



THE CORPORATION OF THE CITY OF STRATFORD FINANCE AND LABOUR RELATIONS SUB-COMMITTEE

OPEN SESSION

A meeting of the Finance and Labour Relations Sub-committee will be held on **Tuesday, March 17, 2015 at 4:30 p.m.** in the Council Chamber, City Hall, 1 Wellington Street.

SUB-COMMITTEE PRESENT: Councillor Mark - Vice-Chair Presiding, Councillors McManus and Vassilakos

REGRETS: Councillor Clifford – Chair, Councillor Beatty

STAFF PRESENT: Andre Morin – Director of Corporate Services, David Carroll – Acting Chief Building Official, Marilyn Pickering - Supervisor of Tax Revenue, Joan Thomson - City Clerk, Naeem Khan – Manager of IT and Business Systems, Jodi Akins – Recording Secretary.

ALSO PRESENT: David Evans and Carl Thomson (Item 2.1), Media

AGENDA

1.0 DISCLOSURE OF PECUNIARY INTEREST AND THE GENERAL NATURE THEREOF

The *Municipal Conflict of Interest Act* requires any member of Council declaring a pecuniary interest and the general nature thereof, where the interest of a member of Council has not been disclosed by reason of the member's absence from the meeting, to disclose the interest at the first open meeting attended by the member of Council and otherwise comply with the *Act*.

Name, Item and Nature of Pecuniary Interest

Sub-committee:

Committee:

2.0 DELEGATIONS

2.1 Stratford Kiwanis Garlic Festival

Objective: For Council to consider a grant request from the 2015 Stratford Kiwanis Garlic Festival.

Attachment – Grant application

Background and Analysis: The Stratford Kiwanis Garlic Festival is requesting financial assistance to support its 2015 event. Please see attached grant application.

Financial impact: \$1,000 from the grant contingency budget.

Staff recommendation: For the consideration of Sub-committee.

Sub-committee discussion:

Sub-committee recommendation:

Committee discussion:

Committee recommendation:

3.0 REPORT OF THE SUPERVISOR OF TAX REVENUE

3.1 Tax Adjustments

Objective: To consider approval of Minutes of Settlement under Section 40 for 2013 and 2014 and to receive a Special Amended Property Assessment Notice for 2014.

Attachment – Report of the Supervisor of Tax Revenue dated March 6, 2015

Background and Analysis: Minutes of Settlement (Section 40) require signed approval from the municipality. These minutes are settlements the parties have agreed to during pre-hearings of the Assessment Review Board, prior to going to a full hearing.

The Special Amended Property Assessment Notice is for information only.

Financial impact: There has been an allowance made in the 2015 Budget for anticipated tax adjustments.

Staff recommendation: That the Report of the Supervisor of Tax Revenue dated March 6, 2015 regarding the Minutes of Settlement under Section 40 for 2013 and 2014 be approved and the Special Amended Property Assessment Notice for 2014 be received as recommended.

Sub-committee discussion:

Sub-committee recommendation:

Committee discussion:

Committee recommendation:

4.0 REPORT OF THE ACTING CHIEF BUILDING OFFICIAL

4.1 Annual Building Permit Fee Report 2014

Objective: To consider permit fees collected and operational costs for 2014.

Background and Analysis: In accordance with subsection 7(4) of the *Building Code Act S.O. 1992, c23* as amended, the City is required to prepare a report on the permit fees received and the direct and indirect costs to administer and enforce the *Building Code Act* in its area of jurisdiction.

The following table shows Total Fees and Total Costs for the calendar year of January 1 to December 31, 2014:

Total Building Permit fees received in 2014		\$447,401.38
Total Direct Costs (Division) to administer and enforce the Building Code Act including the review of applications for permits and inspection of buildings	\$414,303.65	
Total Indirect Costs (Corporate) of administration and enforcement of the <i>Building Code Act</i> including support and overhead costs	\$67,185.24	
Total Direct Costs (Division) and Indirect Costs (Corporate)	\$481,488.89	\$481,488.89
Permit Fees Received less Direct and Indirect Costs*		-\$34,087.51

*Permit fees are not collected for City Projects and Basement isolation programs which in 2014 totalled \$5,885.47.

December 31, 2013 Building Reserve Fund	\$202,959.00
2014 Permit Fees Received less Direct and Indirect Costs	\$34,087.51
December 31, 2014 Reserve Fund if 2014 deficit removed from Reserves	\$168,871.49

Financial impact: \$34,087.51 removed from the reserve fund established to administer and enforce the *Building Code Act* to mitigate the 2014 deficit. The new balance in the reserve fund will be \$168,871.49.

Staff recommendation: That Council accept the 2014 Building Permit Fee Report and transfer \$34,087.51 from the reserve fund established to administer and enforce the *Building Code Act*.

Sub-committee discussion:

Sub-committee recommendation:

Committee discussion:

Committee recommendation:

5.0 REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR OF CORPORATE SERVICES

5.1 Legislative Requirements – Ontario Regulation 284/09

Objective: To meet the legislation requirements of Ontario Regulation 284/09. This regulation requires that if a Council does not include amortization expenses, post-employment benefits expenses, and solid waste landfill closure and post-closure expenses in the annual budget, Council must adopt a report by resolution estimating the impact of excluding the above expenses.

Background and Analysis: Financial reporting for municipalities changed significantly with the changes brought about in the Public Sector Accounting Standards (PSAB) which took effect for the 2009 fiscal year. In the past, municipalities accounted and budgeted for expenses mainly on a cash basis. The new standards require municipalities to report revenue and expenses on an *accrual* basis. The prevalent change is with the accounting of capital assets whereby now assets are amortized (depreciated) over the estimated life of the asset.

Like most municipalities, the City of Stratford continues to budget on a modified cash basis in order to determine the annual tax levy. Section 290 of the *Municipal Act* requires municipalities to prepare balanced budgets – a cash basis budget would not

meet this regulation. In order to allow municipalities to continue to budget using a cash basis, Ontario Regulation 284/09 was passed.

The City of Stratford's 2015 approved budget excludes:

- Amortization expenses on tangible capital assets
- Post-employment benefits expenses
- Solid waste landfill closure and post-closure expenses

The following highlights the impact of these exclusions:

Amortization Expenses on Tangible Capital Assets:

An estimated amortization expense of \$7,964,565 was not included in the 2015 budget. However, the City did budget for 2015 capital transfers (net of reserve contributions) of \$14,173,825. In theory, the annual amortization represents the City's capitalization of its capital assets for the year; therefore, best practice would be to acquire capital assets or put funding aside for future capital (reserves) an annual amount at least equal to the estimated amortization expense. This budget represents net capital spending over the estimated annual amortization.

Post-Employment Benefits Expenses

The City is obligated to report as a liability an estimate for future employee benefits, unused sick leave payments, and WSIB benefits. The latest audited financial statements (2013) estimate the liability to be \$10,861,576 and a 2013 expense of \$618,000. The City annually contributes funds into a reserve for these future expenses, and at December 31, 2014 the balance in the Sick & Severance Reserve was \$5,531,850. The 2015 expense is estimated to be \$750,000.

Solid Waste Landfill Closure and Post-Closure Expenses:

The City is obligated to report as a liability the estimated future cost of landfill closure and post closure expenses. The latest audited financial statements (2013) estimate the liability to be \$712,444. The City currently does not contribute funds to a reserve for future landfill costs. The 2015 expense is estimated to be \$100,000.

Financial impact: The impact to the annual surplus/deficit based on accrual accounting is as follows:

2015 Budget Reflected on Accrual Basis			
2015 Budget Surplus/Deficit			-
	Add:		
	Acquisition of Tangible Capital Assets	24,507,709	
	Transfers to Reserves	8,049,906	
	Long Term Debt Principal Payments	5,925,000	
			38,482,615
	Less:		
	Amortization Expense	7,964,565	
	Post-Employment Benefits Expense	750,000	
	Solid Waste Closure/Post-closure Exp	100,000	
	Proceeds from Long Term Debt	-	
	Transfer from Reserves	18,383,790	
	Proceeds from Sale of Land/TCA	-	
			27,198,355
2015 Estimated Surplus(Deficit) on Accrual Basis			11,284,260

Staff recommendation: That the report from the Director of Corporate Services regarding legislative requirements of Ontario Regulation 284/09, and the impact of excluded expenses from the City's 2015 budget, be adopted by Council resolution.

Sub-committee discussion:

Sub-committee recommendation:

Committee discussion:

Committee recommendation:

5.2 Purchasing Policy Exemption – Budget Software

Objective: To obtain an exemption to the purchasing policy to allow the Director of Corporate Services to negotiate the purchase, implementation, and training of budget software with two preferred suppliers.

Background and Analysis: Currently, the budget is prepared through a collection of Microsoft Excel spreadsheets. Files are sent back and forth through email and files are amalgamated by Finance Staff. Currently, the Administrative Assistant to the Director of Corporate Services is responsible for preparing Excel templates, loading historical data, sending and receiving from departments, ensuring all Excel formulas are properly working, and checking the accuracy of the math on summaries. As well, the budget notes are completed using Microsoft Word, again resulting in ensuring that the data on the Excel spreadsheets matches the data on the Word documents. All in all, many hours are spent duplicating work and verifying accuracy of the data, rather than spending time analyzing the budget data to find efficiencies and savings. Furthermore, budget reporting remains cumbersome.

Corporate Services staff began researching options for a budgeting tool in 2013. Staff received three demos and three quotes from suppliers. However, as quotes were well above \$60,000, staff placed the project on hold.

In 2014, Corporate Services enlisted our financial software provider, Diamond Municipal Solutions, to perform a business process improvement report prior to the financial system update scheduled for April 2015. One of the recommendations included:

Implementation of a budgeting solution will provide the senior team at the City with the ability to develop a budget process that is more effective to manage and increase the communication between the teams to produce accurate data in a format that can then be presented professionally to Council and integrated into the Dynamics GP financials that will then be used for comparative reporting through Management Reporter.

In 2014, staff have received quotes and software demonstrations from four suppliers:

- Diamond Municipal Solutions – GP Forecaster software
- RAC Software – FMW software
- Questica – Budget software
- Bellamy Software Solutions – Budget module

As well, through internal research, it appears as though the majority of municipalities using stand-alone budget solutions in Ontario are either using RAC software or Questica software. Further to that, references from municipalities using Diamond GP Financial software have been contacted to discuss their budget solutions – most are using either Questica or RAC software. An online search of recent (last 3 years) municipal RFPs for budget software solutions revealed 6 RFPs awarded from 2012-2014 – all of which were awarded to either RAC or Questica (the search was performed using AMCTO Municipal Google Search).

Diamond Municipal Solutions FP Forecaster – a detailed discussion with our reps from Diamond has occurred and we both agree that Forecaster is not suitable to meet our needs.

Bellamy Software Solutions – the City currently uses Bellamy for its work order system and will be upgrading this system in 2015/2016 in order to properly support the asset management processes. The budget module has been demonstrated and investigated; however, staff do not feel it will meet the City's need.

As such, it has been determined that either Questica or RAC software are the leading municipal stand-alone budget solution providers in Ontario. Staff would like to shortlist Questica and RAC software to provide final quotes and demonstrations. Their proposals will be evaluated by a staff committee and selected on the following criteria:

- | | |
|---------------------------|------------|
| • Experience/References | 10% |
| • Technical Requirements | 15% |
| • Support Plan | 10% |
| • Functional Requirements | 35% |
| • Price | <u>30%</u> |
| | 100% |

Financial impact: The cost will include 3 categories of one-time start-up costs and 1 ongoing support cost. Start-up costs will include software, implementation, and training and is expected to total \$50,000. Annual support costs are expected to be from \$5,000 - \$7,500 per year.

Software and implementation will be funded through the IT capital reserve (a portion from the 2014 carryforward and a portion from the 2015 enterprise application updates). Training will be funded through the Finance operating budget. Annual maintenance will be funded in subsequent years from the IT operating budget.

Staff recommendation: That Council approve an exemption from the Purchasing Policy and that the following two firms be shortlisted to submit quotes for a budget software solution:

- Questica Inc.
- RAC Software Inc.

Sub-committee discussion:

Sub-committee recommendation:

Committee discussion:

Committee recommendation:

5.3 Debt Issuance

Objective: To obtain approval from Council to for the issuance of long term debt.

Attachment – Long Term Debt Analysis Charts

Background and Analysis: The City has unfinanced debt that needs to be issued. At the end of 2014, the following amounts need to be financed:

South-side Storm project	\$	1,311,186.05
U of W	\$	9,050,000.00
Cooper Site	\$	<u>7,659,151.29</u>
		\$18,020,337.34

As part of the 2015 Budget; **\$11,361,186.05** was to be financed in 2015, with a further \$4,000,000 to be financed at \$1M each year from 2016 – 2019. The balance of unfinanced was budgeted to come from future revenues.

At the end of 2014, the outstanding long term debt already issued and committed totalled \$71,068,450 (this does not include any unfinanced debt). This committed debt will create principal and interest payments of **\$7,521,166** in 2015.

The 2015 budgeted principal and interest payments total **\$8,575,000**. **\$1,053,834** was budgeted in 2015 for principal and interest payments for the issuance of debt in 2015.

Items to consider when issuing debt:

1. Annual Repayment Limit (ARL):

Under Ontario Regulation 403/02 of the Municipal Act, a Municipality cannot incur principal and interest payments of more than 25% of its net revenues. The latest ARL for the City of Stratford shows an estimated ARL of \$11,589,264. This means the City could assume new annual principal and interest payments of over \$11M per year – The City is well within the legislated repayment limit.

2. Interest Rates:

Interest rates are currently very low, and certainly the lowest they have been in the last 3 years. The City should take this opportunity to lock in as much principal as it can to take advantage of current rates. Attached are the posted Municipal lending rates from Infrastructure Ontario as of March 10, 2015 – for example a 15 year serial debenture would have an indicative interest rate of **2.52%**. For comparison purposes, the same debenture yielded the following rates in the past:

July 16, 2014	3.47%
June 25, 2013	3.53%
May 15, 2012	3.21%

3. Terms:

Simply put, the longer the term, the higher the interest rate but the lower the annual payments. As well, similar to personal mortgages, the City could enter into shorter term fixed rate, with a longer amortization period. For example, a 5 year term with a 15 year amortization – in this case, after 5 years, the City would have to either pay off the remaining 10 years of the loan, or renegotiate the agreement with new rates at that time. Currently, almost all of the City's debt is locked in at rates through the entire term of the loan. This is advantageous as most of the locked in rates are very good. The disadvantage is there is no flexibility to refinance or prepay any of those debts without incurring large penalties.

4. Lender:

Currently, approximately 10% of the City's outstanding debt is held with our financial institution, RBC and 90% is held by Infrastructure Ontario. The City's current agreement with RBC includes a \$15,000,000 line of credit which can automatically roll into a long term debt instrument annually. The rates are set based on the current market. Infrastructure Ontario (IO) is a Provincial organization established to assist Municipalities and other government agencies with low cost borrowing. Rates from IO are traditionally .25 - .75% lower than the banks depending on the current market and the length of term. The rules, project eligibility, and application process are more cumbersome and less flexible with an IO debenture, however the rates are very competitive.

Strategies:

Ultimately, the strategy is to keep borrowing costs reasonable, meet current budget/cash flow targets, and ensure future budgets are not negatively affected. Staff have looked at several variations and strategies and have narrowed those options to the following:

Option #1: Status Quo, as budgeted. This option represents how the long term debt has been budgeted over the last few years. U of W and Storm debt would be financed over 20 years and 5 years respectively. Cooper site expenses would be debentured each year at \$1M per year for a total of \$5M. The tax supported principal and interest would remain relatively flat for the next 5 years, and begin decreasing in 2020.

Option #2: The only change in this option is that the Cooper expenses would be debentured as follows: \$1M in 2015 and \$4M in 2016. This option would take advantage of locking in current low interest rates. While the total amount of principal paid would remain the same, it would require an increase in principal payments in 2016, 2017, and 2018. This extra funding would affect future budgets by either requiring an increase in the budget or a requirement to utilize extra funds from either capital or reserve allocations.

Option #3: This option looks at consolidating high interest current debt. Most of the City's debt is secured at very reasonable interest rates – as a whole the City is paying approximately 3.2% on its debt. However, there are a few loans locked in at higher rates, the highest being 4.96%. This option looks at paying out the highest interest loan, along with the penalty, and refinancing that debt at lower interest rates. The challenge is the penalty calculation from Infrastructure Ontario is effectively a prepayment of all the future interest due. This option does not appear feasible at this time.

Option #4: This option looks at securing the best interest rates over terms that coincide with large reductions in future principal & interest payments. At the end of the term, the City would have the option to either pay the balance of the loan in full or refinance the loan. The terms will be strategically selected to ensure that enough budget capacity would be available to pay off the entire remaining loan amount if necessary. The advantage would be interest cost savings and quicker debt repayment. The risk would be that future interest rates could be much higher and if the debt capacity is required for other purposes (ie. Capital, special projects, or service enhancements), refinancing costs may be higher. Similar to option #2, while the total amount of principal paid would remain the same, it would require an increase in principal payments in 2016 and 2017. This extra funding would affect future budgets by either requiring an increase in the budget or a requirement to utilize extra funds from either capital or reserve allocations.

These options do not consider possible future borrowing needs; however, as recommended in the past, any future budgets considering long term borrowing must include the first year's annual principal and interest payment in current budget. This will ensure the City can afford any future required borrowing within its budget envelope.

Charts illustrating the principal & interest payments and the total outstanding debt for each option have been included.

Financial impact:

The total principal and interest payments from 2015 to 2034 for each option are:

Option #1:	Principal	\$86,429,687	
	Interest	<u>\$22,947,235</u>	
	Total	\$109,376,922	
Option #2:	Principal	\$86,429,687	
	Interest	<u>\$22,613,985</u>	
	Total	\$109,043,672	
	Less than Option #1		\$ 333,250
Option #3:	Principal	\$89,299,245	

	Interest	<u>\$ 20,574,919</u>	
	Total	\$109,874,164	
	More than Option #1		\$ 497,242
Option #4:	Principal	\$86,429,687	
	Interest	<u>\$22,507,735</u>	
	Total	\$108,937,422	
	Less than Option #1		\$ 439,500

Note that as indicative interest rates change daily, actual numbers may vary.

Staff recommendation: That the Director of Corporate Services be authorized to enter into long term borrowing agreements of up to \$15,500,000 based on the philosophy presented in Option #4, relating to the following projects:

- **University of Waterloo – Stratford Campus**
- **Southside Storm Sewer Upgrades**
- **Cooper Site**

Sub-committee discussion:

Sub-committee recommendation:

Committee discussion:

Committee recommendation:

6.0 REPORT OF THE CITY CLERK

6.1 Electronic Agendas, Use of Corporate Resources by Council Members and Review of Council Code of Conduct

Objective: To receive a demonstration of the electronic meeting agenda system and demonstration of the YOGA tablet/laptop, to consider adopting an updated policy on use of corporate resources by Council Members and to review the Council Code of Conduct.

Attachment – Draft Policy: Use of Corporate Resources by Council
Council Code of Conduct

Background and Analysis: The City of Stratford is implementing an electronic agenda system, including the issuance of electronic devices to Council Members and Staff to participate in meetings. As part of this overall project, staff reviewed the Use

of Corporate Resources Policy and the Council Code of Conduct and are recommending changes.

A. Draft Policy

Municipalities are prohibited by the *Municipal Elections Act* from making contributions towards a candidate's campaign. Secondly, candidates are prohibited by the Act from accepting prohibited contributions.

Contributions can be money, goods or services. Use of the municipal corporation's resources by Council Member for election campaign purposes or campaign-related activities would be viewed as a contribution by the municipality to the Council Member and would be in contravention of the *Municipal Elections Act*.

As directed, staff have been working on a major project to implement, develop and test electronic agenda technology. In place of paper copies, Council Members and staff attending meeting will use electronic devices to participate in meetings. The system will allow Council Members to view the agenda, reports and background information, to send and receive emails (outside of a meeting), to interact with residents and to search the internet etc. from a single device. Council Members and staff are being issued new electronic devices in order to access the system at meetings.

Staff recommend that the current provisions for use of corporate resources by Council Members be updated to reflect the addition of electronic devices and how to deal with these devices during the fourth year of the Council Members' term of office. In particular:

- Ownership of the electronic devices in an election year
- Use of IT staff to provide technical support to the Council Member devices
- Use of corporate resources by Council Members in an election year

The draft Policy is to provide guidance regarding the use of corporate resources for Council Members, Council Members who are candidates in the municipal election, including candidates who have been acclaimed, retiring Members of Council and during election campaigns to ensure compliance with the *Municipal Elections Act*.

In researching this matter, staff reviewed other municipalities' policies on use of corporate resources in an election year. Some policies provide that Council Members are not to use corporate resources for election campaign-related activities. Municipalities such as London, have taken a different approach. The electronic devices provided to Council Members, become the Council Members own device in the fourth-year of the Council term as the municipality transfers ownership to Council Members.

This is the approach staff are recommending for Council Members so that the devices are not considered corporate resources as of January 1 in a regular election year and would apply whether or not the Council Member intends to seek re-election.

With the transfer of ownership at the start of the fourth-year term of office to Council Members, no updates to technology or software will be provided by IT staff. IT staff will continue to provide technical support, as the devices are continued to be used by Council Members for their council-related duties – participating in meetings, responding to constituent email, but not for election related purposes nor campaign-related activities.

At the start of the new term of council, new devices will be provided to the elected Council Members and the existing electronic devices will no longer be supported in any way by the municipality.

In the future, there will be great deal of work involved to order new electronic devices, configure the equipment and have them operational for December 1. During the transition, there may be times when Council-elect may need to use other equipment to meet as Nominating Committee, prior to the Inaugural Council meeting.

Staff recommend a revised Policy be adopted to incorporate the use of electronic devices by Council Members as part of the electronic agenda project.

B. Review of Council Code of Conduct

Background and analysis: The Council Code of Conduct for Stratford City Council was adopted in 2007 as part of the accountability and transparency tools for municipalities outlined in Bill 130 (2006) by the Province. Section 223.2 of the *Municipal Act*, allows municipalities to establish a Code of Conduct for Council and local boards.

The purpose of a Code of Conduct is to establish standards for the behaviour of Council Members in carrying out their municipal roles and responsibilities. The Council Code of Conduct is in addition to other policies and provincial and federal legislation already in place, such as but not limited to:

- Council Procedural By-law for the governing of meetings
- *Municipal Conflict of Interest Act*
- *Municipal Elections Act*
- *Human Rights Code*
- *Municipal Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act*
- *Criminal Code of Canada*
- Purchasing Policy
- Travel and Conference Policy
- Workplace Harassment and Discrimination Policy

The Council Code of Conduct has a section on the restrictions on the use of the municipal corporation's resources by candidates during an election year – Section E – Election Campaign Work. This section has been reviewed. In addition, some housekeeping amendments are also identified.

Staff recommend that Section E in the Council Code of Conduct be replaced with the following:

"E. Election-Related Activity

Council Members are required to conduct themselves in accordance with the *Municipal Elections Act, 1996*, the City's Use of Corporate Resources by Council Members Policy and all other applicable City policies. The use of corporate resources, both actual municipal property and staff time, for election-related activity is strictly prohibited. The prohibition applies to both the promotion and opposition to the candidacy of a person for elected office. Election-related activity applies not only to a Council Member's personal campaign for office, but also other campaigns for municipal, provincial and federal office."

The following housekeeping amendments are also recommended at this time:

- Section 3.1 A 3.
 - "Members of Council will recognize their obligations to:
 - Follow and respect both the letter and spirit of the provisions of the *Municipal Act* and the *Municipal Conflict of Interest Act* as amended from time to time, and will disclose other interests which may not necessarily be of a pecuniary nature."
 - Add to Section 3.1 A 3: The "*Municipal Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act, the Municipal Elections Act and the Criminal Code.*"
 - Add Section 3.1 A 3: "All of the above Acts and Codes govern the conduct of members of Council."

Financial impact: The residual value of the electronic devices purchased by the City and provided to Council Members will be determined in the third-year of the Council term of office. Council Members will need to be aware of any applicable Canada Revenue Agency or other legislative requirements with respect to the electronic devices.

The lifespan of electronic devices averages between three to four years. The transfer of ownership of equipment would be nearing the end of the average lifespan of such equipment.

Staff recommendation:

1. That the Council Code of Conduct be amended by replacing section E. Election Campaign Work with the following section:

"E. Election-Related Activity

Council Members are required to conduct themselves in accordance with the *Municipal Elections Act, 1996*, the City's Use of Corporate Resources by Council Members Policy and all other applicable City policies. The use of corporate resources, both actual municipal property and staff time, for election-related activity is strictly prohibited. The prohibition applies to both the promotion and opposition to the candidacy of a person for elected office. Election-related activity applies not only to a Council Member's personal campaign for office, but also other campaigns for municipal, provincial and federal office."

2. That Section 3.1 A 3 of the Council Code of Conduct be amended to:
 - a) add "*Municipal Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act, the Municipal Elections Act and the Criminal Code*" to the section;
 - b) add "All of the above Acts and Codes govern the conduct of members of Council" to the section.
3. That the 2014-2018 City Council adopt the Council Code of Conduct as amended.
4. That the updated policy on use of corporate resources by Council Members, including electronic devices during an election year, be adopted.
5. That Sub-committee endorse the electronic agenda project and hardware recommendation as presented.

Sub-committee discussion:**Sub-committee recommendation:****Committee discussion:****Committee recommendation:**

6.2 Review of Council Appointed Advisory Committees Policy C.3.1

Objective: To review the maximum length of service provision for citizen appointments to city advisory and ad-hoc committees, boards, outside boards and agencies, local boards and joint boards, where applicable.

Attachment – Policy C.3.1

Background and Analysis: During recent citizen appointments to City advisory committees, questions were raised regarding the policy on the length of term for citizen appointments.

The following provision is in Policy C.3.1 as a guideline for Council when making appointments of citizens to boards and committee.

Maximum Length of Service

No one may serve on an advisory committee for more than 3 consecutive two-year terms, plus if applicable, one preceding partial term in those cases where committee members are initially appointed mid-term to fill a vacancy.

Staff have reviewed and are now reporting back.

In the past, the City Council term of office was a three-year term. It was the practice of Council at that time to also appoint citizens to city committees and boards for three-year terms, staggered, so that not all citizen appointments came due in the same year. The exceptions to this are appointments that are mandated by legislation such Committee of Adjustment, BIAs and Board of Park Management.

When the Council term of office was changed to four years, Council decided to appoint citizens for two-year terms rather than four-years. It was decided that a four-year term for citizens was too long of a commitment for citizens. A maximum length of service of 3 consecutive two-year terms was put into the policy. Previous Councils have considered and appointed citizens for more than 3 consecutive two-year terms. Some citizen appointments to boards and committees where it is a mandatory 4-year term – ie BIA, Committee of Adjustment, Board of Park Management. Again, Council has exercised its sole discretion in making appointments and that some citizens have been appointed for multiple consecutive terms.

Options

1. If Council wishes to confirm the current appointment process, staff will continue to forward all applications received to Council for their consideration along with information on when each applicant was first appointed to that board or committee. In appointing and reappointing citizens, Council acknowledges it is

their sole discretion to apply the 3 consecutive two-year terms as the maximum length of service or not.

2. If Council wishes to eliminate the maximum length of service provision , staff recommend replacing the provision in the Policy with guidelines for appointments and reappointments:

That City Council, when making appointments and reappointments to City advisory and ad-hoc committees, boards, outside boards and agencies, local boards and joint boards, may take into consideration at their sole discretion, the following factors, including but not limited to:

- Experience and/or skill set of an applicant or member that may help to guide the work of the committee or board;
- Awareness of the community and local issues on the agenda by an applicant or member;
- Degree of project knowledge a member has acquired while on the committee or board, where retention of such project knowledge would be of assistance in the completion of the project;
- Number of applications received for the vacant position(s) on a committee or board;
- Years of service on the committee or board [for citizens applying for reappointment to the same committee or board];
- Attendance at committee or board meetings [for citizens applying for reappointment to the same committee or board];

Staff also request housekeeping amendments to Policy C.3.1 at this time:

That reference to closed session meetings of Advisory Committees be removed from Policy C.3.1. as all meetings of advisory and ad-hoc committees of Council are open to the public.

That reference to "mailing" agendas to advisory committee members be replaced with "provided". Agendas are emailed to members. Members without access to email can continue to pick up their agendas from the Clerk's office or request they be mailed.]

Financial impact: None identified.

Staff recommendation: That the Maximum Length of Service provision in Policy C.3.1 be deleted and replaced with the following new provision:

That City Council, when making appointments and reappointments to City advisory and ad-hoc committees, boards, outside boards and agencies, local boards and joint boards, may take into consideration at their sole discretion, the following factors, including but not limited to:

- **Experience and/or skill set of an applicant or member that may help to guide the work of the committee or board;**
- **Awareness of the community and local issues on the agenda by an applicant or member;**
- **Degree of project knowledge a member has acquired while on the committee or board, where retention of such project knowledge would be of assistance in the completion of the project;**
- **Number of applications received for the vacant position(s) on a committee or board;**
- **Years of service on the committee or board [for citizens applying for reappointment to the same committee or board];**
- **Attendance at committee or board meetings [for citizens applying for reappointment to the same committee or board],**

And, that references to term limits for appointment be deleted from Policy C.3.1.

That reference to closed session meetings of Advisory Committees be removed from Policy C.3.1.

That reference to “mailing” agendas to advisory committee members be replaced with “provided”.

Sub-committee discussion:

Sub-committee recommendation:

Committee discussion:

Committee recommendation:

7.0 REPORT OF THE CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER

7.1 2015 Dashboard Report

Objective: To consider the City of Stratford's revised objectives for 2015.

Attachment – Proposed 2015 Dashboard Report

Background and Analysis: The City's Corporate Leadership Team previously tabled a draft Dashboard at the Council orientation session on January 19, 2015. We have considered the feedback received at that meeting and revised the proposed 2015 dashboard as follows:

- Objectives are organized according to our strategic priority framework;
- Economic development objectives have been added for SEED Co. and STA.;
- Updated transit plan has been added as an objective.

We table this proposed dashboard for your consideration and approval. Please amend as you see fit and we ask that you recommend for approval.

While I am unable to attend this meeting, each department is represented and can answer any questions you may have.

Financial impact: N/A

Staff recommendation: That the Proposed 2015 Corporate Dashboard Report be adopted.

Sub-committee discussion:

Sub-committee recommendation:

Committee discussion:

Committee recommendation:

8.0 ADVISORY COMMITTEE/OUTSIDE BOARD MINUTES

- Perth District Health Unit Board Minutes of January 14, 2015 distributed for the information of Council.
- 2017 Sesquicentennial Ad-Hoc Committee Minutes of January 28, 2015 distributed for the information of Council.

9.0 ADJOURNMENT

Motion by

That the Finance and Labour Relations Sub-committee meeting adjourn.

Meeting Start Time: 4:30 pm

Meeting End Time: