</td>
<td>227,796</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11,900</td>
<td>215,896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>825,036</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>46,900</strong></td>
<td><strong>778,136</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| GRAND TOTAL                           | **4,105,389**         | **863,880**  | **1,297,550**                | **3,871,719**                 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deferred Revenues</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Development Charges</td>
<td>289,345</td>
<td>27,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>316,345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash-in-lieu of Parkland</td>
<td>46,029</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>27,829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>335,374</strong></td>
<td><strong>28,800</strong></td>
<td><strong>20,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>344,174</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
REPORT

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE
August 1st, 2017

Report #PW-2017-13
Stephen Keeley, Public Works Manager

WASTE SITE ACCESS FORM, SHINGLE DIVERSION & RAMP IMPROVEMENTS

STAFF RECOMMENDATION(S)

“THAT, the Waste Site Access Form be implemented for shingle disposal;

AND THAT, the Glen Tay Waste Site ramps be improved for easier disposal of construction & demolition waste, scrap metal, waste overflow and potentially shingles in 2018.

BACKGROUND

Currently, there appears to be a large amount of shingles landfilled at the Glen Tay Waste taking up valuable space. In the past they have been used, in a limited capacity, for cover material and internal road beds, however, there are much better materials to use than using asphalt shingles.

What follows is a two-step process to first be sure that the shingles being brought to the Glen Tay Waste Site are in fact from roofs in Tay Valley. Step two, if possible and reasonable, would be to have them diverted from the landfill to be recycled to other purposes.

DISCUSSION

The first step, to ensure that the shingles are from Tay Valley roofs, can be implemented by using the attached Waste Site Access Form that has been modeled from other municipalities (Attachment 1). With a minimum of road name and civic address number the roofing activity can be confirmed. If necessary further steps may be taken with contractors if no confirmation is possible. Reducing the amount of shingles being brought to the waste site will extend the landfill’s useful life and reduce the amount of time the waste site contractor spends dealing with shingles.

Currently, the bins around the existing ramp at Glen Tay are much higher than the ramps and require hand bombing to get material into the bins. In order to eliminate the amount of shingles that are landfilled the Township could ban shingles or more moderately modify the facilities to allow them to be recycled. Ideally, the ramps would be about the same height as the bins allowing vehicles to back up and dump shingles directly into the bin. These bins would then be taken to a facility that would welcome shingles as a recyclable good.
Raising the ramps would have advantages not only for potential future shingle recycling but for ease of access for Construction and Demolition (C&D), metal bins and waste overflow. At present it is a difficult lift to get, for example, an old mattress or sofa into the appropriate bin. Raising the ramps should be an integral part of a redesign to the waste site and should be done by a firm that has experience in this area and should be included as part of the 2018 budget.

OPTIONS FOR CONSIDERATION

Option #1 (Recommended) – That the Waste Site Access Form be implemented for shingle disposal and the Glen Tay Waste Site ramps be improved for easier disposal of construction & demolition waste, scrap metal, waste overflow and potentially shingles in 2018.

Option #2 – Do Nothing.

FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS

The Township accepts shingles at the Glen Tay Waste Site for $50.00/cubic yard. For 2016 a shingle account was created to separate its' revenue from C&D waste. In the previous year at this point $7,940 had been received and thus far as of July 10th in 2017 $9,645 has been received as revenue. Total revenue for 2016 ended at $25,779. Checking that the shingles are indeed from Tay Valley may reduce the amount of revenue but extend the useful life of the waste site. To divert shingles from the waste site will markedly increase the useful life of the landfill, however this will create an additional cost which will need to be incorporated into the annual budget.

CONCLUSIONS

A good first step is to ascertain that the shingles being landfilled are from within Tay Valley with the use of the attached form. In future diverting the shingles into a useful recycled good or commodity that will extend the useful life of the landfill, on the other hand, it will reduce revenue and likely incur transportation and tipping fees expenses. However, increasing the ramp height or alternately using smaller lower bins does not have to wait for recycling of shingles to be implemented and could be put into place for C&D metal and waste overflow.

ATTACHMENTS

i) Waste Site Access Form

Prepared and Submitted By: 

Approved for Submission By:

Originally Signed

Originally Signed

Stephen Keeley,
Public Works Manager

Larry Donaldson,
Chief Administrative Officer
WASTE SITE ACCESS FORM

If you are bringing shingles to the Glen Tay Waste Site for disposal you’re required to fill out this form. All shingles brought to the Glen Tay Waste Site for disposal MUST be from within Tay Valley Township.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCATION OF WORK COMPLETED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Road Name ____________________ Civic Address # ____________________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HOME OWNERS INFORMATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name _____________________ Home Phone ___________________ Cell ___________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic Address ____________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONTRACTORS INFORMATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name ___________________ Phone # ___________________ Cell ___________________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The personal information collected on this form is collected under the authority of the Municipal Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act and may be used to contact you for clarification or further information regarding your drop off. Questions about this collection should be addressed to the Clerk at the Municipal Office at 217 Harper Road, Perth, ON, K7H 3C6, or by email at clerk@tayvalleytwp.ca or by phone at 613-267-5353 ext. 130.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TO BE FILLED OUT BY WASTE SITE ATTENDANT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date ___________________ Total Bundles ___________________ Tipping Fee Paid ___________________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
STAFF RECOMMENDATION(S)

It is recommended:

“THAT, the temporary Deputy Clerk’s position be extended until December 31st, 2017 to allow the Township to meet legislative requirements/deadlines.”

BACKGROUND

Council at its February 21st, 2017 meeting approved a Deputy Clerk’s position for six months to allow the Township to meet legislative requirements/deadlines.

As part of that approval Council requested periodic updates. A three-month update was provided in May and now a six-month/final update is being provided.

DISCUSSION

The work plan for the Clerk’s Department is attached to this report. It contains items that are above and beyond the regular tasks of the department.

New Items Added Since May (yellow shaded)
- Dog Tags

Items Completed Since May (gray shaded)
- Scanning of all By-Laws

Items In-Progress
- Records Management – indexing and scanning resolutions
- Records Management – indexing by-laws
- Website - On-Line Registration & Payment (to be completed by August 31)
- Tay Valley Guide
- Recreation Master Plan
- 2018 Municipal Election – Policies and Procedures
- Respect in the Workplace – update policy and develop procedures
Due to other priorities, mainly flooding, waste and recycling collection and the OMB Hearing, staff’s time in the department has been redirected to address the other priorities. As a result, there has been limited progress in the last three months on the department work plan. The progress that has been made on items such as the on-line registration forms and payment and the scanning of all by-laws was completed by the Summer Student, who will be finished their position at the end of August.

OPTIONS CONSIDERED

Option #1 – Extend Deputy Clerk’s Position (Recommended)
In order to complete the 2017 Work Plan it is recommended that the Deputy Clerk’s position be extended to December 31st, 2017. Under the Collective Agreement the maximum allowable for a contract position is 12 months. December 31st would be a total of 10 months.

Option #2 – Do Not Authorize Extension
The Clerk does not have an option with regards to the work plan. The majority of the items are legislated and must be completed, otherwise there are penalties. If Council does not wish to authorize the necessary resources (Deputy Clerk) then Council must accept the responsibility for any non-compliance and penalties that may occur as a result. This now shifts the non-compliance penalties from the Clerk to Council.

STRATEGIC PLAN LINK

A number of items in the work plan are directly linked to the old and new strategic plans.

FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS

The four-month extension to the contract is estimated to cost $18,000. The funds would be absorbed in the Contingency Reserve.

CONCLUSIONS

The additional four-month extension of the temporary Deputy Clerk’s position would allow the municipality to meet more of the legislative requirements and workload demands.

ATTACHMENTS

i) Clerk’s Department Work Plan – 2017 to 2019

Prepared and Submitted By:        Approved for Submission By:

Original Signed                  Original Signed

Amanda Mabo, Clerk              Larry Donaldson, Chief Administrative Officer

## CLERK'S DEPARTMENT 3-YEAR WORK PLAN
### 2017 - 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Legislation</th>
<th>Deadline</th>
<th>Penalties</th>
<th>Lead</th>
<th>Time to Complete</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>2018 Municipal Election policies and procedures, use of corporate resources policy, third party advertising policy &amp; procedures, election sign policy</td>
<td>Municipal Elections Act</td>
<td>May 1 &amp; Dec. 31</td>
<td>Legal, $$, information not available or updated</td>
<td>Clerk, Corporate AA</td>
<td>12 Months (intermittent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Records Management finalize hard copy and electronic copy filing adopt records retention policy/by-law indexing of by-laws indexing of resolutions scanning of all by-laws scanning of all resolutions</td>
<td>Municipal Act, Bill 8, Auditors</td>
<td>expired</td>
<td>Legal, Ombudsman Review, Fines, Jail, $$</td>
<td>Clerk, Corporate AA, Project Assistant</td>
<td>6 Months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Councillor Code of Conduct update, adopt code/by-law</td>
<td>Bill 8, Bill 68</td>
<td>expired</td>
<td>Ombudsman Review</td>
<td>Clerk</td>
<td>1 Month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employee Code of Conduct update, adopt code/by-law</td>
<td>Bill 68</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Ombudsman Review</td>
<td>Clerk</td>
<td>1 Month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Procedural By-Law review and update, adopt by-law</td>
<td>Municipal Act, Bill 8</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Ombudsman Review</td>
<td>Clerk</td>
<td>3 Months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Police Services Board - Procedural By-Law review and update once Council Procedural By-Law is updated, adopt by-law</td>
<td>Municipal Act</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td>Clerk</td>
<td>1 Month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Accessibility Return to Work Policy Accommodation Policy Procedures, Training</td>
<td></td>
<td>expired</td>
<td>Audit, Fines, Jail Time</td>
<td>Clerk</td>
<td>2 Months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Occupational Health &amp; Safety update relative policies, procedures, forms, training</td>
<td>Bill 168, Bill 132</td>
<td>expired</td>
<td>Fines</td>
<td>Clerk</td>
<td>2 Months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Bill, Act</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Fee</td>
<td>Responsible Party</td>
<td>Time Period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupational Health &amp; Safety</td>
<td>develop workplace PTSD Prevention Plan and submit to Province</td>
<td>Bill 163, Supporting Ontario's First Responders Act (Posttraumatic Stress Disorder), 2016</td>
<td>Apr. 23</td>
<td>Fines</td>
<td>Fire Chief, CAO, Clerk; a consultant has been retained by the Fire Chief's group to assist</td>
<td>6 Months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website</td>
<td>On-Line Registration and Payment</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Clerk, Corporate AA, Treasurer</td>
<td>3 Months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegated Authority By-Law</td>
<td>update to allow Clerk to provide Letter of Non-Objection</td>
<td>Municipal Act, Liquor License Act</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Council Resolution, Time Delays</td>
<td>Clerk</td>
<td>2 Weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>signing authority for MOECC Environmental Compliance Application for Communal Septic &amp; Water Systems</td>
<td>Building Code</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Council Resolution, Time Delays</td>
<td>Clerk, Planner</td>
<td>2 Weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>update for Bill 68</td>
<td>Bill 68</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td>Clerk</td>
<td>1 Month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Closing - Norris Road</td>
<td>coordinate closing</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Clerk, Public Works Manager</td>
<td>6 Months (intermittent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Closings (ongoing)</td>
<td>various</td>
<td>Municipal Act</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Clerk</td>
<td>8 Months (intermittent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Legal Files (ongoing)</td>
<td>various</td>
<td>Municipal Act</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Clerk</td>
<td>1 Year + (intermittent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tay Valley Guide</td>
<td>introduction of a municipal services directory to replace the annual brochure</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Clerk, Summer Student</td>
<td>3 Months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Description</td>
<td>Task Details</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Responsible Party</td>
<td>Due Date</td>
<td>Lead Time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation Master Plan</td>
<td>inventory of all Township assets</td>
<td>Strategic Plan</td>
<td>expired</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Clerk, Recreation</td>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Month</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Working Group</td>
<td>Council Reps,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Public Works</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Manager</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMC Advertising</td>
<td>new package</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$$</td>
<td>Clerk</td>
<td>1 Month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste &amp; Recycling Collection</td>
<td>human resources, tenders, public notice</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>31-Dec-17</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Public Works Manager, assisted by the Clerk</td>
<td>9 Months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability and Transparency Policy</td>
<td>update for Bill 68</td>
<td>Bill 68</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td>Clerk</td>
<td>1 Month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018 Municipal Election</td>
<td>Details</td>
<td>Legislation</td>
<td>Deadline</td>
<td>Penalties</td>
<td>Lead</td>
<td>Time to Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>orient and train the incoming Council</td>
<td>Municipal Elections Act</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>Legal, Jail Time, $$</td>
<td>Clerk, Corporate AA</td>
<td>12 Months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Orientation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Legal, Fines</td>
<td>Clerk, Department Heads</td>
<td>1 Month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility</td>
<td>New Multi-Year Accessibility Plan (add in Section 80.44 of O. reg. 191/11)</td>
<td>Accessibility for Ontarian's with Disabilities Act &amp; Regulations</td>
<td>31-Dec-18</td>
<td>Legal, Fines</td>
<td>Clerk</td>
<td>2 Months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Access (Entrance) Policy</td>
<td>update and adopt policy/by-law</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Outdated</td>
<td>Legal, $$</td>
<td>Clerk, Public Works Manager</td>
<td>2 Months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Naming Policy</td>
<td>review and update by-law</td>
<td>Municipal Act</td>
<td>Outdated</td>
<td>Legal, $$</td>
<td>Clerk, Public Works Manager</td>
<td>3 Months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications Tower Approval Process</td>
<td>adopt policy/by-law</td>
<td>Best Practice</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$$</td>
<td>Clerk, Planner</td>
<td>1 Month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Responsibility Agreements</td>
<td>develop policy/by-law</td>
<td>Building Code</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Clerk, Planner</td>
<td>2 Months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>identify key competencies to form basis of the performance evaluation program</td>
<td>Strategic Plan</td>
<td>expired</td>
<td></td>
<td>Clerk, CAO</td>
<td>6 Months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>incorporate training and development plans into performance management system</td>
<td>Strategic Plan</td>
<td>expired</td>
<td></td>
<td>Clerk, CAO</td>
<td>6 Months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>structure performance management system to link to individual and corporate goals</td>
<td>Strategic Plan</td>
<td>expired</td>
<td></td>
<td>Clerk, CAO</td>
<td>6 Months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>update performance appraisal form</td>
<td>Strategic Plan</td>
<td>expired</td>
<td></td>
<td>Clerk, CAO</td>
<td>6 Months</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Human Resources | develop a policy to require copy of driver's license and driver's abstracts from employees on on-going basis | Insurance Company | N/A | Legal, $$ | Clerk | 2 Months
---|---|---|---|---|---|---
Staff-Council Relations Policy | develop and adopt policy/by-law | Bill 68 | Unknown | Clerk | 1 Month
---|---|---|---|---|---|---
Integrity Commissioner | appoint integrity commissioner for Council, Election Compliance Audit Committee, Police Services Board, Fire Board and Library Board | Bill 68 | Unknown | Clerk | 1 Month +
---|---|---|---|---|---|---
Conflict of Interest | develop and maintain registry | Bill 68 | Unknown | Clerk | 1 Month
---|---|---|---|---|---|---
Pregnancy and Parental Leave for Members of Council Policy | develop policy/by-law | Bill 68 | Unknown | Clerk | 2 Months
---|---|---|---|---|---|---
Dog Tags

* Bill 68, the Modernizing Ontario's Municipal Legislation Act has received Royal assent, awaiting regulations.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2019 and Beyond</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Legislation</th>
<th>Deadline</th>
<th>Penalties</th>
<th>Lead</th>
<th>Time to Complete</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2018 Municipal Election</td>
<td></td>
<td>Municipal Elections Act</td>
<td>information unavailable, outdated</td>
<td>Clerk, Corporate AA</td>
<td>3 Months or Longer (depends if there is a Compliance Audit Committee review)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>update job descriptions</td>
<td>Pay Equity Act</td>
<td>Legal, $$, Fines</td>
<td>Clerk, CAO</td>
<td>12 Months</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>develop a Pay Equity Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIS</td>
<td>add additional data sets</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>information unavailable or difficult to retrieve when making decisions</td>
<td>Clerk and Department Heads</td>
<td>6 Months</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road By-Law</td>
<td>review and update by-law</td>
<td>Municipal Act</td>
<td>Outdated</td>
<td>Legal, $$</td>
<td>Clerk, Public Works Manager</td>
<td>4 Months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Naming Policy</td>
<td>develop policy and adopt by-law</td>
<td>Best Practice</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Clerk</td>
<td>1 Month</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT - WTC Agreement</td>
<td>develop and adopt by-law</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Legal, $$</td>
<td>Clerk, Treasurer</td>
<td>1 Month</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal Control By-Law</td>
<td>review and update by-law</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Legal, $$</td>
<td>Clerk, Animal Control Officer</td>
<td>2 Months</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cemeteries</td>
<td>locate and document all cemeteries in the Township</td>
<td>expired</td>
<td>Legal, $$</td>
<td>Clerk</td>
<td>6-8 Months</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pass required by-laws</td>
<td>expired</td>
<td>Legal, $$</td>
<td>Clerk</td>
<td>6-8 Months</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vital Statistics</td>
<td>bring files up to date</td>
<td>expired</td>
<td></td>
<td>Clerk</td>
<td>2 Months</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website</td>
<td>online registration and payment of civic addresses, entrance permits, tax certificates, planning and building applications, etc.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td>Clerk, Treasurer, Planner</td>
<td>2 Months</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policies and Procedures</td>
<td>review and update all</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>Clerk and Department Heads</td>
<td>6-8 Months</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
01/01/2017-06/30/2017 Summary Report with Previous 3 year Average

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$8,981.34</td>
<td>$1,063,500.00</td>
<td>$238,833.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$3,708.44</td>
<td>$168,000.00</td>
<td>$560,456.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$4,679.80</td>
<td>$150,210.00</td>
<td>$444,126.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$7,959.88</td>
<td>$883,100.00</td>
<td>$673,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$7,680.38</td>
<td>$1,258,210.00</td>
<td>$892,633.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$9,757.60</td>
<td>$1,468,900.00</td>
<td>$868,949.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$42,967.44</td>
<td>$4,991,920.00</td>
<td>$3,678,508.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Development Charges of $3800 on permits are comprised of $3100 for the Township's Development Charge and $700 for the County's Development Charge

Note: The value in the S.F.D. column is the monthly total for Approved, Residential, New Construction permits and the value entered in the # Dwelling Units Proposed box on the Building Tab
Harvest Festival Participation Interest

From: student Montague
Sent: Wednesday, July 19, 2017 10:45 AM
To: All Clerks(Municipal)
Subject: Harvest Festival Participation Interest

Hello,

As you all may know the Township of Montague is the feature Township at the Harvest Festival that is taking place September 10th. With this the Councillors of Montague are each in charge of arranging specific events that promote local production of food. With this in mind, there has been the suggestion for a Pie Eating Contest to take place in order to raise money for a charity of the winner’s choice. The idea would be that the contest would take place between Councillors from throughout the County with all the pies to be locally made and locally supplied. There would be an entry fee to participate which would go to the Charity of the winner’s choice.

Prior to moving forward with this idea, we would like to know about the levels of interest of other councillors to participate. We would like to ask that you speak to your Councillors to let us know about their interest in participating in this type of event. If you could get back to me by August 1st that would be great.

Thanks,

Destiny Perry
Montague Student
6547 Roger Stevens Drive
Smiths Falls, ON K7A 4W6
613-283-7478
1. **Township of Edwardsburgh Cardinal**: Resolution – Bill 7 – Property Standards Downloading – *attached, page 3.*

2. **FCM**: Universal Broadband Must Reach Under-Served Communities – *attached, page 5*

3. **Parks Canada**: Bobs Lake Dam at Bolingbroke – Update on Project Status - *attached, page 7*

4. **Stewardship Ontario**: Industry Funding for Municipal Blue Box Recycling for the First Quarter of the 2017 Program Year – *attached, page 9*

5. **Tay Valley Township**: Building Permits Granted – June – *attached, page 10*

6. **Smiths Falls Media Release**: Town Reveals New Logo & Website – *attached, page 11*

7. **Canadian Association of Nuclear Host Communities**: Municipal Support for Deep Geologic Repository - *attached, page 13*

8. **AMO Communications**: Investing in Canada Infrastructure Plan – Phase 2 Negotiations – *attached, page 14*

9. **MMA Updates**: National Disaster Mitigation Program and Long-Standing Service Award – *attached, page 17*

10. **Roma Speaks**: Follow Up Correspondence from ROMA – AMP proposed regulation – *attached, page 19*


12. **Township of North Stormont**: Resolution – Amendment to Conservation Authorities Act – *attached, page 27*

13. **The Star**: Ontario School Closings will be put on Hold as Province Reviews Process – *attached, page 28*

15. **Township Resident**: Letter of Support – Planner and Building Inspector – *attached, page 32*


17. **Lanark County Community Justice**: Thank you Letter – Donation – *attached, page 34*


19. **Town of Perth**: Landfill Expansion Environmental Screening Notice of Completion – *attached, page 37*

20. **Township of Manitouwadge**: Resolution 2017-223 reflecting Council’s support of the Resolution passed by the Council of Bluewater, regarding Bill 7 and Residential Rental Maintenance Standards – *attached, page 39*


22. **Lanark County Media Release**: Japanese Knotweed Awareness – *attached, page 41*

23. **Lanark County Media Release**: Electric Car Charging Stations – *attached, page 42*

24. **Tay Valley Township Media Release**: History Scholarship – *attached, page 43*

25. **Smiths Falls Media Release**: Le Boat Officially Calling Smiths Falls Home! – *attached, page 44*


27. **AMO Communications**: AMO Policy Update - Ambulance Act Legislative Consultation Including Fire-Medic Proposal – *attached, page 53*


29. **University of Waterloo, Intact Centre**: Climate Adaption – When the Big Storm Hits – *attached, page 56*
30. **Reply from Minister of Finance:** Removal of Tax Exempt Portion of Councillor Remuneration – *attached, page 2.*

31. **ROMA Speaks:** Investing in Canada Infrastructure Plan - Phase 2 Negotiations – ROMA Comments – *attached, page 3.*

32. **Owen Sound:** Support Resolution – Request for Economic Impact Analysis – *attached, page 5.*


34. **Lanark County Media Release:** Seeking input on Local Economic Development Plan, *attached, page 7.*

35. **Lanark County Media Release:** Lanark County Harvest Festival 2017, *attached, page 8.*

36. **Railway Association of Canada:** Tax Treatment for Railway Lands, *attached, page 10.*
Municipal Natural Assets Initiative (MNAI)

Call for Expressions of Interest

Letter due date: EXTENDED DEADLINE: AUGUST 28 2017

1. Purpose

This document is to solicit non-binding expressions of interest in hosting a Municipal Natural Assets Initiative (MNAI) project.

2. Context

In municipalities across Canada, infrastructure is showing its age, capital and operating costs are rising, and service delivery is strained by growing populations and shifting conditions. Ecosystems are in decline in many communities. Climate change will exacerbate these challenges.

Municipal Natural Asset Management (MNAM) offers a solution to the twin problems of aging infrastructure and ecosystems decline. In order to provide community services in a cost effective and sustainable manner now and in to the future, local governments are looking for ways to improve management of the critical assets that supply these services.

Asset management -- the process of inventoring a community’s existing assets, determining the current state of those assets, and preparing and implementing a plan to maintain or replace those assets--allows municipalities to make informed decisions regarding a community’s assets and finances.

Unfortunately, local governments lack policies and methods to measure one class of assets: natural assets. Natural assets are ecosystem features that provide, or could be restored to provide, services just like
the other engineered assets, but historically have not been considered on equal footing or included in asset management plans. This concept is outlined in more detail here.

In this context, the Municipal Natural Assets Initiative project offers a methodology and support for local governments to integrate these natural assets into core asset management and financial processes. The result is that natural assets are understood, managed and valued by local government in terms of the services that they can provide (e.g. localized or downstream flood management).

At a minimum, this approach can help local governments manage risk by better understanding what services come from natural assets yet are not accounted for. MNAI's real value, however, is in helping local governments to manage natural assets using the same systems as for engineered assets, to secure sustainable service delivery.

The Town of Gibsons, B.C. was the pioneer of municipal natural asset management. Since 2016, MNAI has been working in the pilot communities of City of Nanaimo, City of Grand Forks, District of West Vancouver, Region of Peel and Town of Oakville to refine, replicate and scale-up the original Gibsons' approach.

3. Experience to date

The MNAI approach is very closely aligned with standard asset management processes, with which most local governments will already be familiar (see Figure 1).

Figure 1. Asset Management process. Source: Asset management BC
Therefore, in each of the 5 current pilots, participants are going through a process of:

- Identifying (a) the natural assets of interest (e.g. a wetland); (b) the ecosystem functions of the identified asset(s) (e.g. a wetland may store water) and (c) the municipal services derived from the ecosystem function (e.g. a wetland’s water storage function may reduce local or downstream flooding, or have potential to do so);
- Determining the different scenarios to model – for example, finding out what will happen to the natural asset (e.g. a wetland) in various climate change scenarios, or with land use intensification, or different environmental management practices;
- Determining beneficiaries of the services provided by the natural asset;
- Determining the economic value of the municipal functions provided by the natural asset; specifically, what it would cost the local government to provide the same service by an engineered means; and,
- Developing a costed operations and maintenance plan to maintain the identified natural asset(s) in such a manner that they will continue to provide the identified services, ideally in perpetuity.

At present, the MNAI methodology handles stormwater management related municipal services; this will expand for future project rounds.

MNAI is also undertaking various research activities to facilitate and enable management of natural assets by local governments.

Details on each of the current five projects can be found at:

https://www.dropbox.com/sh/8w010mbxlzzqj7z/AAD94dRCLRFlzwjoJ0gJEG4gba?d=0
4. What is the objective of the project?

Overall, the MNAI objective is to ensure that, at the end of the 16-month project period, participating local governments have changed their decision-making such that the natural assets of interest are properly accounted for and have a plan for management, through means including a costed Operations & Maintenance plan.

This, in turn, will provide a basis for managing the asset on an ongoing basis to provide the identified services, following the project period.

Furthermore, the work undertaken through the project should enable the local government to:

(a) have a rigorous evidence base to seek funding for ecosystem restoration/rehabilitation, if this is determined to be required to provide the municipal services; and,

(b) replicate the work for other natural assets in the city/town/region.

5. What does MNAI provide to the local government?

The purpose of MNAI is expressly not to simply produce a “study” or research document but to support and enable action and operational change through changes in decision-making. The following MNAI support to local governments is provided within this context:

   a) Support for a detailed project scoping to ensure a clear common understanding of the initiative and its objectives;
   b) Detailed guidance and support documents;
   c) Coordinate and lead an on-site workshop to launch project - these typically are a half-day.
   d) Develop a 2-3 pages project document
   e) Provide ongoing “help desk” technical function to municipalities throughout the pilot. This is tailored to each municipality at approximately 15 hours per month per municipality
for 16 months, and typically involves extensive support at each stage of the Asset Management cycle depicted in Figure 1 ranging from: support for scoping data needs; support in finding data sources to enable modelling; trouble-shooting; training on modelling (e.g. EPA SWMM model); support for developing an Operations and Maintenance plan (or equivalent where private land is involved);

f) Regular webinar check-ins at each project milestone to (a) extract lessons on how work is progressing and (b) provide support for the next project step;

g) Conducting all principal aspects of the economic analysis to determine the value of the natural assets' services;

h) Group / cohort learning webinars to share experience across project;

i) Project evaluation at the end of the pilot (monitoring will be conducted throughout)

j) A final 15-20 page public report.

6. The fine print

The initiative is co-developed with extensive, ongoing support from MNAI throughout. The project is not, however, a consulting initiative in which the local government hands responsibility to the MNAI team to conduct all of the work. For example:

a. MNAI will support the municipality fully in identifying data sources that will enable effective modelling and scenario building but does not do all of the data gathering itself;

b. MNAI will support the local government in undertaking the modelling in the sense of ensuring the model is calibrated and executed in an optimal manner, including through on-line support and training webinars. However, the municipality is expected to undertake model execution.

Local governments are expected to share publicly their experiences from their work with MNAI. However, it is also recognized that local
governments want a ‘no surprises’ approach to communications. Public communication regarding project activities is therefore undertaken according to a communications protocol that has been developed with the current five projects.

In addition to the financial contribution noted in 7(f), municipalities should be able to provide a room and refreshments for 10-20 people for a launch workshop.

7. What does the local government provide as part of the project?

Municipalities are expected to:

   a) Demonstrate explicit support from Council and/or the Chief Administrative Office for the project, including for allocating additional capacity in staff workplans for the project.
   b) Demonstrate clear commitment to a structured asset management approach across the organization;
   c) Commit to explore changes to decision-making as a result of the project, including, for example, costed Operations and Maintenance Plans;
   d) Commit the engagement of a multi-disciplinary staff team representing relevant departments such as Finance, Public Works, Engineering, and Parks and well as a single point-person for the MNAI team.
   e) Commit to gathering all data required to calibrate the model effectively.
   f) Commit $30,000 for municipalities of less than 50,000 people; $35,000 for municipalities of between 50,000-100,000 people and $40,000 for municipalities over 100,000 people. It should be noted that these contributions will be leveraged over 10:1 as the overall programme budget exceeds $450,000.

Additional considerations:

- It is important to underscore that an MNAI project requires
incremental staff resources that need to be built into workplanning; the project cannot be effectively managed "from the corner of a desk".

- Although it is not imperative, MNAI pilots are most successful when they link to another current municipal priority such as the development of storm water management plans, as this helps with e.g. data availability.
- The local government contribution is a fraction of project costs; MNAI also receives funding from a variety of sources. This means the municipal contributions are extensively leveraged.

8. Who is involved in the Municipal Natural Assets Initiative?

MNAI comprises 4 convening partners, whose collaboration is governed by a Memorandum of Understanding:

- **The Town of Gibsons**, which is a leader in the integration of natural assets into asset management strategies. It brings extensive applied experience to the project that can be shared with other municipalities;
- **Smart Prosperity Institute**, a national research network and policy think tank based at the University of Ottawa, advancing practical policies and market solutions for a stronger, cleaner economy. SP brings to the project individuals with extensive research and applied experience in municipal policies and expertise in environmental pricing options at the municipal level;
- **The David Suzuki Foundation**, which works to conserve the environment and find solutions that create a sustainable Canada through science-based research, education and policy work. DSF brings to the project specific experience with the tools and methods required to measure natural assets and integrate the data into asset management strategies; and,
- **Brooke and Associates**, a BCorp-certified consulting practice that works with domestic and international clients with a focus on organizational and community sustainability and resilience. Roy Brooke acts as Director of the MNAI.
MNAI also has a Core and Technical partners including:

a) **Asset Management BC**, a technical partner. They will work with the convening partners to share project lessons and guidance with communities; provide ongoing advice to ensure the effective integration of natural asset considerations in asset management; and help to maximize the synergies between relevant communities and disciplines;

b) **The Natural Capital Lab**, a core partner. They support MNAI through access to professional networks and communications.

c) **The Partnership for Water Sustainability BC** is a partner and has strong experience and experience in watershed management. MNAI and the Partnership provide each other support on issues including communications and methodology development.

MNAI funders of MNAI, all of whom are gratefully acknowledged, are:

- The Real Estate Foundation of BC
- The Green Belt Foundation of Ontario
- The Salamander Foundation
- The Province of British Columbia Ministry of Community, Sport and Cultural Development
- Vancity Credit Union
- Tides Foundation
- The Sitka Foundation
- The Bullitt Foundation

Local governments will interact primarily with the Director of MNAI and the Technical Team Leader. The technical team comprises a hydrologist, GIS specialist, modeler, water resources engineer, and economist.

**9. What should go in my expression of interest?**

Interested local governments should send a detailed letter signed or
explicitly authorized by the CAO or equivalent that outlines:

a) The rationale for wishing to host an MNAI project;
   b) The specific natural assets, services and scenarios of greatest interest;
   c) The ability and decision to contribute sufficient capacity to the project, as outlined in Section 7, above;
   d) In detail, how an MNAI project would link to other municipal priorities;
   e) A willingness to contribute $30,000 for municipalities of less than 50,000 people; $35,000 for municipalities of between 50,000-100,000 people and $40,000 for municipalities over 100,000 people, if selected to as an MNAI project.

10. What happens after I send the expression of interest?

The Convenering Partners are applying for funding between June-September 2017. They expect to learn the results of the funding application in October-November 2017, depending on the funder’s timelines and process. Feedback from this call for expressions of interest will be provided to the prospective funders.

Local government applicants will be contacted during the funding application process and following notification of funding decisions.

The pilot launch date will be in the final quarter of 2017 or the start of 2018, as a function of funding process and timing.

11. Evaluation criteria

Applications will be evaluated on criteria including the degree to which applicants demonstrate:

- A commitment to asset management;
- A clear initial understanding of the natural assets on which it
wishes to base the project and of the objectives it hopes to achieve;
• Capacity commitment sufficient to successfully manage the project; and,
• A commitment to implementing / acting on the results of the project to the greatest extent possible.
• Applications may also be assessed to ensure any of: complementarity between MNAI projects, project diversity across the country; and project diversity according to municipality size/type

12. Additional information

The MNAI Facebook page is at this link:
https://www.facebook.com/municipalnaturalassets/

A flyer for MNAI is at this link:
https://www.dropbox.com/sh/b068xewguklskzu/AACLJEdEhknvVCQfEzJqS2RNa?dl=0

A draft paper to scope and define municipal natural assets is here:
http://institute.smartprosperity.ca/request-comments-defining-scoping-municipal-natural-assets

Please submit expressions of interest to: info.mnai@gmail.com

by 17h00 Pacific Daylight Time on July 14, 2017.
Q1 Please indicate whether your property is located on a Provincial, County, Township or Private road:

Answered: 1,024  Skipped: 0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Choices</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provincial Road (Highway 7)</td>
<td>1.77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Road (Althorpe, Christie Lake, Fallbrook, Scotch Line, McDonalds Corners, Narrows Lock, Bennett Lake, Elm Grove, Bollingbrooke, Maberly-Elphin, Highway 511)</td>
<td>17.48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Township Road</td>
<td>33.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Road</td>
<td>48.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,024</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q2 Please indicate whether you are a permanent resident, seasonal summer resident or seasonal weekend resident:

Answered: 1,024  Skipped: 0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Choices</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Permanent Resident</td>
<td>64.10% 657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seasonal Summer Resident (majority of the summer, week long stays)</td>
<td>27.25% 279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seasonal Weekend Resident (occasional cottager, weekender)</td>
<td>8.59% 88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,024</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q3 Please indicate which waste site you currently use for household waste and recycling:

Answered: 1,024  Skipped: 0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Choices</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Glen Tay Waste Site</td>
<td>56.74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maberly Waste Site</td>
<td>15.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanleyville Waste Site</td>
<td>24.41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not use Township Waste Sites</td>
<td>3.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,024</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q4 Are you in favour of implementing waste & recycling collection in Tay Valley Township?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Choices</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>12.99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>87.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reasons for:
- Convenience
- Time saving (not driving to the dump means more time spent with family)
- No longer drive and have to rely on others to take my waste to the landfill for me

Reasons against:
- Current system works just fine, if it ain't broke don't fix it
- Garbage all over the road sides
- Too expensive, don't want increase to taxes
- Animals (bears, raccoons, skunks, barn cats, dogs, birds) will get into the garbage
- Smell/odor
- Doesn't work for private roads
- Hard to have it out at the roadside at the right time
- Snowplows will interfere
- Uncontrolled/illegal dumping and not able to police it properly (people will leave toxic waste, mattresses, etc. at pickup locations)
- Traffic slowdowns
- Won't always be there on the day of collection
Q5 If collection is implemented, would you prefer weekly or bi-weekly collection?

Answered: 795   Skipped: 229

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Choices</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weekly Collection</td>
<td>71.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bi-Weekly Collection</td>
<td>28.18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q6 Do you currently use the Re-Use Centre?

Answered: 1,024  Skipped: 0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Choices</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>81.93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>18.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Q7 Would you continue to use the Re-Use Centre at the Glen Tay Waste Site if your waste and recycling was collected?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Choices</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>40.53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>59.47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q8 What do you like about the current waste and recycling system?

- Status Quo
- Convenience, proximity and flexible hours (can drop garbage off on my time, more often in the summer when hot)
- Garbage is in one place and not scattered all over the neighborhood (no concern about garbage attracting animals)
- Friendly and helpful staff
- Social aspect
- Keeps taxes down
- Efficient, clean & tidy
- The Re-Use Centre
- Educational, community involvement (makes residents more aware of the amount of waste & recycling they produce)
- Exchange program
- Environmental impact
- Well organized
Q9 What do you not like about the current waste and recycling system?

- Nothing, if it ain't broke why fix it
- Would like more open hours (there is no evening hours)
- There doesn't need to be 4 days of garbage drop-off
- Clear bag requirement
- No hazardous waste facility, Middleville is very far away
- Glass is not recycled
- Do not accept brush at Glen Tay Waste Site
- That tetra paks, Styrofoam, plastic bags and cartons aren't recycled
- No ramps, the waste, metal and construction bins should be lower
- Bins need more frequent dumping
- That an outside company picks up the bins of scrap metal and recycling
- Some days Glen Tay is understaffed
- Traffic congestion and site layout at Glen Tay
- Inconvenience (Takes time out of what precious little time we have to spend with family to make a trip to the dump)
- The fact that we must take our own garbage to the dump. It's the 21st Century, it's about time the Township joins in
- Requires loading a car and driving to the site
- No pickup
Q10 What changes would you like to see?
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- Nothing
- Later hours on Sundays (cottagers)
- Buy an incinerator
- Larger Re-Use Centre (Improved Re-Use Centre at Stanleyville)
- Hazardous Waste Days (Middleville is too far away)
- Open Fridays, later hours 1 week night, Sunday evenings in the summer, Sundays all year round.
- Open less hours
- No requirement for clear bags
- Improved parking
- Recycle glass, cartons, plastic bags & wrap, Styrofoam
- Accept brush at Glen Tay Waste Site (Chip it on site for cover)
- Waste bins lowered
- 2 stream recycling - less sorting

- Would love to see collection become a reality
- Garbage pickup (My time has value)
Q11 Please provide the following information:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Choice</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company (if applicable)</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Township Address</td>
<td>843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address 2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Province</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZIP/Postal Code</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email Address</td>
<td>685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone Number</td>
<td>791</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Regular Meeting– May 15, 2017

A regular meeting of the Perth and District Union Public Library Board was held on Monday, Monday May 15, 2017 at 5:30p.m.

In attendance were:
Jennifer Dickson, Councillor, Tay Valley, Chair
Ted Parkinson, Drummond/North Elmsley
Richard Morris, Town of Perth
Carol Rigby, Tay Valley
Erika Heesen, CEO
Heidi Taber, Tay Valley
Lynn Marsh, Secretary-Treasurer
George Sachs, Councillor, Drummond/North Elmsley

Regrets:
John Gemmell, Deputy Mayor, Town of Perth
Lynda Kanelakos, Town of Perth
John Kalbfleisch, Drummond/North Elmsley

Jennifer Dickson called the meeting to order at 5:28 p.m.

Declaration of interest - none

Approval of previous minutes

17-34 The minutes of the April 24, 2017 meeting approved as amended by a motion from Carol Rigby and seconded by Ted Parkinson. Carried.

Additions and approval of agenda

17-35 The agenda approved by a motion from Richard Morris and seconded by George Sachs. Carried.

Delegations – none
Usage statistics:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>April 2017</th>
<th>April 2016</th>
<th>Percent change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total circulation</td>
<td>9235</td>
<td>9412</td>
<td>-2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• % Perth</td>
<td>44.8</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• % Drummond/NE</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>-3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• % Tay Valley</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• % other</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>-7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership</td>
<td>5874</td>
<td>5862</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• % Perth</td>
<td>41.8</td>
<td>41.2</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• % Drummond/NE</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>-3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• % Tay Valley</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>-1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• % other</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public computers</td>
<td>767</td>
<td>877</td>
<td>-13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teen computers</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wireless sessions</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic uses</td>
<td>6967</td>
<td>8911</td>
<td>-22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-book downloads</td>
<td>1425</td>
<td>1262</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website visits</td>
<td>1068</td>
<td>1193</td>
<td>-10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People entering</td>
<td>10174</td>
<td>10908</td>
<td>-7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions answered</td>
<td>586</td>
<td>748</td>
<td>-22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer hours</td>
<td>133.25</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programs</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>-22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program attendees</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>478</td>
<td>-22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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![Circulation by municipality graph]

Page 129 of 132
Finance, building and governance
I continued to work with the Property Committee on updating our Financial Plan and 10-year capital budget. I have been working with Town of Perth and Honeywell staff to further answer questions regarding the library’s possible participation in the Honeywell energy and capital replacement program that is currently being undertaken by the Town. The Property Committee has scheduled an additional meeting on June 6 to evaluate this project, and we plan to bring a recommendation to the Board at the June 19 meeting. I have also scheduled presentations on the Library’s new strategic plan at meetings of all three municipal Councils in May and August.

Programming, staff and services
The How To Fair was a success, with around 50 attendees and 15 community volunteers who manned stations throughout the library. Special thanks to the Friends for providing food for volunteers and manning the button station. We have launched a new Spanish conversation group on Wednesday evenings with the assistance of volunteer facilitators who are fluent in Spanish. This has been a request since the launch of the French conversation groups, and there is significant interest. The group will meet in May and June and then evaluate re-starting in the fall. Lanark Community Programs has completed their annual income tax clinics for this year, where they provide free assistance with completing income tax returns for those with low income. The library will continue to be a pickup/dropoff point for this program throughout the year. Our OverDrive site has been updated as of May 1. The new site makes it more intuitive to find and borrow eBooks, as well as updating the look of the site and making it more accessible.

The BIA has loaned us the Community Collaborative Mandala artwork created during last year’s Stewart Park Festival. It will be displayed in the library to help promote this year’s festival. The Perth and District Community Foundation is undertaking a ‘Vital Signs’ community survey project. We are working with the PDCF to provide library statistics and a location to pickup/drop off surveys. The Local Immigration Partnership (LIP) has hired an English as a Second Language support person to assist local refugee groups. We have provided information on what resources and programs the library has available for ESL learners, and connected the LIP with the other libraries in the area to do the same.

Brian Echlin, our caretaker, will be retiring on June 23. This position will be posted shortly. Our May staff meeting will also go over emergency procedures.

Children’s Specialist Report: Babyltime and Storytime wrapped up again this month with the next sessions starting in May. I added another class visit to the monthly rotation - a Grade 5 class looking for Historica information as well as regular visits to inspire the love of reading. There were a total of six class visits this month, including two classes who had a Silver Birch Voting Party - they voted for their favourite Forest of Reading book, ate cake, played board games and picked out books to sign out. It was a blast! I attended two Welcome to Kindergartens this month with more to come next month. The goal is to sign up kids for cards, talk up the TD Summer Reading Club and in some schools, read a story. I have also started distributing the TD Summer Reading Club invitations and reading recommendations to our schools. The 712 Club continues to evolve into a creative space with crafts, Cubetto, LEGO and LittleBits, plus other manual building block materials. The Read2gether Book Club met - we had six out of nine members attend and had a very lively discussion. Cubetto also made an appearance at the How To Fair where several families got to test run him in the morning. Letters were sent out to potential service club donors for the
Summer Literacy Program this year, with some already responding with cheques. There was also a PA Day where we ran “Board at the Library” for parents and children.

17-36 The May 2017 CEO’s report was received on a motion by George Sachs and seconded by Heidi Taber. 

Financial Report

17-37 The April 2017 monthly financial report was received on a motion by Heidi Taber and seconded by Carol Rigby. 

Correspondence and communications

a. Letter from Eleanor McMahon
b. News article – Humm Speaking Volumes

Advocacy Reports
Carol Rigby spoke to friends at a dinner about the library, the renovations and the need for support if wanting longer hours.
Ted has been using the museum passes and ongoing advocacy to his circles.
George Sachs spoke about the passes and the 3D printer to the other coaches in Little League.

Committee reports

a. Property – minutes of May 8th meeting were presented and reviewed.

17-38 The property report was received on a motion by Heidi Taber and seconded by George Sachs. 

b. Policy – none 

Policy Review - none 

Unfinished/New Business

a. 2016 Annual report

17-39 The 2016 Annual Report was approved as amended with a motion by Richard Morris and seconded by George Sachs. 

b. 2017-2021 Financial Plan - referred to policy committee for further edits.
c. Transfer from Book Reserve – proposal presented and reviewed

17-40 The withdrawal of $7,500 from the Book Reserve to use as per the proposal was approved with a motion by Carol Rigby and seconded by Ted Parkinson.

b. Transfer from Literacy Reserve to PDCF
17-41 The additional amount of $15,525 in the Literacy Reserve is to be transferred to Perth and District Community Foundation, approved with a motion by Heidi Taber and seconded by Richard Morris.

Carried.

e. SOLS Trustee Meeting Report (Ted Parkinson) – Ted reported on topics discussed and reports that we are comparatively doing well.

Upcoming dates
Property Committee – Monday, June 5 @ 6:00 pm
Policy Committee – Monday, June 12 @ 5:30 pm
Library Board Meeting – Monday, June 19 @ 5:30 pm

17-42 Motion to adjourn moved by Carol Rigby at 6:28 pm.

__________________________________________  __________________________________________
Chairperson                                           Secretary-Treasurer