1. **Call to Order**

The Warden called the meeting to order at 10:34 a.m. He noted the next regular Council meeting is scheduled for February 20th, a date that conflicts with the OPP consultation process regarding the proposed new regulations, which is taking place from 9:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. in Brockville that same day. Mrs. Todd confirmed the Council meeting can be rescheduled for Wednesday, February 19th through a motion at the February Committee of the Whole meeting.

2. **Adoption of Agenda**

**Resolution No. CW-015-2020**
Moved by Herb Scott
Seconded by Roger Haley
THAT the Agenda for the January 23, 2020 special meeting of the Committee of the Whole be adopted as circulated.

CARRIED

3. Disclosure of Pecuniary Interest and General Nature Thereof - Nil

4. Staff Reports

4.1 2020 Budget Presentation (Capital Budget)

Public Works
Mr. Mukherjee reported the 2020 Draft Capital Budget was broken into four categories, Roads, Bridges, Garages, and Fleet.

Roads Projects
Mr. Mukherjee provided the Committee with a map indicating where the road projects would be taking place in 2020. He presented the 2020 Draft Roads Capital Budget, which totals $9,321,796.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County Road</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>County Road 1</td>
<td>$1,991,229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Road 3</td>
<td>$786,593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Road 6</td>
<td>$323,247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Road 10</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Road 19</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Road 22</td>
<td>$1,735,564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Road 42</td>
<td>$2,033,996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Road 43</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Road 44</td>
<td>$1,001,167</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mr. Mukherjee said the 2020 Capital Budget contains a number of legacy projects where there has been significant public anticipation, as well as addressing some of the roads in the poorest condition in the Counties. He noted the projects include road rehabilitation that consists of asphalt, paved shoulders, culverts, and ditching. In addition, the Draft Budget includes stormsewer reconstruction and intersection modification, particularly a roundabout on County Road 43.

With respect to the widening of County Road 43, Mr. Mukherjee outlined the Phase 1 to be undertaken in 2020 at a cost of $10,834,968. He noted the project
is to be funded from long-term debt, dedicated infrastructure funds, and Provincial funds. Federal funding will provide additional offset. Phase 1 includes:

- Finalizing Design: $100,000
- New Bridge: $7,163,904
- Utilities Relocation (hydro, bell, gas): $1,637,624
- Property Acquisition (appraisal, surveys, legal): $1,628,160
- Contract Administration, Inspection, Project Management: $305,280

Mr. Mukherjee noted the utility relocation must happen in 2020 in order to start the work. He explained property acquisition consists of many small pieces of property, which can be more complicated and requires appraisals. Knowing where the utilities will be located guides the property acquisitions.

Mr. Haley left the meeting at 10:52 a.m.

**Bridge and Culvert Projects**

Mr. Mukherjee provided the Committee with a map indicating the location of the 2020 Bridge projects. He noted the Newboro Bridge is a legacy project and the Lyndhurst Stone Bridge is the oldest stone bridge in Ontario, which makes it a challenge to preserve the heritage look of the bridge. The Rideau Ferry Bridge will be cost shared with Lanark County. The total capital budget for bridge projects is $2,318,036 and consists of:

- Rideau Ferry Bridge: $31,036
- Lyndhurst Bridge: $400,000
- Newboro Bridge: $1,887,000

Mr. Mukherjee reviewed the types of treatments that can be used on the bridges and culvert projects, including minor rehabilitation of crack injection, concrete patch repair, expansion joint seal replacement, and repointing masonry. Major rehabilitation includes barrier replacement, expansion joint replacement, bearing replacement, deck replacement, and waterproof and paving.

The culvert projects that are scheduled for 2020 include two carry forward projects:

- County Road 22 Cross Culverts: $154,854
- County Road 44 Culverts: $110,000

**Garage Projects**
Mr. Mukherjee presented the 2020 Capital Budget for Roads Garage projects which totals $1,675,000. The projects include:

- North Grenville Garage (yard paving) $50,000
- South Leeds Garage (yard paving, building renovations) $40,000
- Greenbush Garage (communication tower, yard paving, building renovations, hoist) $185,000
- South Grenville Sand Dome $200,000
- North Grenville Sand Dome $200,000
- South Leeds Sand Dome $200,000
- Frankville Sand Dome $200,000
- Greenbush Sand and Salt Dome $600,000

Mr. Mukherjee explained that through the 2019 Building Assessment process, it was identified that all the sand domes are at the end of life and need to be replaced, which represents the majority of the Garage projects.

**Roads Capital Equipment**

Mr. Mukherjee reported the 2020 Capital Budget proposes $1,599,165 in capital equipment. The breakdown of the capital equipment is:

- Forklift $60,000
- Grader $280,000
- Heavy Weight Truck $143,445
- Light Weight Truck $222,441
- Loader $200,000
- Sander/Plow Units $200,000
- Steamer $20,000
- Sweeper $20,000
- Tractor $125,000
- Mowers $45,000
- Hot Mix Asphalt Transporter $48,279
- Compressor $25,000
- Tanker $80,000
- Message Board $30,000
- AVL GPS $100,000

Mr. Mukherjee noted the Capital Equipment is led primarily by the Asset Management Plan; there are vehicles coming up for replacement based on age. He said it is timely to replace the vehicles, otherwise the Counties runs the risk of
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more expensive repair work, reliability issues, and the potential that a vehicle could go out of service. Mr. Mukherjee noted which of the purchases are new and which are replacements. With respect to the purchase of two message boards, he noted they are very helpful to the public and allows the Department to communicate with the public when work is coming.

Forest Management
Mr. Mukherjee stated the last item in the Capital Budget is the purchase of a new tractor for use by forestry staff at a cost of $45,000. He noted this replaces a second hand tractor that has reached the end of its useful life.

Mr. Hoogenboom asked why the County Road 10 project is split between two years. Mr. Mukherjee explained it is a complicated project, noting the road is on a hill with a drop off into the water, and the slope poses a concern for staff. The Department intends to work first on slope stabilization before proceeding with the rest of the project. Working on the slope first will allow the earth to settle and finish the road in the second year. In addition, he said it is not staff’s intention to close the road, noting they will instead go down to one lane as part of the work. He noted the project will be treated as one contract over two years. Mr. Hoogenboom stated staff should ensure the quality of work is sufficient before proceeding with the second year of the contract.

Mr. Haley returned at 11:04 a.m.

Mr. Burrow requested clarification on the difference between the $200,000 sand dome and the $600,000 sand dome listed in the Garages Project chart. He noted in the past the Township of Elizabethtown-Kitley has shared the Frankville dome with the Counties and asked if, rather than each municipality building their own dome, if they could be combined and split the cost savings. Mr. Mukherjee noted the Counties does not use as much sand as the local municipalities and therefore the domes are smaller and the cost is $200,000. The $600,000 dome is a larger dual function sand and salt dome at Greenbush. With respect to sharing the dome with the Township, Mr. Mukherjee stated the Counties is open to that. In the past the sharing was done informally and he would want to undertake a formal process for insurance purposes.

Mr. Burrow asked at how it is determined which stormsewer projects are undertaken. He noted the County Road 2 and Long Beach intersection, there was a situation inherited from the Ministry of Transportation. Mr. Mukherjee said
some of it is driven by the inquiries the Counties receives and some are identified when staff looks at the condition of the road and the status of the drainage in that area. He noted legacy projects need to be talked about this year in order to be ready for 2021.

With respect to property acquisition on County Road 43, Mr. Scott asked if the $1.6 million is on top of what the amount the Counties has spent on property acquisition thus far. Mr. Brown said the Counties has not acquired property unless it has been through the planning process. He also noted there are still a lot of small swaths of land that have not been acquired at this time. He noted it will take some time and the Counties is trying to avoid expropriation.

Warden Sayeau asked for a summary of the complexity of the acquisitions that remain. Mr. Mukherjee stated there are 15 to 20 owners; he noted the design is driving the property acquisitions and the design is just finishing as the Counties gets input from hydro regarding poles and guy-wires. As the design is finalized, staff will be more prepared to start approaching owners with locations. Ms. Peckford said in tandem with the efforts of the Counties, as new properties have been acquired on County Road 43, there has been an effort to ensure the municipality has jurisdiction over the property that is needed.

With respect to the five sand domes that will be constructed this year, Mr. Hoogenboom asked if there is an order of priority to them. He asked if the Counties needs to replace all five domes in one year. Mr. Mukherjee noted there are several strategic reasons to move ahead with all of them, first being the fact that the building assessment was not flattering. He said now that the liability is formally identified, it is staff’s recommendation to move forward as soon as possible. He said they are in slightly different stages of decay, but procurement process is better for a large project and there will be the benefit of the same warranty on all to them, with consistent workmanship, and price should be better for five domes. Mr. Hoogenboom asked if Reserves overall are going up or down with this Budget. Mrs. Huffman stated based on operating reserves it is going down; she noted the Counties is using more in asset replacement in 2020, but because of the increase in the dedicated infrastructure levy it almost balances out. She concluded reserves overall are targeted to go down.

**Corporate Services**

Mr. Brown presented the Corporate Services 2020 Capital Budget.
Information Technology
Mr. Brown reported the Information Technology Capital Budget totals $422,376 and consists of three projects:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ECM Consulting</td>
<td>$62,376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network Servers</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESXi Server</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mr. Brown noted the Electronic Content Management (ECM) Consulting is funded by the Carry Forward Reserve and is a project to develop an electronic content management plan for records management. The project spans over 2018 to 2020; in 2019 FileHold was implemented for a records management system. In 2020, additional consulting is required for ECM conversion and documentation management capabilities within Microsoft Office 365. The Network Servers are a contingency to replace existing servers upon failure. The ESXi Server is funded through Amortization Reserve and is replacing an existing server that has reached the end of life. The replacement is sized to meet projected need of 200 virtual computers used by staff for the next four to five years.

County Properties
Mr. Brown said the total Capital Budget for County Properties is $637,769 and consists of:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25 Central Ave,</td>
<td>Resurface Parking Lot</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brockville</td>
<td>Roof Replacement</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Air Handling Units</td>
<td>$72,769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Boiler Replacement</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elevator Retrofit</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 Wall Street,</td>
<td>Replace Carpet/Flooring</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brockville</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mr. Brown noted the 25 Central Avenue Parking Lot Resurface is funded by the Carry Forward Reserve and the Amortization Reserve. The existing parking area will be reconfigured to provide additional spaces, improve traffic flow and safety, and improve drainage. New energy efficient lighting will also be installed. He noted Phase 1 includes only paving the existing parking lot and addressing safety concerns in 2020. Phase 2 will be postponed to a future year and will involve the west roadway which will be gated off during Phase 1 to allow two-way traffic flow on the east side of the building.
The roof replacement at 25 Central Avenue was identified in the building assessment as needing replacement by 2021. A portion of the flat roof was replaced in 2019. The Carry Forward Reserve will fund this project. The air handling unit at 25 Central Ave is to replace the units with HVAC rooftop units for operating efficiencies. The Amortization Reserve and Carry Forward Reserve will fund the project. The boiler replacement will be funded by the Amortization Reserve and is undertaken based on the age of the current boiler at 25 Central Avenue and as a result of the building condition assessment. One boiler is proposed for 2020 and the second for 2021.

The elevator retrofit for 25 Central Avenue will be funded by the Amortization Reserve and is a recommendation from the building condition assessment. The original elevator was installed in 1973 and is in poor condition. He noted this is also an accessibility issue. At 32 Wall Street the carpet and flooring replacement is funded by the Amortization Reserve. Due to the age and condition of the third floor carpet, the replacement is due in 2020. He noted the first and second floors were replaced in 2019.

**GIS**

Mr. Brown noted the Capital Budget for GIS consists of the purchase of Digital Orthophotography Images at a cost of $20,000. Ms. Clarke noted this involves the Province taking digital images of and was put off in 2019 due to weather.

**Maple View Lodge**

Mr. Brown reported the Maple View Lodge total Capital Budget is $644,730 and consists of:

- Redevelopment Project $598,730
- Exterior Repair $20,000
- Window Replacement $12,000
- Septic Filtration System $14,000

**Maple View Lodge Redevelopment Project**

The Redevelopment Project in the amount of $598,730 is being funded by the Amortization Reserve which has a balance of $1.6million. The Project Management was awarded to Turner & Townsend and they will be looking at the architect selection process next month. Mr. Brown noted future capital work will require outside financing such as debentures.
Maple View Lodge Exterior Repair
This work in the amount of $20,000 will be funded through the Amortization Reserve and is to replace damaged siding around the building.

Maple View Lodge Window Replacement
This project will be funded by the Amortization Reserve in the amount of $12,000. Mr. Brown noted 48 windows were identified to be replaced due to failing seals and fogging issues in resident home areas.

Maple View Lodge Septic Filtration Upgrade
Funded by the Amortization Reserve, this $14,000 project will replace septic foam as per the inspection report. Full replacement is required every 15 years.

Mr. Malanka noted the reconfiguration of the parking lot at 25 Central Avenue indicates there will be additional spots and asked if the stalls would be narrower as a result. Mr. Brown said they would not, noting there is empty space that can be used to gain some spaces.

With respect to the ESXi server, Mr. Burrow expressed his approval of condensing and virtualizing. He asked if there has been any consideration of doing that on the back-end for the servers. Mr. Brown stated he would consult IT and provide an answer.

Ms. Smith-Gatcke noted she did not see any of the railway crossings included in the Capital Budget. Mr. Mukherjee explained paving for railway crossings would not fall under major capital; a patch and pave budget is part of the Operating Budget, and railway crossings would be part of that program. He noted in many cases, railway crossing are dictated by a Board Order which sets out the work to be done. It is preferable the railroad do the maintenance work and the Counties pays its share. Ms. Smith-Gatcke asked if the crossings on County Roads 34 and 3 railway crossings would be included in the 2020 Operating Budget; Mr. Mukherjee confirmed they would.

Mrs. Huffman provided a summary of the 2020 Capital Budget in the amount of $17,849,826 to be funded from the Federal Gas Tax Reserve in the amount of $4,325,222, Provincial Subsidy in the form of Ontario Community Infrastructure Fund (OCIF) in the amount of $1,763,298. The transfer from the Carry Forward Reserve is in the amount of $2,177,973 and transfer from the Amortization
Reserves of $9,013,333. She noted $570,000 is the transfer from the Operating Budget for new capital.

With respect to federal and provincial funding agreements for the year 2020 to 2023, Mrs. Huffman noted there is committed funding of $12,728,953 comprised of the Federal Gas Tax in the amount of $11,064,456 with formal commitments to 2023. The OCIF is $1,664,497 with a commitment for 2020 only. Mrs. Huffman noted in 2019, the Counties received a one-time top up of the Gas Tax and Surplus Administration Funds which have been put into a deferred revenue and have been brought into the 2020 Capital Budget to be utilized for capital projects. In response to a question from the Warden, Mrs. Huffman noted in 2020, the Counties will only be using the 2020 Gas Tax allocation, the one-time top up and the surplus administration funds, all of which total $4,325,222.

Mrs. Huffman noted there are 26 capital projects that are being recommended to be carried forward in the 2020 Budget. These projects, totalling $2,177,973, are:

- Information Technology $63,376
- County Properties $309,815
- Roads $483,546
- Bridges $120,636
- Public Works Buildings $558,000
- Public Works Equipment $554,165
- Paramedic Service $69,435
- GIS $20,000

Mrs. Huffman noted there are 10 new Capital Items being proposed for 2020. These items, totalling $570,000, were reviewed as part of the Public Works Capital Budget. Regarding the Financial Indicator, Asset Consumption Ratio, Mrs. Huffman noted the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing Flexibility Indicator measures how much of the Counties assets have been used or consumed. She noted it is based on the 2018 Financial Information Return (FIR) and compares the closing Amortization balance as a percentage of the total cost of the Counties’ assets. She noted the threshold for a low, medium and high challenge, and stated the Counties is considered to be at a moderate level of risk. The reason being is the Amortization is greater than spending on additions or betterments. In 2018 the Amortization was $14.8 million, however, only $10.9 million was spent on improving Counties assets. She stated it is important to note this does not measure the condition of the assets, as some stay in service.
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longer than their useful life if they are properly maintained. This reiterates the need for a good Asset Management Plan and a good Long-Term Financial Plan.

With regard to assets that will continue life beyond their Amortization window, Mr. Burrow asked if it is the Counties intention to continue putting money away to help address the gap or do contributions for that particular asset stop. Mrs. Huffman stated when the new Asset Management Plan comes into play and is tied to the Financial Plan the contributions will allow the Counties to keep the assets in service, to maintain them, and replace to rehabilitate them. She said the new Asset Management Plan, takes into consideration the condition of the assets.

The Committee discussed the pros and cons of using the full phase-in assessment and the impact of a 2019 Surplus, if any would have on Reserves. They thanked staff for their work on the Budget.

Ms. Peckford asked if all elements of the County Road 43 Project including, borrowing, are included in the Budget. Mr. Brown noted staff will bring a separate report on how County Road 43 will be financed. He stated it is not expected to have an impact the 2020 taxes.

The Warden asked if the Committee wished to proceed with a motion regarding the Budget.

Resolution No. CW-016-2020  
Moved by Doug Struthers  
Seconded by Robin Jones
THAT the Committee of the Whole recommends approval of the United Counties of Leeds and Grenville’s 2020 Budget as presented; and  
THAT the necessary by-laws be prepared.
CARRIED

4.2 Budget Discussion Continued

Budget discussions took place throughout the presentations under agenda item 4.1.

Mr. Scott left the meeting at 12:02 p.m.
In response to a question from Mr. Struthers, Mrs. Todd confirmed the tentative Budget meeting scheduled for January 29\textsuperscript{th} will not be necessary and the Maple View Lodge Committee of Management meeting can be rescheduled to 9:00 a.m. that day at Maple View Lodge.

5. **Questions from the Media**

There were no questions from the media.

6. **Questions from the Public**

There were no members of the public present.

7. **Closed Meeting - Nil**

8. **Adjournment**

Resolution No. CW-017-2020
Moved by Doug Malanka
Seconded by Brant Burrow
THAT the special meeting of the Committee of the Whole adjourn at 12:05 p.m.

CARRIED

_________________________
Chair

_________________________
Lesley Todd, Clerk
