Wednesday February 11th, 2009
Immediately Following the Community Services Committee Meeting
Lanark County Municipal Office
Council Chambers

Bob Fletcher, Chair

1. CALL TO ORDER

2. DISCLOSURE OF PECUNIARY INTEREST

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

   Suggested Motion:
   “THAT, the minutes of the Corporate Services Committee meeting held on January 21st, 2009 and the Special Corporate Services Committee meeting held on February 4th, 2009 be approved as circulated.”

4. ADDITIONS & APPROVAL OF AGENDA

   Suggested Motion:
   “THAT, the agenda be adopted as presented.”

5. PRESENTATIONS & DELEGATIONS

   None.

6. COMMUNICATIONS

   i) Canadian Radio-television and Telecommunications Commission: Response to correspondence regarding rural party lines and 9-1-1 services – attached page 8

   ii) Town of Smiths Falls: Motion of Support for the AMO and OMSSA (Ontario Municipal Social Services Association) poverty reduction strategy – attached, page 9

   iii) Township of Madawaska Valley: Request to the Province to change assessment legislation - attached, page 10

   iv) Township of Lanark Highlands: Motion regarding Current Value Interpretation – attached page 11
7. REPORTS

i) Report: Lanark County Housing Corporation - Request to Receive Capital Funds (verbal) – attached page 15
   Housing Manager, Connie Kingston
   Maintenance Manager, Randy Smith

   Suggested Motion:
   “THAT, the Corporate Services Committee recommend that County Council continue to support the Lanark County Housing Corporation in carrying out their 2008 Capital Plan; and
   THAT, funding in the amount of $112,209.00 be approved as a pre-budget expenditure to allow commencement of Phase II of the project in a timely manner.”

ii) Lanark County Genealogical Society – 2009 Funding Request for the Lanark Archives – attached page 17
   Director of Finance/Treasurer, Kurt Greaves

   Suggested Motion:
   THAT, the Corporate Services Committee recommend that the request from the Lanark County Genealogical Society to continue to provide an annual grant in the amount of $3000.00 to support the Lanark County Archives be referred to the 2009 budget deliberations for consideration.”

    Emergency Services Coordinator, Rick Hannah

    Suggested Motion:
    “THAT, Report #ESC-03-2009 - CERB 2008 Report be received as information.”

    Emergency Services Coordinator, Rick Hannah

    Suggested Motion:
    “THAT, Report #ESC-04-2009 - Rescue Services 2008 Report be received as information.”

Emergency Services Coordinator, Rick Hannah

Suggested Motion:
“THAT, staff be authorized to finalize the agreement with each school board for the establishment of shelters; and

THAT, the Warden and Clerk be authorized to sign the agreement with each school board for the establishment of shelters; and

THAT, the necessary bylaw be prepared for the February 2009 Council meeting.”


Director of Finance/Treasurer, Kurt Greaves

Suggested Motion:
“THAT, Report #FIN-05-2009: 2008 Councillor Remuneration & Expense Summary be received as information.”

vii) Report #C-02-2009: Amendments to Procedural By-law No. 2006-43 - attached page 38

Clerk, Cathie Ritchie

Suggested Motion:
“THAT, the Procedural By-Law amendments attached as Appendix “A” are hereby accepted;

AND THAT, the Clerk is directed to consolidate the changes and prepare the amending by-law for the February 18th, 2009 County Council Meeting.”


Social Housing Manager, Sandy Grey

Suggested Motion:
“THAT, the 2008 Lanark County Accessibility Plan be approved as a planning document;

AND THAT staff continue to work, in conjunction with members of the Advisory Sub -Committee, toward the elimination of barriers to accessibility.”
Social Housing Manager, Sandy Grey

Suggested Motion:
“THAT, Report #C-04-2009: Accessibility Standards be received as information.”

x) Human Resources Information System (HRIS) Project Initiation Report – attached page 113
Director of Human Resources, Lisa Crosbie-Larmon

Suggested Motion:
THAT, the Corporate Services Committee approve the HRIS project in principle subject to funding being provided in the 2009 budget; and

THAT, as part of the project, the County implement the Info:HR system, provided by HR Systems Strategies Inc. as its HRIS; and

THAT, when the budget is approved, the CAO be authorized to enter into a contract with HR Systems Strategies Inc. to provide the software and associated implementation services.”


Suggested Motion:
“THAT, the Report of the Lanark County Ambulance Service December 2008 be received for information only.”

xii) Brainstorming: 2010 Goals for Reserves, Debt and Amount Collected from the Levy (verbal) – deferred to a future meeting.
Chief Administrative Officer, Peter Wagland and Treasurer, Kurt Greaves

xiii) Report of the Lanark County Accessibility Advisory Sub-Committee (verbal)
Chair, Councillor Bruce Horlin

Minutes (excluding attachments): February 2, 2009 – attached page 138

xiv) Report of the Eastern Ontario Warden’s Caucus (EOWC) (verbal)
Warden Paul Dulmage

Suggested Motion:
“THAT, the Report of the Eastern Ontario Warden’s Caucus (EOWC) be received as information only”
8. **CONFIDENTIAL REPORTS**

i) **CONFIDENTIAL**: Leeds, Grenville & Lanark District Health Unit: Office Space – to be distributed at meeting
   **Chief Administrative Officer**, Peter Wagland

   **Suggested Motion:**
   “THAT, the Committee move “in camera” at ___ p.m. to discuss a proposed or pending acquisition or disposition of land by the municipality or local board;

   **AND THAT**, P. Wagland, CAO; C. Ritchie, Clerk; Kurt Greaves, Director of Finance/Treasurer; and L. Drynan, Deputy Clerk remain in the room.”

   **Suggested Motion:**
   “THAT, the Committee return to regular session at ___ p.m.”

   • Chair’s Rise & Report

ii) **CONFIDENTIAL**: Councillor Participation in OMERS (Verbal)
    **Director of Human Resources**, Lisa Crosbie-Larmon and **Director of Finance/Treasurer**, Kurt Greaves

   **Suggested Motion:**
   “THAT, the Committee move “in camera” at ___ p.m. to labour relations or employee negotiations;

   **AND THAT**, P. Wagland, CAO, C. Ritchie, Clerk; Lisa Crosbie-Larmon, Director of Human Resources; Kurt Greaves, Director of Finance/Treasurer; and L. Drynan, Deputy Clerk remain in the room.”

   **Suggested Motion:**
   “THAT, the Committee return to regular session at ___ p.m.”

   • Chair’s Rise & Report

9. **NEW/OTHER BUSINESS**

i) **Meeting Schedule.**
    **Clerk**, Cathie Ritchie

    Special Corporate Services: Budget 5:00 p.m. Wed, Feb. 18<sup>th</sup>
    County Council: 7:00 p.m. Wed, Feb. 18<sup>th</sup>
    Lanark County Housing Corporation 6:30 p.m. Tues, Feb. 24<sup>th</sup>
10. ADJOURNMENT
File Ref. 429631

January 26, 2009

Warden Bob Fletcher
County of Lanark
P.O. Box 37
Sunset Blvd.
Perth, Ontario
K7H 3E2

Dear Warden Fletcher:

Thank you for taking the time to contact the CRTC about your concerns regarding rural party lines and 9-1-1 services. I have received a copy of your letter addressed to Commissioner Cugini. I apologize for the delay in my reply.

The Terms of Service of Bell Canada prevent Bell Canada from disclosing confidential customer information to Lanark County, such as a listing of Lanark County party line customers, including mailing addresses.

However, by copy of this message, I am asking Bell Canada to reply as to its notification policies within twenty days as set out in the CRTC Telecommunications Rules of Procedure and to report back to the Commission.

Commission staff will then review the company's response in light of your complaint and will contact you further only if regulatory action is required.

I am also providing you with a copy of our Fact Sheet entitled "How to File a Complaint About Your Telephone Service" which explains the CRTC complaints process.

Yours sincerely,

Donna Shewfelt
Manager, Eastern & Atlantic Region

Encl.
c: Bell Canada
January 7, 2009

Mr. Pat Vanini, Executive Director
Association of Municipalities of Ontario
200 University Avenue, Suite 601
Toronto, Ontario M5H 3C6

Dear Mr. Vanini:

At their meeting of January 5, 2009 Council of the Corporation of the Town of Smiths Falls passed the following resolution:

WHEREAS the Association of Municipalities of Ontario (AMO) and the Ontario Municipal Social Services Association (OMSSA) have developed a draft joint paper on issues and considerations on reducing poverty in communities across Ontario entitled "Government Makes a Difference: Working Together Towards Poverty Reduction";

AND WHEREAS this paper clarifies the importance of municipal engagement as the government moves forward on its Poverty Reduction Strategy and provides recommendations on both immediate and long term steps to addressing the complex issue of poverty;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Council of the Corporation of the Town of Smiths Falls supports the draft paper and the recommendations put forth and fully believes that municipalities should have a meaningful voice in these reviews, given their first-hand knowledge of the impact of poverty;

AND FURTHER THAT a copy of this motion be forwarded to the Association of Municipalities of Ontario (AMO) and the Ontario Municipal Social Services Association (OMSSA).

Resolution #: 2009-01-018

If you require further information please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours very truly,

Kerry Costello
Supervisor of Administrative & Planning Services / Clerk

cc: Ontario Municipal Social Services Association
Clerk, County of Lanark

Box 695, 77 Beckwith St. N., Smiths Falls, Ontario K7A 4T6
Phone: 613-283-4124  Fax: 613-283-4764  Website at www.smithsfalls.ca
THE CORPORATION OF THE TOWNSHIP OF MADAWASKA VALLEY
85 Bay St., PO Box 1000
Barry's Bay, ON K0J 1B0
ahudder@madawaska-valley.on.ca
P: 613-756-2747 / F: 613-756-0553

#07-0105-09 Moved by: Sylvie Yantha
Date: 05 Jan 2009 Seconded by: Shelley Maika

BE IT RESOLVED
WHEREAS every property owner in the Province of Ontario has received an updated Property Assessment Notice indicating their updated assessed value in the fall of 2008;

AND WHEREAS the Government of Ontario has introduced Bill 187 on March 22, 2007 which has included changes including the change of the assessment cycle from an annual update to a four-year cycle for the years 2009, 2010, 2011 & 2012 based on valuation dated on January 1, 2008;

AND WHEREAS the residential property owners in the Township of Madawaska Valley are seeing an average of 11.22% increase in their assessment (the second highest in Renfrew County including the separated Town of Pembroke) knowing that there has been a dramatic drop in the local real estate market;

AND WHEREAS under the roles, responsibilities and relationships identified by MPAC, it is up to the Province of Ontario to make any changes with regard to the legislation of assessments and the municipalities are only allowed to tax based on the assessment provided by the province;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Township of Madawaska Valley hereby requests that the Province of Ontario change the legislation of assessment to add a freeze at the year 2008 rate for the next for years, a more realistic value for property owners based on the current market and a more realistic value for a tax rate to be based on and also, back to a one-year annual assessment better to react to a current real estate market;

AND FURTHER TO THIS, legislation be drafted to allow for a 2nd class of tax to recognize waterfront properties and the significant tax burden carried by those owners who may be forced to sell their homes due to the unrealistic assessed value provided for their homes;

AND FURTHER TO THIS, this resolution be directed to Premier McGuinty, Minister of Revenue and to AMO for circulation to all municipalities in the Province of Ontario.

CARRIED.

Pat Pilgrim
Pat Pilgrim, CAO/Clerk

DISCLAIMER
This material is provided under contract as a paid service by the originating organization and does not necessarily reflect the view or positions of the Association of Municipalities of Ontario (AMO), its subsidiary companies, officers, directors or agents.
January 27th, 2009

The Honourable Dalton McGuinty
Premier of Ontario
Legislative Building, Queen’s Park
Toronto, ON M7A 1A1

Dear Honourable Dalton McGuinty:

Re: Current Value Interpretation

The Council of the Corporation of the Township of Lanark Highlands at its Council meeting on January 27th, 2009 adopted the following resolution:

RESOLUTION #CP-2009-01-05

"THAT, the Mayor send a letter to the Premier of Ontario requesting legislation to be passed to preserve the outstanding interpretation of "current value" in the Assessment Act and to retain both owner and tenant interests in the valuation of tenanted commercial properties in Ontario;

AND THAT, copies of the letter be sent to the Honourable Dwight Duncan, Minister of Finance; the Honourable Randy Hillier, MPP, Lanark, Frontenac, Lennox & Addington and the County of Lanark."

Please find enclosed a copy of the letter from MPAC dated December 12th, 2008.

If you require any further information, please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned at (613) 259-2398 ext. 233.

Sincerely,

Bob Fletcher,
Mayor

/Enclosure
December 12, 2008

Mayor Bob Fletcher
Township of Lanark Highlands
P.O. Box 340, 75 George Street
Lanark, ON K0G 1K0

Dear Mayor Bob Fletcher:

Re: Current Value Interpretation

I am writing to urge your continued support in asking the province to address an issue fundamental to the property assessment system in Ontario.

As you may know, the Assessment Review Board (ARB), in a decision released earlier this year, interpreted the term "current value" in the Assessment Act in a way that would significantly change how the Municipal Property Assessment Corporation (MPAC) assesses properties across the province. In a decision related to the "Bank Towers" in the City of Toronto, they ruled that "current value" for assessment purposes should be based only on the interests of the owner, exclusive of any tenant interest, and that the buildings must be valued as if vacant.

This decision, if it stands, changes the way MPAC would value tenanted commercial properties, such as office buildings and shopping centres, in the future.

Conservatively, MPAC estimates that the assessments of affected properties would be reduced by 25% to account for the fact that the tenants' interests are no longer to be assessed and the property has to be valued as if vacant. There are approximately 17,000 such properties in Ontario with a current value assessment of almost $100 billion, putting $25 billion in assessment at risk across the province.

MPAC and the City of Toronto were granted leave to appeal the ARB's decision to the Divisional Court on November 14, 2008. As a result, the parties will now embark on a litigation process that is expected to be lengthy, costly, and which puts the assessment base for all municipalities, as well as business education tax revenue to the provincial government at risk of substantial reductions.
Since leave to appeal the decision has been granted, MPAC has returned the 2008 values for taxation in the current four-year assessment cycle based on the existing valuation methodology. It is anticipated that it could take several years before the appeal is finally resolved through the higher courts, with no guarantee that MPAC's interpretation of the Assessment Act will be upheld. As a result, a significant amount of municipal revenue and provincial education tax is in jeopardy for future years.

There is also considerable assessment at risk because of the number ofARB appeals outstanding for prior taxation years. Approximately 14,000 assessment appeals for shopping centres and office buildings were put on hold pending the outcome of the bank tower decision. The majority of these appeals apply to the 2005 through 2008 taxation years, with some dating back to 2003.

Provincial government intervention, in the form of a legislative amendment to the definition of "current value", is necessary to avoid lengthy and unpredictable appeal litigation, and financial uncertainty for municipalities. Because of the implications for Ontario municipalities, we urge you to continue to raise this concern to your local members of provincial parliament.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me at (905) 688-0990 extension 225 or Carl Isenburg, President and Chief Administrative Officer of MPAC at (905) 837-6150.

Yours truly,

[Signature]

Debbie Zimmerman
Chair, MPAC Board of Directors

Copy: MPAC Board of Directors
Carl Isenburg
REPORTS


Lanark County Housing Corporation
52 Abbott Street North, Unit #4
Smiths Falls, Ontario K7A 1W3
(613) 283-2555 1-800-267-1313
Fax (613) 283-5420

Board Chairperson
David Bothwell

Housing Manager
Connie Kingston

CORPORATE SERVICES
Request to Receive Capital Funds

As part of our 2008 Capital Plan, the Lanark County Housing Corporation Board of Directors and County Council approved Phase I of III to replace the windows and doors at 46 Bell Avenue in Smiths Falls.

The original contract gave an option to renew for Phase II and III pending budget approval and Board approval of any price increases.

On January 27, 2009, the Housing Corporation Board of Directors awarded Phase II of the contract to the original low bidders, Burchill Glass and Comeau Carpentry, pending budget approval.

The requested budget for the job is $160,000.00 with $47,791.00 being provincially funded. This leaves a balance of $112,209.00 to be funded by the county.

The Housing Corporation would like to request that the $112,209.00 be approved prior to the conclusion of the budget deliberations.

There are several reasons we would like to start this job early:

1) It is a large job with thirty-two units being completed and the contractors would like to start the job early as their workload is not as demanding in March and April.

2) There is a six-week delivery time for the windows and doors. Waiting to issue the purchase order in April would delay the start of the job until mid-May or later.

3) Most of the capital jobs are warm weather dependant. Early completion of this large job would take a great burden off Housing Corporation Staff as this job could be 80% completed by late spring.

4) Early completion would let the tenants enjoy their patios and balconies in the warm weather and not be disrupted with construction.

The Lanark County Housing Corporation Board of Directors has approved that this request be forwarded to Corporate Services for consideration.

Board Resolution 9-2009
Randy Smith – Maintenance Manager
Lanark Corporation Housing Corporation

15 of 144
RESOLUTION # 9-2009

Moved by: Sharon Mousseau
Seconded by: Donna Gourlay

THAT the request from the Maintenance Manager to receive Capital Funds prior to approval of the final budget, be forwarded to Corporate Services for consideration.

CARRIED.

Dave Bothwell, Chairperson

Date: January 27th, 2009
Lanark County Genealogical Society  
Lanark County Archives  
Box 512, Perth Ont K7H 3K4

January 22, 2009

Chairman, Corporate Services Committee  
Lanark County Council Sunset Boulevard,  
P.O. Box 37  
Perth Ont. K7H 3E2

Dear

The Lanark County Genealogical Society (LCGS) respectfully requests the county’s continuing support to assist and further the 2009 activities of our “Lanark Archives”, located in Drummond Centre. The continuing grant of $3000.00 would be much appreciated. Our Archives operates on an a budget separately from the Society, and would request the grant be made out to “The Lanark County Archives”, rather than the Society. A copy of a void cheque is enclosed. This will facilitate our record keeping. Irene Spence (Sec. Treasurer of the Archives) is the contact person (spence1@rippnet.com) 613-267-2232

Our Archives has been opened since February 2002, and continues to collect and preserve the histories of Lanark County. Seventy-two acquisitions were received from individuals in 2008, proof of people’s desire to preserve records for the future. Seventeen boxes of historical materials were received from the Innisville Museum holdings and are now catalogued. In order to accommodate our holdings, we had to rent a quality controlled storage unit this year

We have been open 69 regular days this past year, and 5 other times by appointment. We continue to have visitors from across Canada and the United States. Please be aware that this facility is run totally on a volunteer basis

Volunteer hours this year have amounted to over 1250 at the Archives alone, not to mention the necessary background work and planning meetings. We are concentrating this year on fine tuning a proper database.

Lanark County’s support at this time is crucial to help us to grow and move ahead. More and more visitors are coming to the Archives from a distance, a positive effect on the local economy

Yours truly

Frances Rathwell  
President

Frances Rathwell

Att: Copy of proposed 2009 budget
## Summary of 2007-2008 Budgets Plus 2009 Proposed Budget

### INCOME

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>2007 Actual</th>
<th>2008 PRO</th>
<th>2008 Actual</th>
<th>2009 PRO</th>
<th>2009 Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rec donations</td>
<td>1071</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash don (Drum)</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>.600</td>
<td>522</td>
<td>500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage maps</td>
<td>787</td>
<td>.500</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCGS Cont'b</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lan Co grant</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund Raising</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>.500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research &amp; Misc</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>550</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photocopy</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>.282</td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GST Rebate</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>150(approx)</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memorial Contr</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spec Proj</td>
<td>1.570.*</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>Bks 440</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tsf in from ING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open By Appt</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8100</td>
<td>.6474</td>
<td>11350</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bal Brought</td>
<td>4042</td>
<td>4042</td>
<td>4320</td>
<td>370</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>13415</td>
<td>12420</td>
<td>10794</td>
<td>14720</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### EXPENSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>2007 Actual</th>
<th>2008 PRO</th>
<th>2008 Actual</th>
<th>2009 PRO</th>
<th>2009 Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Office rental</td>
<td>2500</td>
<td>2500</td>
<td>2500</td>
<td>2500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storage Unit</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1002</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Map repro</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arch supp</td>
<td>814</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office/Supp</td>
<td>1143</td>
<td>2500</td>
<td>1570</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro Fees</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>3272</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publicity/signs/</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web site</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchases (books)</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>.625</td>
<td>250</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projects</td>
<td>1146</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>759</td>
<td>4000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arch acquisitons</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSF to ING.*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency fund</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spec Event</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Purchases</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>548</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment/tools for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>emergency/maintenance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub Total</td>
<td>9095</td>
<td>12100</td>
<td>10424</td>
<td>14550</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carry over</td>
<td>4320</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>170</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>13415</td>
<td>12420</td>
<td>10790</td>
<td>14720</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Budget accepted January 17th, 2009
Moved: Marilyn Snedden
Sec: Helen Gillian
THE COUNTY OF LANARK

CORPORATE SERVICES COMMITTEE
February 11, 2009

Report #ESC # -05- 2009 of the
Emergency Services Coordinator

SHELTERS AGREEMENT

1. STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

THAT, staff be authorized to finalize the agreement with each school board for the establishment of shelters.

AND THAT, the Warden and Clerk be authorized to sign the agreement with each school board for the establishment of shelters.

AND THAT the necessary bylaw be prepared for the February 2009 Council meeting.

2. PURPOSE

To provide Members of Council an update on the activities performed by staff, as directed by Council, in relation to the agreement with the school boards for shelters during an emergency.

3. BACKGROUND

Report #ESC-21-2007 Emergency Plan – Shelters Management presented to Corporate Services Committee, on November 21, 2007, produced Motion #CP-2007-316 “that the County of Lanark enter into negotiations for an agreement with the school boards for shelters during an emergency”. The direction given to staff was to include that the Local Municipality could initiate and access the facilities.

The ESC worked with school board representatives to develop a mutually acceptable agreement. The components of the agreement included the process to access the facilities; the use and restriction of specified areas within the facilities, for food preparation and for animals; timelines for access to transportation systems; staffing requirements and storage of equipment at the facilities; cost apportionment during emergencies and termination and dispute settlement clauses. The agreement was reviewed by representatives of the insurance carrier and a legal opinion was obtained to assure the agreement was acceptable for the County of Lanark.

The CAO became involved in the development of the agreement, specifically to address the direction of Council, for the provision to access the facilities by the Head of Council of the Local Municipality. A joint meeting with representatives of each
school board and the county staff took place. Gordon Greffe, the Associate Director of Education with the Catholic School Board of Eastern Ontario and Rick Gales, the Superintendent of Business with the Upper Canada District School Board participated in the meeting. The representative decided that a decision should be made by the School Board on the issue of access. The CAO followed up the meeting with a letter outlining the direction given by County Council.

A response was received from a representative of each school board; the response was to inform the County of Lanark that an agreement with a single point of access was the format to be taken.

Each school board boundary operates within eight (8) counties and thirty-eight (38) Local Municipalities. The decision was to reduce the number of agreements and to reduce the number of points of contact for access to facilities.

4. DISCUSSION

The Aim of the Emergency Plan of the Local Municipality is “to protect the health, safety, welfare and property of our citizens, from the effects of a natural, technological or human caused emergency”.

The Aim of the Emergency Plan of the County of Lanark expands on the efforts of the Local Municipality to “support the local municipalities in the implementation and operation of their emergency plans’ and “support all local municipalities in the mitigation of an emergency in the county” and “provide available resources to assist the local municipalities, as required”.

The Local Municipal Emergency Plan identifies responsibilities of the County of Lanark Director of Social Services to “ensure for the care, feeding and shelter of evacuees” and for the “management of reception and evacuation shelters”.

The Community Emergency Management Coordinator (CEMC) of the County of Lanark has established operation procedures with a number of agencies that provide information, expertise and support for the mitigation of an emergency. The Ontario Power Generation (OPG) company, Evergreen Energy, have named the County of Lanark as the primary contact in the event of a dam failure on the Mississippi River system. The responsibility, as the primary contact, is to make contact with Local Municipal CEMC or designate, to distribute information and obtain resource requirements for such an emergency. This was practiced in November 2008 during the OPG Emergency Exercise. Other procedures for contact have been established with Hydro One Emergency Management, Mississippi Valley Conservation Authority, Rideau Valley Conservation Authority and the Ministry of Natural Resources. To create a similar arrangement with the School Board would not be difficult.
5. **ANALYSIS AND OPTIONS**

The establishment of shelters is important for the protection of the residents during an emergency. The development of an agreement with the School Boards for access to their facilities for shelters before an emergency reduces the affect on the residents when evacuated.

The School Board decision to develop an agreement with the single point of contact creates a diversion from the direction given by Council. Similar arrangements with other agencies have proven to be effective and could be established with the School Board.

6. **FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

There is no financial impact related to the agreement.

7. **LOCAL MUNICIPAL IMPACT**

The establishment of an agreement for shelters during an emergency meets the aim of the Local Municipal Emergency Plan. To include the contacting of the County in procedures, which is currently established, is not a difficult effort.

8. **CONCLUSIONS**

The mitigation of the emergency situation is the responsibility of the Local Municipality; the County will provide support as required. The establishment of shelters, the responsibility of the Local Municipality allocated to the Director of Social Services, can be accomplished by completion of the agreement with the School Boards.

9. **ATTACHMENTS**

   i) Draft Agreement.

---

**Recommended By:**

Rick Hannah  
Emergency Services Coordinator

**Approved for Submission By:**

Peter Wagland  
Chief Administrative Officer
THIS AGREEMENT made in duplicate day of , 2009

BETWEEN:

UPPER CANADA DISTRICT SCHOOL BOARD

Hereinafter referred to as “the Board”

OF THE FIRST PART

AND:

THE CORPORATION OF THE COUNTY OF LANARK

Hereinafter referred to as “the County”

OF THE SECOND PART

1. DEFINITIONS

1.1 In this Agreement, unless there is something in the context inconsistent therewith:

“Agreement” means this Agreement including the Schedules hereto attached;

“Animal” means any member of the animal kingdom, other than human”;

“Board Emergency Plan” means an emergency plan formulated by the Board for the safety and security of students, Board employees and property of the Board in an Emergency;

“Board Facilities” means that real and personal property owned by the Board and described in Schedule “A” hereto;

“Emergency” means a situation or an impending situation that constitutes a danger of major proportions that could result in serious harm to persons or substantial damage to property and that is caused by the forces of nature, a disease or other health risk, an accident or an act whether intentional or otherwise;

(a) situation necessitating action to arrange for temporary shelter or transportation for residents evacuated from their residences prior to or without the declaration of an Emergency Under Section 4(1) of the Emergency Management and Civil protection act; and

(b) situation necessitating a declaration of Emergency under Section 4(1) of the Emergency Management and Civil Protection Act by the head of council of the County;

“Emergency Control Group” means the Emergency Control Group established by the County under Section 12 of Ontario Regulation 380/04 under the Emergency Management and Civil Protection Act;

“Emergency Management and Civil Protection Act” means the Emergency Management and Civil Protection Act, R. S. O. 1990, c.E.9 as amended and the Regulations thereto; and

“Municipal Emergency Plan” means an emergency plan formulated by the County pursuant to Section 3(1) of the Emergency Management and Civil Protection Act.
2. **RECITALS**

2.1 The County has formulated a Municipal Emergency Plan to govern the provision of necessary services during an Emergency and the procedures under and the manner in which employees of the County and other persons will respond to the Emergency.

2.2 The Municipal Emergency Plan includes provisions for the use of the Board Facilities.

2.3 The Board is the owner of the Board Facilities.

2.4 The Board has formulated a Board Emergency Plan to govern the provision of necessary services during an Emergency.

2.5 The County and the Board acknowledge and agree that the Agreement is made pursuant to Section 13(3) of the Emergency Management and Civil Protection Act.

3. **NOTIFICATION**

3.1 In the event of an Emergency which may threaten the safety, health and well-being of students, Board employees or Board property, or which will require the use of some or all of the Board Facilities, the County shall advise the Director of Education of the Board or such other person or persons designated by the Board of such Emergency.

3.2 The method for notification under Clause 3.1 hereof shall be agreed to by the County and the Board and shall be reviewed and tested semi-annually while this Agreement is in effect with such testing to be undertaken in the months of April and November in each calendar year or as may otherwise be agreed to by the parties.

4. **LIAISON**

4.1 Forthwith upon receipt of notification of an Emergency under Clause 3 hereof the Board shall designate an employee of the Board (hereinafter called the “Board’s Liaison Officer”) to liaise with the County on behalf of the Board on all matters relating to the Emergency and without limiting the generality of the foregoing the Board’s Liaison Officer shall:

(a) be available to the County’s Emergency Control Group;

(b) advise the Emergency Control Group as to steps being taken by the Board in relation to the Emergency and as to assistance required by the Board to safeguard students and Board employees and property during the Emergency; and

(c) provide advice and assistance to the Emergency Operation Centre in arranging for the use of the Board Facilities as may be required.

5. **USE OF BOARD FACILITIES**

5.1 Upon receipt of notification of an Emergency under Clause 3 hereof the Board shall make available to the County such of the Board Facilities as may be deemed necessary by the County, acting reasonably.

5.2 Without limiting the generality of the foregoing Clause 5.1 the County covenants and agrees that when determining what Board Facilities are to be deemed necessary for use in the Emergency the County shall give due consideration to the Board’s needs for the use of Board Facilities for the safety and transportation of students and Board employees.
5.3 Without limiting the generality of the foregoing Clause 5.2 the County acknowledges and agrees that during school days buses under contract to the Board and providing transportation to the Board’s students shall remain under the control of the Board until such time as the Board releases such buses to the County for use by the County during the Emergency.

5.4 Subject to Clause 5.3 the Board acknowledges and agrees that in and during an Emergency the final decision as to the use and control of Board Facilities shall rest with the County under the terms and conditions of the Emergency Management and Civil Protection Act.

5.5 The County acknowledges and agrees that the Board Facilities shall be preserved as a smoke-free environment at all times.

5.6 The County shall be entitled to place and store within Board Facilities in such location as the County and the Board may agree a kit containing equipment for use in an Emergency. Attached hereto as Schedule “C” is an up-to-date inventory of the contents of the kits. The Board and the County acknowledge and agree that Schedule “C” hereto shall be up-dated from time to time as maybe agreed to by the parties in writing and any such amendment shall not require the parties to enter into a formal Amending Agreement.

5.7 The County covenants and agrees to use the documents listed on Schedule “D” hereto as guidelines in the use of the Board Facilities under the within Agreement. The County and the Board acknowledge and agree that Schedule “D” may be amended from time to time as may be agreed to by the parties in writing and any such amendment shall not require the parties to enter into a formal Amending Agreement.

6. STAFFING OF BOARD FACILITIES

6.1 The Board shall have at least one Board Employee at such of the Board’s buildings identified by the County under Clause 5.1 hereof and such Board employee or employees as the case may be shall assist the County with the operation and maintenance of the identified buildings during the Emergency.

7. DILIGENCE AND CARE

7.1 The County for itself, its employees, servants, agents and invitees covenants and agrees to exercise due diligence and care in the use of Board Facilities so as to not interfere with any of the Board’s property, activities or instructional procedures unless such interference is deemed necessary by the County, acting reasonably, in response to the Emergency.

7.2 Prior to the use of any Board Facilities the Board’s Liaison Officer shall meet with a duly authorized representative of the County and both shall inspect together the Board Facilities to be used in the Emergency and both shall make a joint written note, signed by both persons, of any existing damage, deficiencies or other relevant factors before such Board Facilities are used by the County in the Emergency.

7.3 Following termination of the use of Board Facilities the Board’s Liaison Officer and a duly authorized representative of the County shall inspect together the Board Facilities used in the Emergency and shall make a joint written note, signed by both persons, of any new damage, deficiencies or other relevant factors resulting from the County’s use of the Board Facilities.

7.4 The County covenants and agrees to pay to the Board the cost of any repair to or replacement of any Board Facilities arising out of the use of such Board Facilities during the Emergency.
7.5 The County further covenants and agrees to make payment to the Board under Clause 7.4 hereof within thirty (30) days of receipt of a written invoice from the Board.

8. **COSTS**

8.1 The County covenants and agrees to reimburse the Board for any extraordinary costs incurred by the Board as a consequence of the use of Board Facilities during an Emergency and such costs may include but are not limited to the Board’s actual costs incurred for:

(a) supplies and services;

(b) overtime wages, salaries and benefits paid to Board employees;

(c) additional costs for utilities, cleaning and restoration of Board Facilities for normal school activity;

(d) security costs; and

(e) telephone charges.

8.2 The County covenants and agrees to make payment to the Board pursuant to Clause 8.1 hereof within thirty (30) days of receipt of a written notice from the Board.

9. **AGENTS OF THE COUNTY**

9.1 The County and the Board acknowledge and agree that all individual volunteers, volunteer groups, agencies and others who are engaged by the County in an Emergency to manage or assist with the operation of an Evacuation Centre (as hereinafter defined) in Board Facilities shall be deemed for all purposes to be agents of the County and shall not for any purposes be deemed to be agents of the Board.

10. **CONDUCT IN BOARD FACILITIES**

10.1 The County covenants and agrees to take any and all reasonable steps so as to protect Board Facilities against vandalism and mischief and further to supervise and be responsible to the Board for the behaviour of all persons who are accommodated in or who make use of any Board Facilities under this Agreement.

10.2 Without limiting the generality of Clause 10.1 hereof the County acknowledges and agrees that the Board may request the attendance of a local police force or the provincial police force in or on Board Facilities to maintain order where the Board, acting reasonably, deems such attendance necessary.

10.3 Without limiting the generality of Clause 10.1 hereof the Board acknowledges and agrees that the County may request the attendance of a local police force or the provincial police force in or on Board Facilities to maintain order where the Board, acting reasonably, deems such attendance necessary.

11. **FOOD**

11.1 The County covenants and agrees that no food preparation or food consumption will be permitted in Board Facilities other than in locations normally used by the Board for such purposes.

11.2 The County further covenants and agrees that no stoves or other cooking devices may be used in Board Facilities other than such stoves or cooking devices permanently installed therein by the Board.
12. ASSIGNMENT OF CONTRACTS

12.1 Notwithstanding contracts the Board may have with suppliers of goods and services, including but not limited to contracts for bulk supply of foods and contracts for bus services, at the request of the County and where permitted at law to do so, the Board may assign in whole or in part to the County the Board’s rights under such contracts in furtherance of the terms and intent of this Agreement.

12.2 The County covenants and agrees that the cost of the supply of goods and services assigned to the County under Clause 12.1 hereof shall be the sole responsibility of the County and the County hereby covenants to indemnify and save harmless the Board from any claim related to such costs.

13. ANIMALS

13.1 The County acknowledges and agrees that Animals shall not be allowed inside the Board’s buildings.

13.2 The County and the Board acknowledge and agree that subject to space and security Animals which are domestic may be accommodated on outdoor property owned by or under the control of the Board provided that all such Animals shall be leashed or caged at all times and provided further that all applicable municipal by-laws shall be complied with.

14. INDEMNITY

14.1 The Parties shall each indemnify and save harmless the other from and against all claims, losses, damages, judgments, costs, expenses, actions and other proceedings made, sustained, brought, prosecuted or threatened to be brought or prosecuted that are based upon, occasioned by or attributed to any bodily injury to or death of a person or damage to or loss of property caused by any negligent act or omission on the part of the indemnifying party, its officers, employees, students, agents or volunteers arising out of this Agreement.

15. INSURANCE

15.1 During the term of this Agreement, each party shall obtain and maintain in full force and effect, general liability insurance issued by an insurance company licensed to carry on business in the Province of Ontario, providing coverage for personal and bodily injury, public liability, property damage, hostile fire, products and completed operations, tenants legal liability, blanket contractual liability, additional insured endorsement and non-owned automobile including contractual liability. Such policy shall:

(a) have inclusive limits of not less than Five Million Dollars ($5,000,000) for injury, loss or damage per occurrence;

(b) contain a cross-liability clause endorsement of standard wording;

(c) name the other party as an additional insured with respect to any claim arising out of the other party’s obligations under this Agreement or the County’s or Board’s provision of personnel, services, equipment or material pursuant to this Agreement;

15.2 The County’s and the Board’s general liability insurance, when called upon to respond to a claim on behalf of the respective named insured party, shall each apply as primary insurance and not excess to any other insurance available to the additional insured designated on the named insured’s policy.

15.3 Each party shall provide to the other party a valid Certificate of Insurance satisfactory to the other party, acting reasonably, and any replacements thereof, that references this Agreement and confirms the coverage’s identified herein.
16. **EMERGENCY EVACUATION/RECEPTION CENTRES**

16.1 The County and the Board acknowledge and agree that the County has identified certain of the Board Facilities to be used in an Emergency as evacuation and/or reception centers (hereinafter “Evacuation Centers”) under the Municipal Emergency Plan and the Evacuation Centers are more particularly described in Schedule “B” hereto annexed.

16.2 The Board agrees to permit the County to store a kit in each Evacuation Center in a space suitable to the Board and the County.

16.3 The Board further agrees to permit the County and the applicable Health Unit in the County on reasonable notice to the Board to jointly evaluate each Evacuation Centre with regards to access to and adequacy of such Evacuation Centre.

16.4 The Board further agrees to permit the County and a contractor for the County on reasonable notice to the Board to evaluate each Evacuation Center as to back-up power capacity and needs.

17. **LEGAL RELATIONSHIP**

17.1 The County and the Board acknowledge and agree that the use and occupation of Board Facilities under this Agreement does not create in law or in equity in favour of the County, its officers, servants agents or invitees including members of the public any estate, right title or interest in the Board Facilities and further that such use and occupation of Board Facilities is as a bare licensee.

18. **TERMINATION**

18.1 This Agreement shall remain in full force and effect until terminated by mutual agreement in writing or under the provision of Clause 18.2.

18.2 Either of the parties hereto shall have the right to terminate this Agreement by giving sixty (60) days written notice to the other party.

19. **DISPUTE RESOLUTION**

19.1 In the event of a disagreement between the parties with respect to the interpretation of this Agreement or their obligations thereunder (hereinafter “the Dispute”), the parties shall make good faith efforts to resolve the Dispute by negotiation.

19.2 In the event that negotiations do not lead to a resolution of the Dispute, the parties agree that alternative dispute resolution processes such as mediation, appointment of a neutral third party evaluator or arbitration are preferable to litigation as a way to resolve Disputes that may arise under this Agreement and each party agrees to give good faith consideration to having to resort to an alternative dispute resolution process before initiating legal proceedings to deal with any such Disputes.

19.3 Either party may, at any time, give written notice of a Dispute to the other.

19.4 No later than ten (10) business days after the delivery of a notice of a Dispute, the parties shall meet and attempt, in good faith, to resolve the Dispute.

19.5 If the Dispute is not resolved within thirty (30) business days of the delivery of a notice of a Dispute any party may, by giving written notice to the other party, require that the Dispute be submitted to mediation or arbitration and the parties agree that notice requiring arbitration may be given whether or not a mediation is ongoing. If notice requiring arbitration is given while mediation is ongoing, the parties shall cease all mediation activities and proceed with arbitration in accordance with Clause 19.7 hereof.
Mediation of a Dispute shall be subject to the following terms and conditions:

(a) the party giving a notice of mediation shall include the names of two (2) individuals to act as mediator in the notice. After receiving the notice of mediation, the other party shall within five (5) business days submit the names of two (2) individuals to act as mediator. If the party fails to submit names within five (5) business days that party shall be deemed to accept as a mediator, the persons selected by the other party. Individuals submitted to act as mediator shall be qualified and experienced professional mediators whose mediation practice is based in Eastern Ontario.

(b) a single individual shall be unanimously chosen by the parties from the names submitted, provided however that if the parties are unable to reach agreement on the selection of a mediator within five (5) business days after the last party has provided the names of its proposed mediators, the mediator shall be selected at random by draw from among the mediators proposed by the parties;

(c) not more than ten (10) business days after the date of the appointment of the mediator, each party shall submit to the mediator and to the other party a without prejudice written mediation brief of not more than ten (10) pages in length setting out the party’s position concerning the matters involved in the Dispute;

(d) the mediation shall be attended by the representatives of the parties with full authority to settle the Dispute. A party may be accompanied to the mediation by its lawyer provided that it gives the other party written notice at least three (3) business days in advance of its intention to do so;

(e) any party or the mediator shall be entitled to withdraw from the mediation at any time;

(f) the mediation shall end on the earlier of (a) the date that the parties enter into a binding settlement agreement with respect to the Dispute (b) the date that any party or the mediator withdraws from the mediation, or (c) at 5:00 p.m. (Eastern time) on the day that is the 30th day after the notice of mediation was received in accordance with the terms of this Agreement; and

(g) the fees and expenses of the mediation shall be borne as specified in a settlement, if a settlement is obtained. If no settlement is obtained, the mediator’s fees and expenses shall be as specified in the notice issued by the mediator stating that the mediation has failed. Each party shall bear its own expenses of the mediation whether or not it is successful.

Arbitration of a Dispute shall be subject to the following terms and conditions:

(a) The Dispute shall be determined by the provisions of the Arbitrations Act (Ontario) by a sole arbitrator agreed upon by the parties, or failing agreement, appointed by a judge of the Ontario Superior Court of Justice upon the application of either of the parties; and

(b) any determination by arbitration shall include a determination as to payment of the costs of the arbitration and shall be binding upon the parties, who shall not have any right of appeal from such determination.

The negotiations and other settlement efforts of the parties shall, in all respects, be kept confidential and shall be strictly without prejudice. All information provided, documents disclosed or statements made in the course of those negotiations and settlement efforts, including without limitation, any admission, view, suggestion, notice, response, discussion, position or settlement proposal, shall be held in strict confidence by the parties and, unless there is a legal requirement that such information be revealed, it shall not be subject to disclosure through discovery or any other process or relied upon by any party and shall not be
admissible into evidence for any purpose, including impeaching credibility, in any subsequent proceedings except as required by law.

20. **NOTICE**

20.1 Any demand or notice to be given pursuant to this Agreement shall be properly made and given if made in writing and either delivered to the party for whom it is intended to the address as set out below or sent by prepaid registered mail addressed to such party as follows:

(a) where the Board is the intended recipient:

Upper Canada District School Board  
225 Central Avenue West  
Brockville, Ontario  
K6V 5X1

Attention: David Thomas  Director of Education

(b) where the County is the intended recipient:

County of Lanark  
99 Christie Lake Road,  
PO Box 37 Sunset Blvd  
Perth, Ontario  
K7H 3E2

Attention: Peter Wagland  Chief Administrative Officer

Or such other addresses as the parties may from time to time notify in writing, and any demand or notice so made or given shall be deemed to have been properly made or given and received on the day on which it shall have been so delivered or, if mailed, then, in the absence of any interruption in postal service affecting the delivery or handling thereof, on the day following three (3) business days following the date of mailing.

21. **GENERAL PROVISIONS**

21.1 Should any provision of this Agreement be declared or found to be illegal, unenforceable, legally ineffective or void, then each party shall be relieved of any obligation arising from such provision, but the balance of this Agreement, if capable of performance, shall remain in full force and effect.

21.2 No term or provision of this Agreement shall be deemed waived and no breach consented to, unless such waiver or consent is in writing and signed by an authorized representative of the party claimed to have waived or consented.

21.3 This Agreement shall not be assigned in whole or in part by the County or by the Board without the prior written consent of the other party, which consent will not be unreasonably withheld.

21.4 This Agreement may not be varied, altered, amended or supplemented except by an instrument in writing duly executed by the parties.

21.5 Nothing contained in this Agreement, expressed or implied, shall confer upon any person, corporation or other entity, other than the parties hereto and their successors in interest and assigns, any rights or remedies under or by reason of this Agreement.

21.6 Each party shall, from time to time, and upon reasonable request by the other party, execute, perform and make or cause to be executed, performed and made all such further acts, deeds,
assurances and things as may be reasonably required in order to get the full effect of this Agreement.

21.7 The provisions of this Agreement shall enure to the benefit of and be binding upon each of the parties hereto and their respective successors and assigns.

21.8 This Agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with the laws of the Province of Ontario.

21.9 This Agreement constitutes the entire agreement between the parties with respect to the subject matter of the Agreement and it supersedes all previous negotiations, communications and other agreements whether written or oral, unless incorporated by reference in this Agreement.

21.10 Time is of the essence in this Agreement.

21.11 All paragraph headings are for ease of reference only and do not affect the construction or interpretation of this Agreement.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF the Board has set its hand and seal attested to by its property signing officer duly authorized in the belief.

Dated at this day of , 2008.

SIGNED, SEALED AND DELIVERED ) UPPER CANADA DISTRICT SCHOOL BOARD
 IN THE PRESENCE OF )
 )
 ) Per: _______________________
 ) Richard Gales
 ) Superintendent of Business
 )

IN WITNESS WHEREOF the County has hereunto affixed its Corporate Seal duly attested by its Warden and Clerk.

Dated at this day of , 2008.

SIGNED, SEALED AND DELIVERED )
 IN THE PRESENCE OF ) _______________________
 ) _______________________
 ) _______________________
 )
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SCHEDULE “A”

BOARD FACILITIES

(SCHOOLS, VEHICLES ETC.)
SCHEDULE “C”

KITS
SCHEDULE “D”
GUIDELINES

(a) “Use of Schools for Sleeping Accommodations” published January, 2002 by the Office of the Fire Marshall and in particular Schedule “C” thereto;

(b) “Emergency Facility Survey” issued by the County of Lanark, and;

(c) Such emergency lodging guidelines as may be found from time to time on the Health Canada website (http://www.phac-aspc.gc.ca/emergency-urgence/index-eng.php).
THE COUNTY OF LANARK

CORPORATE SERVICES COMMITTEE
February 11, 2009

Report #FIN-05-2009
of the Treasurer

2008 COUNCILLOR REMUNERATION & EXPENSE SUMMARY

1. RECOMMENDATIONS

For information only.

2. PURPOSE

To provide Council with an itemized statement on remuneration and expenses paid to County Council and members of boards appointed by Council as required by section 284 of the Municipal Act, 2001, S.O. 2001, c.25 (the Act).

3. BACKGROUND

Clause 284(1)(a) of the Act states:

"The treasurer of a municipality shall in each year on or before March 31 provide to the council of the municipality an itemized statement on remuneration and expenses paid in the previous year to,

(a) each member of council in respect of his or her services as a member of the council or any other body, including a local board, to which the member has been appointed by council or on which the member holds office by virtue of being a member of council”.

4. DISCUSSION

Appendix A attached identifies both the taxable and non-taxable portions of County Council remuneration, benefits as well as all other expenses paid to Councillors in 2008. This includes all payments made directly to Councillors and paid by the County on their behalf.
5. ANALYSIS AND OPTION
None.

6. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS
None.

7. LOCAL MUNICIPAL IMPACT
None.

8. CONCLUSIONS
For information only.

9. ATTACHMENTS
APPENDIX A: 2008 Remuneration and Expenses

Prepared and Recommended By:  
Kurt E. Greaves  
Treasurer

Approved for Submission By:  
Peter P. Wagland,  
C.A.C.
## Council and Land Division
### 2008 Remuneration and Expenses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employee ID</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Taxable</th>
<th>Non Taxable</th>
<th>Benefits</th>
<th>Per Diems &amp; Benefits</th>
<th>Expenses</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>000163372</td>
<td>CHURCHILL</td>
<td>AUBREY</td>
<td>$12,205</td>
<td>$6,103</td>
<td>$986</td>
<td>$19,294</td>
<td>$8,572</td>
<td>$27,866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>000300239</td>
<td>DOBSON</td>
<td>WILLIAM</td>
<td>$6,620</td>
<td>$3,310</td>
<td>$764</td>
<td>$10,944</td>
<td>$6,883</td>
<td>$17,827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>000163388</td>
<td>DULMAGE</td>
<td>PAUL</td>
<td>$9,305</td>
<td>$4,653</td>
<td>$1,061</td>
<td>$15,019</td>
<td>$6,917</td>
<td>$21,936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>000163389</td>
<td>FENIK</td>
<td>JOHN</td>
<td>$9,405</td>
<td>$4,703</td>
<td>$1,071</td>
<td>$15,179</td>
<td>$4,340</td>
<td>$19,519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>000163373</td>
<td>FLETCHER</td>
<td>ROBERT</td>
<td>$29,703</td>
<td>$14,852</td>
<td>$579</td>
<td>$45,134</td>
<td>$26,229</td>
<td>$71,364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>000163374</td>
<td>FREEMAN</td>
<td>SUSAN</td>
<td>$11,755</td>
<td>$5,878</td>
<td>$1,389</td>
<td>$19,022</td>
<td>$5,051</td>
<td>$24,073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>000300158</td>
<td>HORLIN</td>
<td>BRUCE</td>
<td>$10,672</td>
<td>$5,336</td>
<td>$1,251</td>
<td>$17,258</td>
<td>$11,799</td>
<td>$29,057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>000300163</td>
<td>HURRLIE</td>
<td>BRENDA</td>
<td>$9,355</td>
<td>$4,678</td>
<td>$1,074</td>
<td>$15,107</td>
<td>$4,891</td>
<td>$19,998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>000163390</td>
<td>KERR</td>
<td>KEITH</td>
<td>$10,005</td>
<td>$5,003</td>
<td>$1,161</td>
<td>$16,169</td>
<td>$4,001</td>
<td>$20,170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>000163377</td>
<td>KIDDE</td>
<td>RICHARD</td>
<td>$11,105</td>
<td>$5,553</td>
<td>$1,296</td>
<td>$17,953</td>
<td>$8,618</td>
<td>$26,571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>000300164</td>
<td>LAUT</td>
<td>WENDY</td>
<td>$9,655</td>
<td>$4,828</td>
<td>$1,114</td>
<td>$15,597</td>
<td>$6,374</td>
<td>$21,971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>000163391</td>
<td>LUNNEY</td>
<td>JAMES</td>
<td>$11,093</td>
<td>$5,646</td>
<td>$216</td>
<td>$16,856</td>
<td>$8,121</td>
<td>$24,977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>000300161</td>
<td>MACTAVISH</td>
<td>JOHN</td>
<td>$9,305</td>
<td>$4,653</td>
<td>$780</td>
<td>$14,738</td>
<td>$4,420</td>
<td>$19,158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>000163378</td>
<td>MCCONNELL</td>
<td>GORDON</td>
<td>$8,955</td>
<td>$4,478</td>
<td>$175</td>
<td>$13,607</td>
<td>$3,016</td>
<td>$16,623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>000163393</td>
<td>MOUSSEAU</td>
<td>SHARON</td>
<td>$10,105</td>
<td>$5,053</td>
<td>$1,175</td>
<td>$16,332</td>
<td>$4,728</td>
<td>$21,060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>000300162</td>
<td>SONNENBURG</td>
<td>EDWARD</td>
<td>$9,655</td>
<td>$4,828</td>
<td>$1,114</td>
<td>$15,597</td>
<td>$8,558</td>
<td>$24,155</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total County Council**

$178,899 | $89,450 | $15,208 | $283,557 | $122,519 | $406,075

| 000163219 | TYSON      | CHRISTOPHER | $1,350 | $675 | $26 | $2,051 | $1,917 | $3,968 |
| 000163380 | STRACHAN   | ROBERT      | $1,600 | $800 | $38 | $2,438 | $1,895 | $4,332 |
| 000300165 | MURPHY     | DAN         | $1,774 | $887 | $35 | $4,489 | $2,905 | $7,394 |

**Total Land Division**

$4,724 | $2,362 | $99 | $7,185 | $6,717 | $13,901

**Grand Total**

$183,623 | $91,812 | $15,307 | $290,741 | $129,235 | $419,977
AMENDMENTS TO PROCEDURAL BY-LAW 2006-43

1. RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended:

THAT, the Procedural By-Law amendments attached as Appendix “A” are here by accepted;

AND THAT, the Clerk is directed to consolidate the changes and prepare the amending by-law for the February 18th, 2009 County Council Meeting.

2. PURPOSE

The purpose of this report is to present the amendment to the Procedural By-Law regarding the Working Group structure and also minor revisions for clarity.

3. BACKGROUND

The Lanark County Procedural By-Law 2006-43 was adopted October 2006. Since its inception changes to procedures have been approved by Council.

In February 2007 County Council approved the suggested amendments to address voting and quorum issues for the Smiths Falls representatives as a specific group of the Community Services and Corporate Service Committees of the Whole; with specific voting rights

- shall be entitled to vote on all matters regarding the specified services contained in Sections 7.5.4.1 and 7.5.4.2
- during the taking a vote, for all matters other than those prescribed, the Smiths Falls representatives shall not be included for the purpose of determining a majority vote or quorum.

On November 26th, 2008 County Council approved by resolution to focus on a Committee of the Whole model for conducting its’ business; and that Council reduce its’ Sub/Steering Committee Structure and move to a Working Group model, where required in an attempt to reduce after hours meetings and avoid staff overtime while still providing council consultation.
Since 2006, reporting procedures from Sub-Committee and Steering Committee to Committee of the Whole have been inconsistent. Action items contained in the minutes of these committees have been received for information rather than being pulled and voted on separately. This as an omission in the process which should be included the procedural by-law.

The Lanark County Procedural By-Law states that “The authority of any Committee of the Whole is limited to the making of recommendations to Council…and all Committee recommendations shall be referred to Council before becoming effective.” Further, in accordance with Section 2.6 “Where procedural matters of Council or Committees of Council are not governed by the Municipal Act, Municipal Conflict of Interest Act or provisions of the By-Law, Robert’s Rules of Order shall apply.” According to Robert’s Rules of Order Committee recommendations whether in the affirmative or negative are to be presented to Council for ratification. Committee motions or recommendations that have not been ratified through a Council motion may be revisited at any time where motions of Council shall only be brought back to the table through the process of a motion to reconsider.

4. DISCUSSION

See Appendix “A” for discussion.

5. ANALYSIS AND OPTIONS

Section 238 (2), of the Municipal Act, 2001, R.S.O., c. 25 as amended, requires that every municipality and local board shall pass a procedure by-law for governing the calling, place and proceedings of meetings.

Should a municipality deem it expedient to change its procedures for governing meetings it is necessary to revise the procedural by-law through an amendment(s).

Council has approved certain changes to their procedures. Staff has identified ambiguity requiring clarification.

6. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

None

7. LOCAL MUNICIPAL IMPACT

8. CONCLUSIONS

The amendments contained in this report define the Working Group structure and procedures, provides the required amendments and clarity to the Procedural By-Law.
9. ATTACHMENTS

APPENDIX “A” – Amendments to Procedural By-Law 2006-43 (changes are in italics)

Prepared and Recommended By: Cathie Ritchie, Clerk

Approved for Submission By: Peter Wagland, Chief Administrative Officer
APPENDIX “A”

7. 5 Committee of the Whole

Section 7.5.4 Separate Town of Smiths Falls

Amend Section 7.5.4.3

The Town of Smiths Falls shall appoint a maximum of two (2) representatives to the Lanark County Community Services Committee and Corporate Services Committee and shall be entitled to vote on all matters regarding the specified services contained in Sections 7.5.4.1 and 5.5.4.2.

Add Section 7.5.4.4

During the taking of a vote, for all matters other than those prescribed, the Smiths Falls representative shall not be included for the purpose of determining a majority vote or quorum.

Definitions

Add:

“Working Group” – includes any group established by Council which has either a continuous existence or which goes out of existence as soon as the specified task is completed. The membership of the group shall be comprised of staff, County Council Members and lay members when necessary. The membership of a working group shall consist of less than 50% County Council and/or Local Board Members (a minimum of 2 members of Council).

Council and Committee Meetings

Add Section:

7.9 Working Group

7.9.1. Every Working Group shall have Terms of Reference recommended by the Striking Committee and approved by Council and shall contain:

i) purpose and mandate
ii) composition (membership)
iii) budget (if applicable)
iv) duration of group and membership

7.9.2. The authority of any Working Group is limited to making recommendations to a Committee of the Whole through staff reports which reflects the direction of the Working Group Members. No decision to take any action other than administrative in nature shall be recognized as emanating from any Working Group.
7.9.3 A Working Group is deemed not to be a committee of Council as defined in the Municipal Act Section 238 and therefore will only be open to the public when considered necessary by the Working Group or County Council to obtain public comment for the benefit of preparing recommendations or completing a mandated activity. Delegations are to be referred to the appropriate Committee of the Whole in accordance with Section 8.4.

7.9.4 Meeting agendas will be prepared by staff and circulated electronically to all Working Group Members no later than 3 days prior to the meeting. Following each meeting a summary of action items and recommendations shall be circulated electronically to all Working Group Members. Action Items or recommendations shall be referred to the respective Committee of the Whole in the form of a Staff Report.

7.9.5 A quorum as defined in the Municipal Act is not required.

7.9.6 Recommendations will be formulated through consensus within the group members.

7.9.7 The Chair of the Working Group shall be selected by its members and shall be limited to a member of council or staff only.

7.9.8 Lay Members as authorized by the Terms of Reference shall be appointed by Council through a recommendation from the Striking Committee.

Delegations and Presentations

Add Section:

8.4.1.13 Delegations’ requesting to appear at a meeting may be declined if one has failed to follow established by-laws, policy, procedures or protocol; or as prescribed in an applicable governing statute and/or regulation.

7.5.1 Committee of the Whole

Amend Section:

7.5.3 The authority of any Committee of the Whole is limited to the making of recommendations to Council. No decision to take any action or do anything other than administrative in nature shall be recognized as emanating from any Committee, and all Committee recommendations shall be referred to Council before becoming effective. All Committee of the Whole motions are considered recommendations whether adopted or defeated and shall be contained in the Committee Report to Council for ratification.
THE COUNTY OF LANARK

CORPORATE SERVICES COMMITTEE
February 11, 2009
Report #C-03-2009 of the
Accessibility Advisory Committee

2008 ACCESSIBILITY PLAN

1. STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended:

“THAT, The 2008 Lanark County Accessibility Plan be approved as a planning document;

AND THAT staff continue to work, in conjunction with members of the Advisory Sub-committee, toward the elimination of barriers to accessibility.”

2. PURPOSE

The County of Lanark is required to publish an annual Accessibility Plan. This report requests Council approval of the Accessibility Plan for 2008.

3. BACKGROUND

The Ontarians with Disabilities Act requires each municipality to approve and publish an annual Accessibility Plan. The plan must look at the barriers that exist in a municipality’s buildings, facilities, programs, practices, services, by-laws and policies. The plan must also report on the steps that the municipality has taken to identify, remove and prevent barriers to people with disabilities.

4. DISCUSSION

The 2008 Accessibility Plan highlights Lanark County Achievements from prior years and goals for future improvements to accessibility.

5. ANALYSIS AND OPTIONS

The County is required to produce an annual Accessibility Plan, in consultation with our Accessibility Advisory Committee.

This Plan includes an assessment of physical accessibility in the Lanark County Administration and Public Works buildings.
6. **FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

Prior year Accessibility budgets included $10,000 for capital expenditures. Only minimal amounts have been spent. In 2008, the Accessibility Advisory Sub-Committee recommended that the 2007 and 2008 capital budget be allocated to repairs to the Round Garden. These funds were not spent in 2008. The intention is to build a reserve for future capital requirements to improve Accessibility. The introduction of further Accessibility standards, have the potential to require extensive investment in capital improvements. Responsibility for this item has been transferred to Public Works in the 2009 budget.

There will be some costs associated with meeting the standards required by the Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act over the next five years. Departmental budgets should include provisions to meet training and implementation requirements for standards which have been developed regarding Customer Service, Transportation and Communication & Information.

Municipalities are required to report on compliance to the Customer Service Standard as of January 1, 2010. The compliance date for Information & Communication is December 31, 2011.

7. **LOCAL MUNICIPAL IMPACT**

Each municipality must complete an annual Accessibility Plan.

8. **CONCLUSIONS**

None

9. **ATTACHMENTS**

1) 2008 Lanark County Accessibility Plan
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Message from Lanark County Accessibility Advisory Sub-Committee (LCAAS)

Accessibility issues affect everyone. Although people with disabilities are the most disadvantaged when accessibility is lacking, improvements in accessibility generate benefits for everyone and make good business sense. The classic example of this is ensuring your facilities are accommodating for people in wheelchairs provides a more welcoming environment for parents with strollers or tourists with wheeled suitcases.

The Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act, 2005 (AODA) mandates full accessibility implementation by 2025. Lanark County encourages a strategic approach to accessibility that will implement accessibility improvements in manageable increments annually, in compliance with accessibility standards.

Major renovations were completed in the Lanark County Administration and Public Works buildings in 2008. The LCAAS was pleased to provide recommendations on physical improvements to the buildings and welcomed the opportunity to participate in the 2008 Open House show casing the renovations. Staff and residents may be proud of the accessible facilities provided in Lanark County.
Feedback

Your comments will help us improve future accessibility plans. Please let us know what you think about Lanark County’s 2008 Accessibility Plan.

You can send in your comments or inquiries in any of the following ways:

E-mail: clerk@county.lanark.on.ca

Mail: The Corporation of the County of Lanark
      Clerk’s Department
      Box 37
      99 Christie Lake Road
      Perth, ON    K7H 3E2

Phone: 1-888-9-LANARK
        (613) 267-4200 ext 1501

Fax:     (613) 267-2964

You can access this Plan at: www.county.lanark.on.ca
Executive Summary

The Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act, 2005 (AODA) provides for the development of standards in order to achieve accessibility for Ontarians with disabilities with respect to goods, services, facilities, accommodation, employment, buildings, structures and premises on or before January 1, 2025. Until full implementation of the AODA is achieved, the Ontarians with Disabilities Act, 2001 (ODA) will continue to apply.

The ODA requires all municipalities in Ontario to prepare an annual accessibility plan which must include a review of all of the municipality’s functions, including its bylaws, programs, procedures, practices, policies, facilities and services. The purpose of the ODA is to improve opportunities for people with disabilities in Ontario through the identification, prevention and removal of all barriers which may prevent full participation in society.

Ontario Regulation 429/07 is the final version of the Customer Service Standard. The County of Lanark will be required to comply fully with the Regulation as of January 1, 2010. Four additional standards are at various stages of completion. Standards will be developed for Transportation, Employment, Built Environment and Information & Communications.

Under the AODA, the role of Municipal Accessibility Advisory Committees will change from advising municipal councils on their annual accessibility plans, to advising councils on their municipality’s compliance with new accessibility standards.

This plan identifies prior year accessibility achievements and future plans to identify, prevent and remove remaining barriers throughout Lanark County.
Did you know?

- Customers with disabilities spend approximately $25 billion every year across Canada.
- Most barriers can be addressed without costly changes.
- There are 1.9 million people in Ontario with disabilities.
- Municipalities will be required to comply fully with the Customer Service Standard Regulation by January 1, 2010.
- A disability is defined in the Ontario Human Rights Code.
- 1 in 3 Canadians either has a disability or is close to someone who does (Envirionics, 2004)
# Lanark County Accessibility Advisory Sub Committee Members

The members of the 2008 Accessibility Advisory Sub-Committee, as appointed by Lanark County Council are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>E-Mail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>James Dewis</td>
<td>45 Julian St, Carleton Place, ON K7C 3W7</td>
<td>613-257-5789</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dewis@rogers.com">dewis@rogers.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(resigned Dec 2008)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dianne McConkey</td>
<td>The Canadian Hearing Society 68 William St.,</td>
<td>613-498-3933</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dmconkey@chs.ca">dmconkey@chs.ca</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Suite 205 Brockville, ON K6V 4V5</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:diannemcc@sympatico.ca">diannemcc@sympatico.ca</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martha Read</td>
<td>9 McLean Blvd, Perth, ON K7H 2Z2</td>
<td>613-326-0251</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debbie Bonselaar</td>
<td>229 Robert Run, Perth, ON K7H 3C7</td>
<td>613267-5909</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dbonselaar@developmentalservices.com">dbonselaar@developmentalservices.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Costello</td>
<td>352 High St., Carleton Place, ON K7C 1X1</td>
<td>613-257-2978</td>
<td><a href="mailto:wbriancostello@sympatico.ca">wbriancostello@sympatico.ca</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(resigned Dec 2008)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deborah Bowes</td>
<td>16 Herriott St, Apt # 7, Perth, ON K7H 1T1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharon Lee</td>
<td>346 Norris Rd., RR # 4, Perth, ON K7H 3C6</td>
<td>613-264-8888</td>
<td><a href="mailto:leesha@lao.on.ca">leesha@lao.on.ca</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ext 225</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruce Horlin</td>
<td>629 Peters Point Road, White Lake, ON K0A 3L0</td>
<td>613-623-8830</td>
<td><a href="mailto:b_horlin@sympatico.ca">b_horlin@sympatico.ca</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(chair)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Members 2009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim Richard</td>
<td>24 B D'Arcy Street, Perth, ON K7H 2V1</td>
<td>613-267-5610</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Allan</td>
<td>RR#6, Perth, ON K7H 3C8</td>
<td>613-326-0573</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rcallan@storm.ca">rcallan@storm.ca</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What is a Disability?

The Ontarians with Disabilities Act, 2001 (ODA) uses the Ontario Human Rights Code definition of a disability.

A disability is:

a) any degree of physical disability, infirmity, malformation or disfigurement caused by bodily injury, birth defect or illness and includes, but is not limited to:

- diabetes mellitus
- epilepsy
- brain injury
- any degree of paralysis
- amputation
- lack of physical co-ordination
- blindness or visual impediment
- deafness or hearing impediment
- muteness or speech impediment or
- physical reliance on a guide dog or other animal, or on a wheelchair or other remedial appliance or device

b) a condition of mental impairment or a developmental disability
c) a learning disability, or a dysfunction in one or more of the processes involved in understanding or using symbols or spoken language
d) a mental disorder or
e) an injury or disability for which benefits were claimed or received under the insurance plan established under the Workplace Safety and Insurance Act, 1997.
What is a Barrier?

The ODA defines a “barrier” as anything that stops a person with a disability from fully taking part in society because of that disability. Some barriers include:

- physical barriers, e.g. a step at the entrance to a store;
- architectural barriers, e.g. no elevators in a building of more than one floor;
- information or communications barriers e.g. a publication that is not available in large print;
- attitudinal barriers, e.g. assuming people with a disability can’t perform a certain task when in fact they can;
- technological barriers such as traffic lights that change too quickly before a person with a disability has time to get through the intersection; and
- barriers created by policies or practices, for instance not offering different ways to complete a test as part of job hiring.
The Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act, 2005 (AODA)

The goal of the AODA is to ensure that all Ontarians with disabilities have full access to goods, services, facilities, accommodation, employment, building structures and premises by January 1, 2025. This goal will be achieved through the development, implementation and enforcement of provincially set accessibility standards in five specific areas:

- Customer Service
- Transportation
- Information & Communication
- Built environment
- Employment

Standard Development Committees have been appointed by the Provincial government and standards have been developed for Customer Service, Transportation, and Information Communications. Implementation of all standards will be complete by January 1, 2025.

The AODA will eventually replace the current ODA. However, there will be a transition period where municipalities will continue to have obligations under the ODA, 2001 while the AODA is phased in. Lanark County must meet the challenge of implementing both Acts simultaneously until the ODA is replaced.
Accessibility Standard for Customer Service

Ontario Regulation 429/07 requires municipal compliance to the Customer Service Standard by January 1, 2010. Lanark County will be required to:

1. Establish policies, practices and procedures about how services are provided to persons with disabilities;
2. Provide training to all staff who deal with members of the public about the provincial accessibility legislation and regulations, and how to deliver accessible services (communication, assistance for people using service animals, technical devices or support persons);
3. Provide training to all staff involved in policy development;
4. Ensure policies and practices do not impede supports provided to individuals by their service animals and personal support staff;
5. Provide notice of temporary disruption of services;
6. Provide a way for people to give feedback about the accessibility of services; and
7. Prepare and make available documents about how these standards are met.
Municipal Highlight

Lanark County is a mainly rural municipality with a population slightly over 60,000. It is located adjacent to the City of Ottawa, the Counties of Renfrew, Frontenac, and Leeds & Grenville.

The population is primarily English speaking, with approximately 5% of the population whose first language differs from English.

The County of Lanark and its constituent municipalities maintain a two tier governance structure. Eight municipalities together comprise the County of Lanark with the main commercial centres being the Towns of Carleton Place, Perth, and Almonte. The population distribution as of the 2001 and 2006 census is shown in the following chart:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Population In 2001</th>
<th>Population In 2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>County Of Lanark</td>
<td>62,495</td>
<td>63,785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tay Valley</td>
<td>5,440</td>
<td>5,634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beckwith</td>
<td>6,046</td>
<td>6,387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carleton Place</td>
<td>9,083</td>
<td>9,453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drummond/North Elmsley</td>
<td>6,670</td>
<td>7,118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lanark Highlands</td>
<td>4,795</td>
<td>5,180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi Mills</td>
<td>11,647</td>
<td>11,734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montague Twp</td>
<td>3,671</td>
<td>3,595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perth</td>
<td>6,003</td>
<td>5,907</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Departmental Organization

The Corporation of the County of Lanark is organized in the following divisions:

- Lanark Lodge
- Administration/Tourism/Planning
- Public Works
- Finance
- Social Services
- Information Technology
- Human Resources
- Emergency Services

The County is also responsible for a number of legislated programs and discretionary services that are provided through service contracts/purchase of service. These include:

- Ambulance
- Forestry
- Public Health
- Economic Development

Lanark County is also responsible for the provision of some services on behalf of the separated Town of Smiths Falls.

A listing of County facilities is included as Appendix 12.4
Strategic Plan

Lanark County's long term strategic plan, Vision 2025, provides the foundation for many important corporate initiatives. Beginning in the fall of 2003, residents and community leaders from across Lanark County were asked to envision what our community could look and be like in twenty or so years. One of the results of this undertaking was the development of a vision statement for Lanark County.

*Lanark County is proud of its heritage and cherishes its small-town character, rural way of life, sense of community and distinctive natural features. We want to strengthen and diversify the economy, effectively manage growth, protect the environment, preserve our heritage and maintain our unique character for future generations.*

Vision 2025. What the Future May Hold, published in 2006, includes this paragraph;

"Adequate accessibility to and within all facilities and transportation services for persons of all ages with disabilities has long been a priority in Lanark County."

Complying with the specific requirements of the ODA through the development and implementation of annual accessibility plans further supports the goals set out in Vision 2025.

---
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Lanark County Accessibility Advisory Sub-Committee Goals

1. The primary goal for 2008 is to increase awareness of accessibility issues throughout Lanark County. This will be accomplished through the use of a number of mechanisms. The Accessibility Advisory Sub-Committee has authored a brochure, providing information on the Sub Committee and the issues it deals with. This brochure will be distributed throughout Lanark County. Access Awareness Week is celebrated May 26 – June 1, 2008. The Accessibility Advisory Committee will use the opportunity to raise the profile of accessibility issues in Lanark County. An opportunity exists to highlight the 2007 improvements to accessibility during the 25th Anniversary celebrations in the Lanark County Administration building.

2. Increased Training on accessibility issues is another goal for 2008. With the implementation of Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act (AODA) standards beginning in 2008, the Accessibility Advisory Sub-committee will participate in, and encourage participation in, Customer Service Training. The AODA includes provision for the establishment of standards in five areas, Customer Service, Transportation, Communication/Information, Built Environment, Employment and. As standards and requirements are finalized in these areas, The Lanark County Accessibility Advisory Sub-committee will review training requirements.

3. The third goal for 2008 is to increase input on accessibility issues in Lanark County policies and procedures. The AODA regulation on Accessible Customer Service includes requirements for written policies and procedures on this topic.
Accessibility Achievements

The Corporation of the County of Lanark is proud to have implemented a number of initiatives to eliminate barriers and to make our Community more accessible to all residents, visitors and employees. The following highlights our most significant achievements.

LCAAS Achievements

2003

- Established the Lanark County Accessibility Advisory Sub-Committee
- Advised Lanark County Council on the development of its annual accessibility plan
- Represented the LC AAS at the International Ploughing Match. Shared an Information Booth with representatives from the Carleton Place Accessibility Advisory Committee (CP AAC), Carleton Place Manor and the War Amps

2004

- Advised Lanark County Council on the preparation, implementation, and effectiveness of its annual accessibility plan
- Developed and produced Lanark County (LC) Accessibility Guideline
- Distributed copies of LC Accessibility Guideline to all local municipalities in Lanark County

2005

- Advised Lanark County Council on the preparation, implementation and effectiveness of its annual accessibility plan
- Developed sixty-four Recommendations for inclusion in the Space Optimization Study that was conducted in the Lanark County Administration and Public Works Buildings

Conducted physical inspections of:

- Perth & Smiths Falls District Hospital: Perth Site
- Lanark Lodge
- Montague Township Offices and
- Rosedale Hall

- Hosted a public education event, "Doorways to Abilities" in Perth
2006

- Advised Lanark County Council on the preparation, implementation and effectiveness of its annual accessibility plan
- The Chair of the LC AAS sat as an Accessibility Advisor on the County of Lanark Building Renovations Project
- Conducted physical inspections of:
  - Tay Valley Community Halls
  - Tay Valley Township Offices
- Hosted an Awareness Day on “Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder” at the Lanark County Administration Building

2007

- Advised Lanark County Council on the preparation, implementation and effectiveness of its annual accessibility plan
- The Past Chair of the LC AAS sat as an Accessibility Advisor on the County of Lanark Building Renovations Project
- Met with Lanark County staff to discuss the County Building Renovations Project
- Director of Public Works, Steve Allan, conducted a tour of the renovated buildings with members of the Sub-Committee
- Consulted with Lanark County staff and Chair of Round Garden Inc. in regard to making the Round Garden accessible for people with disabilities
- Developed promotion materials: brochure
- Reviewed County policies
- Hosted a Joint Accessibility Planning Meeting with members of the Carleton Place and Mississippi Mills Accessibility Advisory Committees and staff from the local municipalities
2008

- Advised Lanark County Council on the preparation, implementation and effectiveness of its annual accessibility plan
- Consulted with Lanark County staff and Chair of Round Garden Inc. in regard to making the Round Garden accessible for people with disabilities
- Developed and distributed a brochure to publicize the Lanark County Accessibility Advisory Sub-Committee
- Participated in Lanark County Administration Building Re-opening ceremonies
- Participated in AMCTO training re Accessibility Standards for Customer Service
- Distributed Access Awareness Week posters
- Conducted building audits for accessibility issues of the Lanark County Administration and Public Works buildings
- Agreed to provide advice to Carleton Place/Mississippi Mills Rotary Club re building an accessible playground
- Provided staff training on use of Assistive Listening Device “PockeTalker”
- Conducted building audits of Lanark Highlands Municipal facilities
- The past Chair of the LC AAS sat as an Accessibility Advisor on the County of Lanark Building Renovations Project
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Departmental Accessibility Plans

A short description of the function of each department follows, including notable initiatives or barriers identified within the department.

CAO’s Office

The Chief Administrative Officer (CAO) ensures the programs and services in Lanark County are delivered in accordance with Council approved policy and in a professional, effective, efficient and customer-oriented manner. The CAO is responsible for motivating and developing skills of department heads and their staff to foster productivity, professionalism and high morale. The CAO has general control and manages the administration of the government and affairs of the corporation. The CAO’s office reports to the Corporate Services Committee of Lanark County Council.

The CAO’s office oversees the efficient operation of the corporation. The CAO presents reports and information regarding program progress and accomplishments, chairs and convenes meetings to facilitate policy development and provides resource information for Council. The CAO directs collective bargaining of employment contracts for all Municipal employees.
Clerk's Office

The Clerk’s Office is responsible for statutory and regulatory functions as well as provision of services to the public, Council and other County departments. It also oversees the administration of special projects, reception, customer services and the main administration building. The Clerk’s office supports the governance functions of the County of Lanark by preparing and maintaining agendas, minutes, reports and correspondence. It responds to Council, staff and public information requests in a timely manner in the area of corporate records management and freedom of information/protection of privacy matters, and it handles media relations, including media releases and interviews.

Corporate Services also fall within the realm of the Clerk’s Office, including the management of the corporations’ administrative requirements. The Clerk issues auctioneers’ licenses; handles relations between municipal, provincial and federal governments; and distributes information such as reports, external bulletins, items of general interest and material related to cross-departmental issues.

2008 Goals for the Clerks office include:

1. The development of a consolidated book of County Policies and Procedures (New Policy Manual);

2. Development of a Revised Records Retention By-Law and compilation of a comprehensive inventory of documents;

3. Facilitation of Customer Service Standards Training throughout all departments by communicating the availability of training opportunities;

4. Organizing ceremonies to commemorate the 25th Anniversary of the Lanark County Administration Building and showcasing the 2007 renovations to improve accessibility;

5. Increasing access to public documents through the Lanark County website.
Finance

The mandate of the Finance Department is to provide financial information, advice and planning to County Council, management, staff and the public and ensure the requirements of the Municipal Act and provincial programs are met in the context of financial management and tax policies. It manages all financial resources with prudence and probity and monitors and analyses financial performance of departments and the County as a whole.

The department strives to develop short and long term financial blueprints that support the strategic directions of Council, protect the County’s financial position and minimize the risk to the taxpayer. It has established fair financial and business practices and policies that promote accountability and controllership, and works to identify and mitigate areas of financial risk to the corporation. The Finance Department is responsible for treasury, insurance and risk management, as well as financial services such as records, payroll, accounts payable and accounts receivable. Staff analyzes tax ratios, capping tools and legislation and make recommendations to County Council on tax policy. The department coordinates and presents the annual budget process. The department provides materials management and procurement advice to other departments.

2008 Goals for the Finance Department include:

1. Deliver refresher Great Plains/Dynamics training to staff

2. Improve Great Plains/Dynamics data sharing capabilities by ensuring relevant data and reports are available to all departments.
**Information Technology**

The mandate of the Information Technology (IT) department is to ensure the corporation has the information technology resources and direction to deliver its programs to the public in the most efficient, effective manner. The IT department is a corporate service available for advice and training to all County staff, councillors and participating local municipalities.

Partnerships with local municipalities are important to the department in order to promote coordinated approaches to information technology throughout the County. The Department also develops standards and policies for systems and resources and their use; provides project management expertise for various information technology projects (including Geographic Information System) develops database applications and reports to meet the information needs of staff, management, Council and the public and keeps abreast of technology trends and recommends changes and upgrades to programs and services as appropriate.

**2008 Goals for the Information Technology Department include:**

1. Enhancement of Geographic Information System for use by all local municipalities

2. Oversee the implementation of a telephone system upgrade in Lanark County Administration Building to ensure a user friendly voicemail system

3. Implementation of a Help Desk for computer users

4. Provide IT training across various departments

5. Upgrade computer workstations for Social Services department.
**Human Resources**

Human resources staff oversees the policies affecting all County of Lanark employees. They administer such responsibilities as labour relations, benefits and pensions, corporate training, recruiting and selections and employee records. The department also oversees special events and workshops and coordinates such activities as service awards for employees.

The Human Resources/Employee Services Department strives to create and maintain professional, skilled, talented and accountable people resources. They also foster a safe, healthy and attractive workplace, which promotes high staff morale and productivity.

**The 2008 Goals of the Human Resources Department include:**

1. Producing Human Resources policies and procedures that are current and compliant through the abolishment of the Non Union Employment By-Law and development of a series of policies and procedures
2. Facilitating a Non-Union group and Council Compensation Management Review;
3. Development of Health and Safety policies and procedures that are current and compliant
4. Reviewing Human Resources programs to ensure they meet or exceed Lanark Lodge accreditation requirements
Planning

At the County level planning is limited to approvals of delegated matters concerning land subdivision, in its various forms, as provided under the province's Planning Act. Administrative procedures have been developed by staff from the County and local municipalities concerned with the delivery of planning approvals.

The County relies on two consulting firms for advice regarding plans of subdivision. The consultants will review submissions and advise of the requirements for information and studies that are then relayed to the municipalities. The constituent municipalities undertake the bulk of planning activities in the form of preparing new official plans; new comprehensive zoning by-laws and they are administering committee of adjustment variance and related functions, official plan amendments, zoning by-law amendments and site plan approvals.

The County has been delegated authority to administer the following functions:

- consents
- subdivision
- Part lot control by-laws
- Condominium plans

The planning department is located in the County Administration Building. Client traffic is moderate.
Tourism

The focus of the Tourism Manager is to create partnerships, generate awareness, act as a resource and partner with local municipalities in promoting tourism product, as a means to increase visitation and length of stay in the County of Lanark. There is a strong affiliation between the County of Lanark and the Lanark County Tourism Association. Together, they develop promotional materials, generate interest and distribute information about the area. They strive to foster an environment that responds to the needs of our visitors.

The major 2009 goals of the Tourism department are:

1. To distribute the Tourism Guide & Map to provide travel information and tour ideas to potential visitors
2. To heighten the profile of Lanark County in the marketplace using recent partnerships and advertising
3. To increase presence with the travel media by providing story ideas and familiarization tours
4. To attend consumer shows to create awareness about Lanark County as a Tourism destination
5. To inspire community pride and promote new tour product through the promotion of “7 Wonders of Lanark County”
6. To create awareness of agricultural tourism and culinary tourism through a network of local food producers, retailers and restaurateurs

The Tourism department is located on the main level of the county Administration Building.

The Seven Wonders Maple Fest
Perth's Garlic Festival
Emergency Services

Lanark County has a number of emergency services responsibilities. Recognizing the numerous complexities; the activities of various individuals, groups and organizations have become the responsibility of one sub-committee. The Emergency Services Sub-Committee will advise the Lanark County Council on issues relating to emergency services.

Emergency Services of the County of Lanark include:

- Fire Dispatch Services
- 911 Central Emergency Reporting Bureau (CERB)
- Rescue Services
- Ambulance Services
- Emergency Planning
- Emergency Preparedness
- Fire Safety Planning

The Emergency Services Sub-Committee advises Council on matters relating to emergency services provided for the benefit of the residents of Lanark County. The Sub-Committee directly reports to the Corporate Services Committee of Lanark County Council.
Social Services

The Social Services department provides a diverse range of Community & Human Services and is organized into four divisions: Ontario Works, Children's Services, Adult Protective Services and Social Housing.

Ontario Works provides financial aid and employment services to approximately 1,000 families in Lanark County and the Town of Smiths Falls.

Client interviews are conducted in the County Administration building and in rented office space in the Towns of Carleton Place and Smiths Falls.

Staff has identified a physical barrier in the Carleton Place sub office, in that it is not wheelchair accessible. Alternate arrangements can be made for staff to meet with clients in their home, if they are aware of the need for this accommodation. Staff can also arrange to meet clients in more accessible community space, such as the Town Hall, Library or Arena.

Communication issues include the need for “PockeTalker” assistive listening devices for the Smiths Falls and Carleton Place sub offices. Should clients encounter difficulty in reading any documents or forms, they can be made available in larger print.
### Barriers Planning/Evaluation Form-Ontario Works

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What barrier was identified?</th>
<th>What type of barrier was it?</th>
<th>What will be gained by removing or preventing this barrier?</th>
<th>Means to prevent/remove the barrier?</th>
<th>Indicators of Success?</th>
<th>Timing (when will change happen)?</th>
<th>Resources Required (human or financial)</th>
<th>Division/Department Responsible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Architectural</td>
<td>Physical</td>
<td>Accessibility</td>
<td>Home visit/Alt location</td>
<td>Clients having their needs met</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>Appropriate questions asked at intake</td>
<td>Social Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication SF/CP sub offices</td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Accessibility</td>
<td>Pocket Talkers</td>
<td>Client awareness/Accessing services</td>
<td>2009 budget</td>
<td>Financial</td>
<td>Social Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudinal-we can always learn more about providing services to those clients Accessibility</td>
<td>Attitudinal</td>
<td>Better Understanding</td>
<td>Enhance skill set by providing training</td>
<td>Worker Awareness</td>
<td>SAIL training province wide discrimination and disability awareness training (April 2009)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Social Services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1. Indicate where the barrier was found. For example, was it in a program, service, by-law, policy, or facility
2. I.e. was it a physical, architectural, informational, communicational, attitudinal, technological, policy/practice
3. Indicate what type(s) of disability will be addressed
4. Describe what action will be taken to remove and/or prevent the barrier
5. Indicate how customer service will be improved by removing or preventing this barrier? Also indicate any other measure(s) that will be used to determine whether or not your Department was successful in removing or preventing this barrier
6. The timing for addressing a barrier does not necessarily have to be set within the 15-month period. The nature of the action may be phased in over a number of months or years depending on the resources and priorities of your Department.
7. Indicate if this activity will be completed within existing resources or if new resources will be required. Quantify the human/financial costs.
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The Child Care Division is the Service Manager for wage subsidy, special needs resource program and fee subsidy. They are also responsible for the management and administration of the National Child Benefit Reinvestment Program. The Department is also responsible for the Management of the Best Start Initiative which started in 2005 and is currently in phase 2 of this initiative.

It is the goal of the County to provide access to quality affordable, accessible childcare. The daycare programs who serve children with special needs, some of whom are building new facilities or renovating/retrofitting facilities are incorporating accessibility into their sites, including such features as:

- Accessible washrooms
- Accessible front entrances
- Interior designs to support visually impaired children (wall textures, colours)
- Playground equipment for children in wheelchairs and textures on wall mounts for outdoor play
- Visual fire alarms (flashing lights)

The staff of the Adult Protective Services division support individuals with developmental handicaps to live valued and integrated lives. They advocate on behalf of individuals and teach practical skills.

Client services are delivered in the County Administration Building (basement level) and in rented sub offices in the towns of Smiths Falls, Carleton Place and Almonte.

The Social Housing department coordinates the provision of affordable housing to low and moderate-income residents of Lanark County and the Town of Smiths Falls. Funding is provided to six non-profit housing corporations.
Public Works

The Public Works department is responsible for overseeing road and bridge maintenance and construction, facilities, fleet and equipment. Staff complete needs studies and long term transportation plans to support and develop the capital program, then recommend plan and undertake the rehabilitation reconstruction and replacement of County roads and bridges to meet the system adequacy objectives of Council. The department receives, investigates and responds to numerous inquiries and requests from the public. It also plans, conducts and oversees environmental assessments and public involvement centres as required, and is currently developing, implementing and maintaining an asset management system with a Geographic Information System component.

The public works fleet includes approximately 30 vehicles including light and heavy trucks, heavy equipment trailers and various tools and equipment. The department manages more than 20,000 square feet of facilities. There are ten signalized intersections and 6,000 regulatory, warning or directional signs throughout the County highway system. The County road network consists of 567 two-lane kilometres of roads.

Lanark County is undertaking a network analysis and Transportation Master Plan study examining problems, opportunities and alternative solutions for the transportation network in Lanark over the next 20 years. Lanark County’s Strategic Plan and Vision provides a foundation for the study.

The County of Lanark and the Town of Mississippi constructed a roundabout at the intersection of County Road s 49 and 17.
Lanark Lodge

Lanark Lodge is a municipal Long-Term Care Home owned and operated by the County of Lanark that offers 163 beds providing 24 hour nursing and personal care services, accommodations, meals, as well as a variety of social and recreational activities. It is a regulated health care program governed by the Homes for the Aged and Rest Homes Act (Ministry of Health and Long Term Care, Government of Ontario) and is subject to the standards set out in the Ministry of Health and Long-Term Care Facilities Program Manual. The home is fully accredited by the Canadian Council on Health Services and is an active member of the Ontario Association of Non-Profit Homes and Services for Seniors.

Lanark Lodge completed a comprehensive multi-year Strategic Plan for Long-Term Care in 2005 which was reviewed and approved by County Council. Lanark Lodge has an annual working strategic plan with set goals and objectives. Regular updates are provided to County Council appointed sub-committee who works with management on the implementation of the plan.

TOGETHER:

T-True To Our Mission

O-Opportunities to Lead and Exceed

G-Growing With The Community

E-Excellence, Innovation, Integrity

T-Team Strength, Trust and Pride

H-Home-Comfort, Compassion, Laughter

E- Enthusiastic About Making A Difference

R-Responsible and Accountable
Recommendations/Response to Identified Barriers

The elimination of barriers to accessibility was a major consideration throughout the design and the renovation of the Lanark County Administration & Public Works Buildings. The Lanark County Accessibility Advisory Sub-Committee, the Project Design Team, County staff, Construction Manager and Contractors worked hard to create a barrier free environment for the public and the aim was achieved. Some of the accessibility improvements are listed below:

**Exterior**
- Curb cuts at main entrance
- Automatic door openers
- Accessible building signs
- Wheelchair ramp (Public Works Building)
- Additional disabled parking spaces
- Standby generator to maintain power to both buildings, including elevator

**Interior**
- Wheelchair access to Main Reception counter
- Barrier free washrooms
- Barrier free showers
- Overhead lighting improvements
- High visibility signage with Braille Text
- Barrier free water fountain
- Barrier free elevator
- Light switches relocated for access from wheelchairs
- Visual smoke detectors
- Wider doorways for wheelchair access
- Corridors widened and railing installed on lower level
- Security cameras at all access points with central monitoring
- Use of "green" cleaning products
On April 7, 2008 members of the Lanark County Accessibility Advisory Sub Committee conducted an audit of the Lanark County Administration and Public Works Buildings. The inspection report follows:

Lanark County Administration Building

1. **Entrance-Front**

   Barrier Free Path of Travel (BFPT) to front entrance includes appropriate curb cuts, signage and level walking surface. Entrance is easy to find and equipped with automatic door openers. No tripping hazards identified. Reception desk is prominently located near the entrance.

2. **Stairwell**

   Suitable graspable handrails available. Contrasting colour & tactile surfaces used at elevation changes

3. **Lobby-Reception Desk**

   Lowered counter available with adequate space for manoeuvring wheelchairs or stroller and adequate well under counter. Good lighting & signage. No TTY service available

   Recommendation – Communication device ("PockeTalker") and TTY should be available.

4. **Council Chambers**

   Variety of seating available. Communication aids available. Good lighting and signage.

   Recommendations-
   a) remove obstacle (lip) from ramp to dais
   b) widen gap between wardens/clerks desks to allow wheelchair passage
   c) develop equivalent presentation area to be available to presenters unable to use podium

5. **Clerk’s Department**

   Generally all plugs and light switches are well located

   **Deficiencies – some doorways to offices too narrow.**
6. **HR Office**

   Deficiencies – lip at doorway creates unacceptable transition, choice of transition moulding creates tripping hazard.

7. **Employee Entrance**

   Automatic door openers installed. Good BFPT from accessible parking.

   Deficiencies – alarm keypad located too high.

8. **Washrooms**

   Visual smoke detectors installed.

   Deficiencies - Downstairs – door closes too fast in men’s washroom. Shower stalls not wheelchair accessible, folding bench can’t be opened or closed by persons with disability.

   Recommendations – install highboy toilets. Install handle on inside of cubicle door to assist in opening/closing door. Ensure garbage can placement does not interfere with wheelchair access. Adjust door closure speed. Adjust or lubricate shower benches.

9. **Lunchroom**

   Wheelchair does not fit in door.

   Recommendations – install 90 degree swing-away hinges to allow full opening of door.

10. **Social Services Interview/Waiting Rooms**

    Reception area appropriate level for persons using mobility devices. Interview room accessible.

11. **Hallways Lower Level**

    Graspable handrail available on one side of wall in downstairs hallway. Seating available at various locations.
Public Works Building

No access to basement level for persons in wheelchairs. Only one accessible washroom in building, toilet is too low in that washroom.

1. **Outside Ramp**

   Handrail has hazardous end. No signage to indicate that ramp is available.

   **Recommendations** – post signs to indicate location of wheelchair accessible ramp. Bend under 180 degrees end of handrails to alleviate snagging issues.

2. **Washrooms**

   Accessible washroom signage on washrooms which are not accessible.

   **Recommendations** – post signs to indicate location of alternate accessible washrooms. Install highboy toilet in accessible washroom (main lobby).

3. **Stairs**

   May be hazardous for persons with poor vision.

   **Recommendations** – stair edge should be marked in clearly contrasting colour.
Monitoring Progress

Evaluation is an ongoing process to monitor and track the accessibility planning progress. Comment Forms and Surveys will be circulated to provide some input regarding improvements to Accessibility, both accomplished and requested.

2009 Accessibility Plan

Planning for accessibility will be incorporated into the annual strategic planning completed by every County Department. Results of departmental planning (budgeting & resources) will be forwarded to the Lanark County Accessibility Advisory Sub Committee for inclusion in the 2009 Accessibility Plan.
APPENDIX

12.1 County Councillors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>MUNICIPALITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R. Kidd</td>
<td>Beckwith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Mousseau</td>
<td>Beckwith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Dulmage</td>
<td>Carleton Place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Sonnenburg</td>
<td>Carleton Place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Churchill</td>
<td>Drummond/N. Elmsley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. McConnell</td>
<td>Drummond/N. Elmsley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Fletcher</td>
<td>Lanark Highlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Hortin</td>
<td>Lanark Highlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Lunney</td>
<td>Mississippi Mills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Hurtle</td>
<td>Mississippi Mills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Mactavish</td>
<td>Montague</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Dopson</td>
<td>Montague</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Laut</td>
<td>Perth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Fennick</td>
<td>Perth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. Kerr</td>
<td>Tay Valley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Freeman</td>
<td>Tay Valley</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 12.2 2008 Executive Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peter Wagland</td>
<td>CAO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cathie Ritchie</td>
<td>Clerk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurt Greaves</td>
<td>Treasurer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa Crosbie-Larmon</td>
<td>Director of Human Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy Green</td>
<td>Director of Social Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam Law</td>
<td>Director of Information Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Allan</td>
<td>Director of Public Works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deborah Pidgeon</td>
<td>Director of Lanark Lodge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Truelove</td>
<td>Executive Assistant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 12.3 Barriers Planning/Evaluation Form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What barrier was identified?</th>
<th>What type of barrier was it?</th>
<th>What will be gained by removing or preventing this barrier</th>
<th>Means to prevent/remove the barrier</th>
<th>Indicators of Success</th>
<th>Timing (when will change happen)</th>
<th>Resources Required (human or financial)</th>
<th>Division/Department Responsible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Indicate where the barrier was found. For example, was it in a program, service, by-law, policy, practice, or facility.
2. I.e. was it a physical, architectural, informational, communicational, attitudinal, technological, policy/practice
3. Indicate what type(s) of disability will be addressed
4. Describe what action will be taken to remove and/or prevent the barrier
5. Indicate how customer service will be improved by removing or preventing this barrier? Also indicate any other measure(s) that will be used to determine whether or not your Department was successful in removing and/or preventing this barrier.
6. The timing for addressing a barrier does not necessarily have to be set within the 15-month period. The nature of the action may be phased in over a number of months or years depending on the resources and priorities of your Department.
7. Indicate if this activity will be completed within existing resources or if new resources will be required. Quantify the human/financial costs.

---
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### 12.4 County Facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>OWN/RENT</th>
<th>CONTACT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administration Building</td>
<td>99 Christie Lake Rd</td>
<td>Own</td>
<td>Jonathan Allen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perth, ON K7H 3E2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Works Building</td>
<td>99 Christie Lake Rd</td>
<td>Own</td>
<td>Jonathan Allen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perth, ON K7H 3E2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lanark Lodge</td>
<td>RR 4</td>
<td>Own</td>
<td>Bob Brady</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perth, ON K7H 3C6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Works Garage (Perth)</td>
<td>110 Wilson St W</td>
<td>Own</td>
<td>Jonathan Allen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perth, ON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Works Garage (Almonte)</td>
<td>4752 County Rd 29N</td>
<td>Own</td>
<td>Jonathan Allen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RR 3 Almonte K0A 1A0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McDonald's Corners Gravel Pit</td>
<td>4705 McDonalds Corners Rd</td>
<td>Own</td>
<td>Jonathan Allen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 N Waste Site</td>
<td></td>
<td>Own</td>
<td>Jonathan Allen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dalhousie Gravel Pit 1</td>
<td>Lot 3 Con 6 Dalhousie</td>
<td>Own</td>
<td>Jonathan Allen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darling Gravel Pit 2</td>
<td>Lot 8 Con 7 Darling</td>
<td>Own</td>
<td>Jonathan Allen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ontario Works Sub Office</td>
<td>92 Bridge Street</td>
<td>Rent</td>
<td>Jonathan Allen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carleton Place</td>
<td>Carleton Place, ON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ontario Works Sub Office</td>
<td>52 Abbott St. N</td>
<td>Rent</td>
<td>Jonathan Allen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smiths Falls</td>
<td>Smiths Falls, ON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APS Sub Office Almonte</td>
<td>154 Bridge Street</td>
<td>Rent</td>
<td>Jonathan Allen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Almonte, ON K0A 1A0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
12.5 Glossary of Terms and Definitions

Barrier:
Anything that prevents a person with a disability from fully participating in all aspects of society because of his or her disability, including a physical barrier, an architectural barrier, an informational or communications barrier, an attitudinal barrier, a technological barrier, a policy or a practice (obstacle).

Barrier Identification Process:
Any process or methodology used to determine what barriers exist, where barriers exist and other information. Examples of a barrier identification process may include surveys, audits or customer feedback.

Disability:

Means,
(a) Any degree of physical disability, infirmity, malformation or disfigurement that is caused by bodily injury, birth defect or illness, and without limiting the generality of the foregoing, includes diabetes mellitus, epilepsy, a brain injury, any degree of paralysis, amputation, lack of physical coordination, blindness or visual impediment, deafness or hearing impediment, muteness or speech impediment, or physical reliance on a guide dog or another animal or on a wheelchair or other remedial appliance or device,
(b) A condition of mental impairment or a developmental disability,
(c) A learning disability, or a dysfunction in one or more of the processes involved in understanding or using symbols or spoken language,
(d) A mental disorder, or
(e) An injury or disability for which benefits were claimed or received under the insurance plan established under the Workplace Safety and Insurance Act, 1997; (handicap)

Types of Disability and Functional Limitations
A person’s disability may make it physically or cognitively hard to perform everyday tasks. Listed below are different kinds of disabilities and the effects of these limitations on an individual’s ability to perform everyday tasks.

Physical

Physical disabilities include minor difficulties moving or coordinating a part of the body, muscle weakness, tremors and in extreme cases, paralysis in one or more parts of the body. Physical disabilities can be congenital, such as Muscular Dystrophy; or acquired, such as tendonitis.
Physical disabilities affect an individual’s ability to:

- Perform manual tasks, such as hold a pen, grip and turn a key, type on a keyboard, click a mouse button, and twist a doorknob
- Control the speed of one’s movements
- Coordinate one’s movements
- Move rapidly
- Experience balance and orientation
- Move one’s arms or legs fully, e.g., climb stairs
- Move around independently, e.g., walk any distance, easily get into or out of a car, stand for an extended period
- Have strength or endurance

Sensory

Hearing

Hearing loss includes problems distinguishing certain frequencies, sounds or words, ringing in the ears and total (profound) deafness. A person who is deaf, deafened or hard-of-hearing may not be able to use a public telephone, understand speech in noisy environments, or pronounce words clearly enough to be understood by strangers.

Speech

Speech disability is a partial or total loss of ability to speak. Typical voice disorders include problems with:

- Pronunciation
- Pitch and loudness
- Hoarseness or breathiness
- Stuttering or slurring

Vision

Vision disabilities range from slightly reduced visual acuity to total blindness. A person with reduced visual acuity may have trouble reading street signs, recognizing faces, or judging distances. They might find it difficult to manoeuvre, especially in an unfamiliar place. He or she may have a very narrow field of vision, be unable to differentiate colours, have difficulties navigating or seeing at night, or require bright lights to read. Most people who are legally blind have some vision.
Deaf-blind

Deaf-blindness is a combination of hearing and vision loss. It results in significant difficulties accessing information and performing activities of daily living. Deaf-blind disabilities interfere with communication, learning, orientation, and mobility.

Smell

Smell disability is the inability to sense, or a hypersensitivity to, odours and smells. A person with a smelling disability may have allergies to certain odours, scents or chemicals or may be unable to identify dangerous gases, smoke, fumes and spoiled food.

Taste

Taste disability limits the ability to experience the four primary taste sensations: sweetness, bitterness, saltiness, and sourness. A person with a taste disability may be unable to identify ingredients in food, spoiled food, or noxious substances.

Touch

Touch disability alters the ability to sense surfaces and their texture or quality, including temperature, vibration and pressure. Touching sensations may be heightened, limited, absent (numbness), or may cause pain or burning. A person with a touch disability may be unable to detect (or be insensitive to) heat, cold or changing temperatures. Alternatively, a person with a touch disability may be hypersensitive to sound, physical vibrations, or heated surfaces or air.

Cognitive

Intellectual

An intellectual disability affects an individual’s ability to think and reason. The disability may be caused by genetic factors (e.g., Down Syndrome), brain trauma and psychiatric conditions. A person with an intellectual disability may have difficulty with:

- Language: understanding and using spoken or written information
- Concepts: understanding cause and effect
- Perception: taking in and responding to sensory information
- Memory: retrieving and recognizing information from short- or long-term memory
- Recognizing problems, problem solving and reasoning
Mental Health

There are three main kinds of mental health disabilities:

- **Anxiety**: A state of heightened nervousness or fear related to stress
- **Mood**: Sadness or depression
- **Behavioural**: Being disorganized; making false statements or inappropriate comments; telling distorted or exaggerated stories

People with mental health disabilities may seem edgy or irritated; act aggressively; exhibit blunt behaviour; be perceived as being pushy or abrupt; start laughing or get angry for no apparent reason.

Learning

Learning disabilities are disorders that affect verbal and non-verbal information acquisition, retention, understanding, processing, organization and use. People with learning disabilities have average or above-average intelligence, but take in information, retain it, and express knowledge in different ways. Learning disabilities affect reading comprehension and speed; spelling; the mechanics of writing; manual dexterity; math computation; problem solving; processing speed; the ability to organize space and manage time; and orientation and way finding.

Other

Disabilities result from other conditions, accidents, illnesses, and diseases, including ALS (Lou Gehrig disease), asthma, diabetes, cancer, HIV/AIDS, environmental sensitivities, seizure disorders, heart disease, stroke, and joint replacement.
12.6 Municipal Responsibilities under the ODA

The ODA, Sections 11, 12 and 13, state that:

11.

(1) Each year the Council of every municipality shall prepare an accessibility plan; and

(a) Either,

i) seek advice from the accessibility advisory committee that it establishes or continues under subsection 12(1), or

ii) consult with persons with disabilities and others, if the Council has not established or continued an accessibility advisory committee under subsection 12(1).

(2) The accessibility plans shall address the identification, removal and prevention of barriers to persons with disabilities in the municipality’s by-laws and in its policies, programs, practices and services.

(3) The accessibility plan shall include,

(a) a report on the measures the municipality has taken to identify, remove and prevent barriers to persons with disabilities;

(b) the measures in place to ensure that the municipality assesses its proposals for by-laws, policies, programs, practices and services to determine their effect on accessibility for persons with disabilities;

(c) a list of the by-laws, policies, programs, practices and services that the municipality will review in the coming year in order to identify barriers to persons with disabilities;

(d) the measures that the municipality intends to take in the coming year to identify remove, and prevent barriers to persons with disabilities; and

(e) all other information that the regulations prescribe for the purpose of the plan.

(4) A municipality shall make its accessibility plan available to the public.

12.

(1) The council of every municipality having a population of not less than 10,000 shall establish or continue an accessibility advisory committee and the council of every municipality having a population less than 10,000 may establish or continue an accessibility advisory committee.
(2) The committee shall advise the Council in each year about the preparation, implementation, and effectiveness of its accessibility plan.

(3) A majority of the members of the committee shall include persons with disabilities.

(4) The Council shall seek advice from the committee on the accessibility for persons with disabilities to a building, structure, or premises, or part of a building, structure or premises,

(a) that the council purchases, constructs or significantly renovates;
(b) for which the council enters into a new lease; or
(c) that a person provides as municipal capital facilities under an agreement entered into with the council in accordance with section 210.1 of the Municipal Act.

(5) The Committee shall,

(a) perform the functions set out in this section, including reviewing in a timely manner the site plans and drawings described in Section 41 of the Planning Act that the committee selects; and
(b) perform all other functions that are specified in the regulations.

(6) If the committee selects site plans and drawings described in section 41 of the Planning Act to review, the council shall supply them to the committee in a timely manner for the purpose of the review.

13.

In deciding to purchase goods or services through the procurement process for the use of itself, its employees or the public, the council of every municipality shall have regard to the accessibility for persons with disabilities to the goods or services.
12.7 LCAAS Brochure

Vision
To improve the accessibility of Lanark County by identifying and removing existing barriers over time, and by preventing the creation of new barriers.

Purpose
To advise Lanark County Council to help it carry out its responsibilities under the Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act, 2005 (AODA). Specifically:

- Advise Council on the preparation, implementation and effectiveness of its annual accessibility plan.
- Provide consultation services and advice to local municipalities on accessibility issues.
- Liaise with other municipal accessibility advisory committees.
- Host public education events on accessibility issues.

Sub-Committee Members
Chair: Bruce Horlin
Deborah Bowes
Sharon Lee
Dianne McConkey
Debbie Bonselaar
Kim Richard
Richard Allan
Martha Read

For more details about the LC AAS contact: Sandy Grey
Phone: 613-267-4200 Ext. 2401
E-Mail: sgrey@county.lanark.on.ca.

Information on Accessibility at Lanark County is available at:
www.county.lanark.on.ca.

The 2007 Accessibility Plan is available at:
www.county.lanark.on.ca.

Designed by
Dianne McConkey
Lanark County Accessibility Plan
Draft 2008
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Did You Know?

13.5% of Ontario’s population, approximately 1.5 million people, have a disability.

In 2006, 1 in 7 people in Ontario had a disability.

By 2026, it is anticipated that 1 in 5 people in Ontario will have a disability.

The Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act (AODA), Bill 118, received Royal Assent on June 13th, 2005, and is now law.

The purpose of the AODA is to benefit all Ontarians by developing, implementing and enforcing accessibility standards in order to achieve accessibility for Ontarians with disabilities by 2025.

Accessibility standards will be developed related to: customer service, transportation, information and communications, built environment and employment. The Act also addresses policies and attitudinal barriers.

Let’s make Lanark County a place where

- Customer service principles of
  - dignity,
  - equity,
  - inclusion,
  - independence,
  - responsiveness and
  - sensitivity
  are evident.

- More buildings and facilities are accessible.

- More people with disabilities are able to be employed and work to the best of their ability.

- Information and communications are available in an accessible format i.e. Braille, TTY, sign language.

- People with disabilities are able to contribute to the community.

- People with disabilities are able to participate fully in the life of the community.

Committee Membership

The County of Lanark invites applications regularly from members of the public interested in serving on the LC AAS. People with disabilities and representatives of people with disabilities are encouraged to apply.

Applicants must be at least 18 years of age, a Canadian citizen and a resident of, or a property owner, in the County of Lanark.

Under the AODA the majority of committee members shall be persons with disabilities.

Meeting Schedule

LC AAS meets bi-monthly at 3:00pm, on the first Monday of the month. Other meetings may be called at the discretion of the Chair.

Meetings are held in a meeting room at the Lanark County Administration Building at 99 Christie Lake Road in Perth.
Comment Form

(Available on-line at www.county.lanark.on.ca)

The Lanark County Accessibility Advisory Sub Committee would like your input on improving Accessibility throughout Lanark County. Please take a few minutes to complete this form and let us know what you think. Thank you.

1. How did you find out about Accessibility Awareness, Lanark County’s 2008 Accessibility Plan?
   - [ ] Lanark County Staff
   - [ ] Website
   - [ ] Newspaper article
   - [ ] Community Agency
   - [ ] Local municipality

2. Are you a resident of Lanark County?
   - [ ] Yes
   - [ ] No

3. Are you a person with a disability?
   - [ ] Yes
   - [ ] No

4. What do you see as the key issue facing people with disabilities in Lanark County?
   - [ ] Awareness
   - [ ] Attitudes
   - [ ] Lack of services/supports
   - [ ] Housing
   - [ ] Barriers in commercial sector
   - [ ] Social Assistance
   - [ ] Lack of Information
   - [ ] Lack of Accessibility standards
   - [ ] Other
5. **What do you like most about the plan?** (Choose all that apply)
   - [ ] Overall layout & format
   - [ ] Information concerning the action the County has already taken to ensure people with disabilities can use its services and programs
   - [ ] Information concerning the plans the County has to improve services and programs in the future
   - [ ] The types of barriers that will be addressed this year
   - [ ] How the County will identify barriers within its programs & services
   - [ ] The participation of all County departments in accessibility planning
   - [ ] Other

6. **Do you think there has been an improvement in Accessibility issues in Lanark County since the implementation of the Advisory subcommittee in 2003?**
   - [ ] Yes
   - [ ] No
   
   If yes, what has improved?
   
   If no, please explain

7. **Is the plan easy to read and understand?**
   - [ ] Yes
   - [ ] No
   
   If no, why?
8. Are you a member of an organization or agency that represents or provides services to people with disabilities in Lanark County?

☐ Yes  ☐ No

If yes, what is the name of the organization?

________________________________________________________

Thank you

If you would like to receive more information about this Plan or Accessibility planning in Lanark County, please contact us.

You can return your completed form by:

Mail:  Clerk's Department
       County of Lanark
       Box 37
       99 Christie Lake Road
       Perth, ON  K7H 3E2

Fax:  (613) 267-2694

E-mail:  clerk@county.lanark.on.ca
Accessibility Standards

1. STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended:

“THAT, this report be received as information only.

2. PURPOSE

The purpose of this report is to inform council of the Municipal requirements contained in Provincial regulation regarding three accessibility standards:

1) Customer service
2) Transportation
3) Information and Communications.

3. BACKGROUND

The Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act, 2005 outlines a plan to create comprehensive accessibility standards in Ontario by 2025. The province is developing accessibility standards for the identification, removal and prevention of barriers to accessibility in five key areas:

1) Customer Service
2) Transportation
3) Information and Communications
4) The Built Environment
5) Employment

The Customer Service Standard came into force January 1, 2008, and municipalities will be required to comply with the standard by January 1, 2010.

A proposed Transportation Standard was announced May 2007, public comments were received, and a committee is currently working on a final standard.

In November 2008, an initial proposed standard for Accessible Information and Communication was announced. Public comment on the standard was accepted until Feb 6, 2009.

4. DISCUSSION
Customer Service Standard

A Summary of Requirements - Accessibility Standards for Customer Service is attached (Appendix A).

The Association of Municipal Managers, Clerks and Treasurers of Ontario (AMCTO) has established a Municipal Accessibility Working Group to develop resources to assist municipalities comply with the requirements of O. Reg 429/07. Cathie Ritchie, Lanark County Clerk is a member of this provincial working group. Lanark County and the local Municipalities have also established a joint working group to share resources.

The major requirements for Municipalities will be to establish appropriate policies, practices and procedures and to ensure that all staff, volunteers and contractors receive training on a number of topics.

Transportation

A summary of the proposed content of the Transportation standard is attached.

The proposed Transportation standard specifies accessibility requirements for Provincial and Municipal public transportation services, including:

1) Accessibility features of transportation vehicles
2) Practices and procedures for providing service to people with disabilities in transportation settings
3) Service criteria and outcomes for the delivery of accessible public transit services and emergency preparedness and response requirements for transportation providers.

Lanark County Transportation Association and Lanark Lodge may be affected by the Transportation standard. Compliance with the standard is required within three years after it is adopted in regulation. Organizations whose primary business is not the provision of passenger transportation services, but who provide other passenger transportation services must be prepared to provide boarding/deboarding assistance, allow people to travel with medical aids and develop emergency response procedures.

Information and Communications

A quick read summary of the Information and Communications standard is attached. Public sector organization will be required to comply with the standard by December 31, 2011.

Municipalities will be required to write a statement of commitment to accessibility and incorporate it into their policies, practices and procedures. Staff responsible for designing, providing or receiving information and communication will be required to participate in accessibility training. All municipalities must establish user feedback and complaint processes, and inform the public that accessible information and communication is available.
Emergency and Public Safety information must be available to the public and employees in accessible formats.

The Information and Communication Standard establishes four categories of communication:
1) Prepared communication to someone (e.g. a brochure)
2) Predictable communication from someone (e.g. an order form)
3) Unprepared communication to someone (e.g. OW caseworker explaining eligibility)
4) Unpredictable communication from someone (e.g. a request for assistance)

When prepared information is in print, organizations must provide an accessible electronic format, a Braille-ready electronic or printed copy, audio format, large print version and electronic version with supports for comprehension. Municipalities must also develop a policy and establish a practice and procedure for making plain language communication available and for providing communication assistance upon request.

Any newly acquired business enterprise system (Great Plains, SDMT) must provide accessible formats and methods of communication when they are made available for use by employees or the public. Existing systems must meet requirements within six years of the standard coming into effect.

5. ANALYSIS AND OPTIONS

None

6. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

The Standard Development Committees have included cost impact assessments, conducted by KPMG Consultants, with all of the proposed standards. For the Information and Communication standard, KPMG analyzed a small municipality in Southern Ontario and estimated the cost impact would range from 1% - 3% of its annual operating cost.

7. LOCAL MUNICIPAL IMPACT

Local municipalities will have additional requirements with regard to making the election process accessible.

A committee of interested local municipalities has been meeting to investigate options for shared development of resources to meet Accessibility Standard requirements.

8. CONCLUSIONS

AMCTO has been actively researching and accumulating resources to assist
municipalities meet required standards. Work is continuing, in conjunction with local municipalities, to develop a draft policy which addresses requirements for Customer Service. The next meeting of this committee is scheduled in March.

The Executive Management Team will be kept informed of accessibility implications for purchasing and budgeting, as further details become available.

9. ATTACHMENTS

a. Summary of Requirements – Accessibility Standards for Customer Service
b. Summary of contents of proposed Transportation Standard
c. Quick read summary of Information and Communications Standard

Prepared by:

Sandy Grey
Manager, Social Housing

Recommended by:

Cathie Ritchie
Clerk

Approved for Submission:

Peter Wagland
Chief Administrative Officer
Accessibility Standards for Customer Service

Summary of Requirements

What you need to know
The Accessibility Standards for Customer Service (Ontario Regulation 429/07) came into force on January 1, 2008. If you are a provider of goods or services, and have one or more employees in Ontario, you will be required to comply with the regulation.

- If you are a public sector organization designated in the standard, you must comply by January 1, 2010.
- If you are a private business, non-profit organization, or any other service provider with at least one employee in Ontario, you must comply by January 1, 2012.

This document outlines what you must do to ensure you are providing accessible customer service to people with various kinds of disabilities. The following is a summary of requirements:

1. Establish policies, practices and procedures on providing goods or services to people with disabilities.

2. Use reasonable efforts to ensure that your policies, practices and procedures are consistent with the core principles of independence, dignity, integration and equality of opportunity.

3. Set a policy on allowing people to use their own personal assistive devices to access your goods and use your services and about any other measures your organization offers (assistive devices, services, or methods) to enable them to access your goods and use your services.

4. Communicate with a person with a disability in a manner that takes into account his or her disability.
5. Allow people with disabilities to be accompanied by their guide dog or service animal in those areas of the premises you own or operate that are open to the public, unless the animal is excluded by another law. If a service animal is excluded by law, use other measures to provide services to the person with a disability.

6. Permit people with disabilities who use a support person to bring that person with them while accessing goods or services in premises open to the public or third parties.

7. Where admission fees are charged, provide notice ahead of time on what admission, if any, would be charged for a support person of a person with a disability.

8. Provide notice when facilities or services that people with disabilities rely on to access or use your goods or services are temporarily disrupted.

9. Train staff, volunteers, contractors and any other people who interact with the public or other third parties on your behalf on a number of topics as outlined in the customer service standard.

10. Train staff, volunteers, contractors and any other people who are involved in developing your policies, practices and procedures on the provision of goods or services on a number of topics as outlined in the customer service standard.

11. Establish a process for people to provide feedback on how you provide goods or services to people with disabilities and how you will respond to any feedback and take action on any complaints. Make the information about your feedback process readily available to the public.

If you are a designated public sector organization or other provider with 20 or more employees, you must:

1. Document in writing all your policies, practices and procedures for providing accessible customer service and meet other document requirements set out in the standard.

2. Notify customers that documents required under the customer service standard are available upon request.
3. When giving documents required under the customer service standard to a person with a disability, provide the information in a format that takes into account the person’s disability.

Some small steps you can take immediately to improve accessibility include:
- treating all customers with dignity and respect
- asking ‘How may I help you?’

**More Information**

At [www.AccessON.ca/compliance](http://www.AccessON.ca/compliance) you’ll find information and resources to help you understand how to comply with the regulation.

Please note: This document is for information purposes only. This is not legal advice and should be read together with the official language of the standard. To view the official wording of the regulation, go to [www.e-laws.gov.on.ca](http://www.e-laws.gov.on.ca), and click on “Current Consolidated Law” to do a keyword search for “429/07”. Or contact ServiceOntario (listed below) to order a copy.

For more information or to get this document in an alternate format, contact:

Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act (AODA) Contact Centre (*ServiceOntario*)
Toll-free: 1-866-515-2025
TTY: 416-325-3408 / Toll-free: 1-800-268-7095
Fax: 416-325-3407
Website: [www.AccessON.ca](http://www.AccessON.ca)

This document was produced by the Ministry of Community and Social Services, March 2008.
Ce document est également disponible en français.

© Queen’s Printer for Ontario, 2008
ISBN 978-1-4249-5933-4 (Print)
ISBN 978-1-4249-5935-8 (PDF)
APPENDIX “B”

Summary of contents of proposed Transportation Standard

Transportation Services and Vehicles

The Initial Proposed Transportation Accessibility Standard, if adopted as a regulation under the Act, would apply to all persons or organizations that provide the following types of passenger transportation services and vehicles under provincial and municipal jurisdiction:

- Municipal transit, including buses, specialized transit (specifically for persons with disabilities), subways and rapid transit, streetcars and light rail (e.g. trolleys);
- Commuter rail and bus (e.g., GO Transit)
- Inter-city rail and coaches (e.g., Ontario Northland Transportation Commission, and other inter-city coaches operating exclusively in Ontario)
- On-demand taxis;
- Community transportation services (e.g., those provided by volunteer agencies);
- Ferries operating in Ontario;
- School transportation services;
- Booked transportation services (e.g., taxis, shuttles, limousines, tour buses, and community transportation services);
- Other organizations that provide transportation services, but are not primarily in the business of providing transportation (e.g., hospitals and long-term care homes, employers, colleges and universities, amusement parks, zoos).

The standard would not apply to federally regulated transportation providers such as: airlines, Via Rail, inter-city coaches (e.g. Greyhound, Canada Coach) that travel across Ontario borders, rental car agencies water taxis and rickshaws.

The standard would not apply to personal use of private vehicles.

The standard would not apply to buildings and facilities, like bus and subway stations. Those would be covered under a standard to be developed for the built environment.
Types of Disability

The term “disability” is similarly defined in the *Ontario Human Rights Code* and in the *Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act, 2005*.

In simple, non-legal terms, disability involves some form of physical, sensory, mental health, developmental or learning impairment. People may have limitations on their mobility, vision, hearing or speech. They may need the help of a support person, a service animal, or a device such as a wheelchair.

The disability may not be immediately apparent to others – for example, if a person cannot hear well or cannot understand symbols or spoken language.

Types of Requirements/Service Improvements

Requirements under the Initial Proposed Transportation Accessibility Standard, if adopted as a regulation under the *Act*, would build on what is already the law in Ontario.

There are a number of already existing requirements for accessible transportation under Regulation 629 of the *Highway Traffic Act* governing vans or buses (other than for personal use) used to transport a person with a disability, such as low-floor municipal buses and wheelchair accessible taxis. The Regulation covers safety requirements such as emergency exits, first aid kits, fire extinguishers, the number, size and location of doors, securement systems (for a wheelchair, for example), lifts and ramps, mirrors, lighting and floor coverings. However, it does not cover all aspects of accessibility, nor all types of disability.

The types of requirements included in the Initial Proposed Accessibility Transportation Standard include the following (these are examples only – please refer to the Initial Proposed Transportation Accessibility Standard for more detail):

- For fixed route passenger transportation services (e.g. buses, subways), there are requirements for:
• audible announcement and visual display of the route, stops and connections along the route to help people who have sight or hearing impairments know when to get on or off a vehicle;

• training of staff and volunteers so that they recognize the need to provide assistance to people with disabilities, offer it and provide it;

• boarding and exiting lifting devices, ramps or portable bridge plates to be deployed at designated accessible stops on the request of a passenger with a disability;

• fare payment and ticket validation equipment that is accessible on all vehicles;

• no fare charged for personal care attendants, recognized by the transportation provider, accompanying a passenger with a disability.

• For municipal public transit there are requirements for accessible public transit services for people with disabilities (e.g., specialized transit services) who can’t use conventional fixed route public transit. Requirements include:

  • establishing plans, with specific performance measures, to ensure equivalent transportation services for all passengers;

  • the same hours and days of service in the same geographical areas covered as conventional fixed route public transit;

  • common eligibility criteria and processes for “accessible public transit” across the province, based on the inability of the person to use conventional fixed route transit either temporarily or permanently.

• For on-demand taxi services (i.e. a taxi hailed on the street or booked less than one hour before service delivery), there are requirements for establishing policies, procedures and practices and reporting by taxi drivers, brokers and dispatchers to deliver accessible services equivalent to services available to the general population.
• For booked services (where a trip is reserved at least one hour before service
delivery e.g., tour buses, shuttles, taxis, limousines) and for organizations
not primarily in the business of transportation (e.g., religious organizations,
hospitals, amusement parks, employers), there are requirements for the
provision of accessible vehicles to passengers upon request.

• For school transportation, there are requirements for provision of accessible
school transportation services or, if not possible due to the nature of the
disability or safety concerns, alternative accessible transportation (i.e.,
temporary service that approaches the desired result, until the barrier is
removed or an equivalent service is put in place).

Potential Economic Costs and Benefits

The Act requires Standards Development Committees to take into account, in
setting timelines for implementation, any technical or economic considerations that
may be associated with the requirements set out in a proposed standard.

The timelines vary for the many specific requirements under the Initial Proposed
Transportation Accessibility Standard. Some service improvements are required
immediately, some must happen within one year, and many are required within
three years. For some requirements, the timeline is up to 18 years.

The purpose of phasing in implementation is to allow organizations time to remove
barriers as part of their regular business planning.

The consulting team of Deloitte & Touch LLP and ENTRA Consultants worked
with the Committee to assist them in understanding the state of readiness and
potential costs of the initial proposed standard. A report has been made available to:
http://www.mcss.gov.on.ca/mcss/english/pillars/accessibilityOntario/accesson/business/transportation/sta
ndard/cosl/index.htm

An Invitation to Participate

The deadline for providing comments and feedback on the proposed standard has
been extended to September 28, 2007.
Quick read summary of Information and Communications Standard

Quick Read Summary

The Need for Change – The public is being asked to provide feedback on an Initial Proposed Standard for Accessible Information and Communication. It has been developed by a Standards Development Committee established by the Ontario government under the Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act (AODA 2005).

The standard is about removing or preventing barriers that limit the participation of more than 1.5 million Ontarians with disabilities in the life of our communities.

In everyday life, we are constantly involved in communicating information – that is, providing, sending or receiving knowledge or data or facts that tell us something. Communication is the process. Information is the content.

Being able to communicate is important for all kinds of activities, like talking to a doctor about a health issue, signing a lease on an apartment, writing an exam, filling out a questionnaire, and buying or selling a product or service.

There are different types of disability, such as limitations on vision, mobility, hearing, and understanding, and there are many ways to give and receive information (spoken word, text on paper, electronic message etc.) That means there are different barriers that arise in a variety of contexts. The Accessible Information and Communication Standards Development Committee has identified specific means to address these barriers.

The Committee and the Process – The membership of the Committee includes individuals with disabilities and representatives of disability organizations and private, not-for-profit and public sector organizations.

The Committee worked by consensus. That does not mean that everyone around the table had to agree. There was a lot of debate. But there was enough support among the voting members to send the Initial Proposed Standard out for public review.

After considering the results of the public review, the Committee will finalize a proposed standard and send it to the Minister of Community and Social Services. The Ontario government will decide what becomes law under AODA regulations.

The AODA reform process is moving forward on several fronts at the same time. There are other Standards Development Committees working on transportation, employment and built environment (buildings and other structures). Customer Service was the first standard to become law. It took effect Jan. 1, 2008.

The AODA assumes that progress will be made in stages. The legislation requires a review five years after a standard is regulated to see what has happened and what still needs to be done. The legislation envisions full accessibility by 2025.

October 27, 2008
A Step Towards a Vision – The Committee’s vision for 2025 is an Ontario where information and methods of communication are designed and developed up-front to be accessible to people with disabilities. That is not true today. Old ways of doing things will have to change so that the individual with a disability doesn’t always have to ask – because accessibility will be built into all the new products, services and systems.

Even with inclusive design of products, services and systems, there will still have to be some personalised accommodation for individual needs and differences. Current law (Ontario’s Human Rights Code) already requires individual accommodation for persons with disabilities. What the Committee has done is to build on that legal foundation by laying out a first step for what accommodation for information and communication has to look like.

The proposal being put forward by the Committee defines what organizations must be prepared to do to provide formats and methods of communication that can be used by people with a variety of disabilities under different circumstances.

This standard would be a “first” for Ontario. It is intended to create consistency in what people with disabilities can expect. For example, a person with low vision could expect to get a listing of services or products in large print or Braille copy or electronic or audio format and that the information in those alternate formats would be updated regularly and there would be no extra charge to get them.

The Committee’s Initial Proposed Standard also sets out how individuals with disabilities will be treated in terms of timeliness, quality and availability of the communication.

The Committee recognizes that this Initial Proposed Standard is just a step towards the vision. Among the questions asked by the Committee is whether the public feels that the step is too small, too big or just about right and if the way forward is clear enough.

Application of the Standard – There are three classes of organization that are identified in this Initial Proposed Standard. They are the same as the classes in the Accessible Customer Service Regulation under the AODA.

- Class 1 – Private Sector or non-profit organizations with 1-19 employees
- Class 2 – Private Sector or non-profit organizations with at least 20 employees
- Class 3 – Public sector organizations with at least one employee.

The Committee singled out a group of organizations within Class 1. They are organizations providing “critical services”. This group is described as including doctors, lawyers, organizations providing financial services and counselling services. There are requirements for these organizations (Class 1 - Critical Services) that are not required for other organizations within that class.

The dates for compliance – except where the standard says otherwise – are: Class 1 by Dec. 31, 2013; Class 2 by Dec. 31, 2012; Class 3 by Dec. 31, 2011.
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Requirements for all Classes – The Committee’s Initial Proposed Standard sets out some specific requirements for all organizations in Ontario with at least one employee. They include the obligation to:

- Inform persons with disabilities that there is accessible information and communication available;
- Charge no more for alternate accessible formats than the regular cost paid by other consumers;
- Ensure that individuals with disabilities are not disadvantaged in terms of the timeliness, quality and availability of communication, given or received;
- Establish a user request, feedback and complaints process that allows persons with disabilities (whether they are consumers or employees) to identify their communication needs and to communicate with the organization;
- Provide emergency and public safety information required under existing law (e.g., evacuation procedures) to the public and employees in formats and communication methods that can be used and understood by persons with disabilities;
- Develop, implement and maintain policies, procedures and practices to comply with the standard for accessible information and communication and write a statement of commitment to accessibility;
- Ensure that employees, volunteers and others who are responsible for designing or providing and receiving information and communication on behalf of the organization receive accessibility training.

In addition, certain organizations must have the capacity to provide information and communicate when asked by a person with a disability, in a format that takes into account the person’s disability, that is appropriate for the type of communication, and is in accordance with the standard’s technical requirements.

Organizations are already required by Ontario law to respond to a request for individual accommodation. Organizations in Class 3, Class 2 and Class 1 - Critical Services are required under this standard to be prepared to respond according to the specifications detailed in the standard.

For example, when prepared information is in print, organizations must provide an accessible electronic format (e-text), a Braille-ready electronic or printed copy, audio format, large print version and electronic version with supports for comprehension.

They must respond in ways that provide the same level of response that others receive in terms of timeliness, quality and availability of the communication.

Public Review – All suggestions and comments will be considered by the Committee before it finalizes its recommendation to the Ontario government on a proposed standard.
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1. **STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS**

It is recommended:

**THAT**, the Corporate Services Committee approve the HRIS project in principle subject to funding being provided in the 2009 budget;

**THAT**, as part of the project, the County implement the Info:HR system, provided by HR Systems Strategies Inc. as its HRIS;

**AND THAT**, when the budget is approved, staff be authorized to enter into a contract with HR Systems Strategies Inc. to provide the software and associated implementation services.

2. **PURPOSE**

To provide the Corporate Services Committee with an overview of the HRIS project and the rationale for selecting Info:HR as the County’s HRIS.

3. **BACKGROUND**

On January 1, 2004, the Corporation implemented Dynamics GP, commonly referred to as Great Plains, as its integrated corporate management system. This system replaced most of the other systems in the corporation including the HRIS used by the Human Resources department. The HRIS was a version of the Info:HR system that used Microsoft Access as its database.

(Note: Dynamics GP and the latest version of Info:HR use Microsoft SQL, a more robust database product.)

Since its introduction in 2004, there have been many changes to the County’s implementation of Dynamics GP software to stabilize the system and enable it to better address our business requirements. Due to their priority and resource constraints, the vast majority of these changes have been in the financial and payroll areas with very limited changes made in support of our other business functions such as Human Resource (HR) management.
Diamond Municipal Solutions is the County’s service provider for Dynamics GP. It provides technical support for the software as well as support for any upgrades. The company also develops system “add-ons” to assist its clients, Canadian Municipalities, to get the most value from their investment in Dynamics GP.

4. DISCUSSION

The Access version of Info:HR was implemented in 1995/96 and provided HR staff as well as line managers with an effective tool to support HR and associated management functions. Not only did the system meet HR’s business requirements, it required minimal IT support. It had been the County’s initial intention to upgrade the system to its SQL version to be compatible with the newly acquired Dynamics GP system.

Dynamics GP is marketed as an Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) system, i.e. an enterprise-wide information system designed to coordinate all the resources, information, and activities needed to complete the majority of business processes – basically a system “Swiss army knife” for a corporation. When selected in 2003, it was decided that the County would use Dynamics GP to support as many business functions as possible, including the HR function. It was felt that the integrated information base provided by Dynamics GP and the associated support benefits offered by having only one system would outweigh any weaknesses that the system might have in any one business line.

Since its introduction in January, 2004, HR has been using Dynamics GP as its prime system for conducting its business. The cost of the HR module was $10,500 with an annual license fee of 25% or about $2,600 per year. Due to its limitations, the system is not used to support management in its HR functions. From the outset, the system has not been able to provide the same richness in HR functionality nor is it as intuitive for HR staff to use. In order to meet its business requirements, HR has had to introduce several manual procedures, spreadsheets, and small auxiliary systems. Management and Council reports require significant effort, usually involving overtime, to generate the requested information. Extra care must be taken to ensure the information in the reports is correct as they often involve re-keying of Dynamics GP data.

There are two innate reasons within the software why the HR function is not strongly supported by Dynamics GP. Firstly, at its core, the system is a financial system developed to support financial functions. The HR modules were added later to make it a more comprehensive system. Screens, terms, and business processes are based on financial functions. Secondly, the HR module is based on United States of America HR policies and standards. There is a separate Canadian module for payroll which builds on the American payroll module but there is no equivalent Canadian version for HR.

There are several Counties that use Dynamics GP to support their financial functions and Info:HR to support the HR function. In late 2008, the County of Frontenac, which uses Dynamics GP for finance, chose Info:HR as their
HRIS following a competitive selection process. Though the total number of employees is less than 500, the County’s overall HR environment is complex. Its business lines are such that the types of work and associated skill sets are varied. Employees are associated with 3 different unions each with their own agreements which impose certain system requirements plus there are non-union staff, managers, and executives. The County also provides HR support to the Lanark County Housing Corporation.

In September, 2008, County staff produced a report of high priority HR requirements that were not being met by Dynamics GP (please see summary in Attachment “A”). This report has been used as a basis for discussion with Diamond Municipal Solutions and with HR Systems Strategies, the developer and provider of Info:HR. It has also served as a basis to assess system options for moving forward.

5. ANALYSIS AND OPTIONS

A project team was formed in late 2008 to consider options for moving forward. The core team, under the direction of the Director of Human Resources, consisted of a project manager, an HR representative, and an IT representative. There were several meetings held with “stakeholders” (e.g. HR, finance, administrative assistants, Lanark Lodge, line managers) who were familiar with both Dynamics GP and Info:HR.

The project team considered three (3) options to address the current system shortcomings in support of the HR function. These options are consistent with the County’s procurement policy, By-Law 2007-57 as we already own the basic software outlined in these options which “ensure compatibility with existing products”. The options are:

- Option 1 – Implement the Info:HR system (recommended option);
- Option 2 – Work with Diamond Software Solutions to upgrade the Dynamics GP system to meet the County’s HR business requirements;
- Option 3 – continue with the current Dynamics GP system and continue to supplement it with manual processes, spreadsheets, and internally developed Access database systems.

The project team developed assessment criteria from 3 perspectives; Business, Information Technology (IT), and Overall Management including costs.

Option 1 – Implement Info:HR system – recommended option

Overview

This option would see the implementation of the latest version of Info:HR system converting the HR information now in Dynamics GP to the new Info:HR database. While most of the information would be converted electronically, there would be a need to input some historical and limited current information “manually” following conversion. The conversion itself
would take place over a period of approximately one month with up to 2 months of follow-up to stabilize the system and update any missing information.

Once the file conversion is completed and the necessary testing and training finished, the system would be used initially by HR staff to fulfill their duties. The next step would be to introduce the system to managers to assist them in their HR functions such as employee development and associated appraisals.

A further phase in 2010, would see the introduction of the Employee Self Service module which would allow employees to view applicable sections of their own HR records not only providing them with ready access to this information but also reducing the number of requests that have to be answered by managers and HR staff. In 2010, we would also consider introducing the WSIB forms generator which would allow the forms to be completed on-line and sent electronically to WSIB.

Staff Assessment of Option 1

Business Perspective

Of the three options, this system best meets the HR business needs and associated management HR functions. This includes the high priority requirements identified by the project team and not currently met or met with significant limitations by our existing Dynamics GP HR modules.

The Info:HR system is a Canadian-based product developed in Ontario and therefore meets Canadian regulations and uses Canadian terms. This is not true of the other options.

The Info:HR system is used solely to support HR functions and uses common HR terms that are familiar to HR professionals as well as managers. This single use means the system is less complex and easier to use. The work flows inherent in the system and associated screens are consistent with the County’s current HR procedures and practices. It is expected that the system could be implemented without any modifications.

The system can produce most, if not all, of the management reports required by Council, County executive, and line managers. These are currently produced using spreadsheets and often involve the re-keying of information which can cause inaccuracies. This would free up HR resources to work on other priority activities and would reduce related overtime requirements.

The project would also introduce electronic time sheets where they are still required in the organization. These would be completed by the employee, forwarded to managers electronically for approval, and once approved, electronically sent to payroll for final processing before being updated automatically on the employee’s payroll and employee records. This will eliminate current manual processes resulting in time savings and improved accuracy.
IT Perspective

The system is fully compatible with our current IT environment and could be implemented without any additional hardware or systems software. Info:HR uses the same server operating system, Windows Server 2003, and also the same database software, Microsoft SQL, as Dynamics GP. There may be some additional hard drive space required on the server for the installation of the software and its database. Any associated costs would be minimal. IT staff would not require any additional technical training to support this system though technical documentation from HR Systems Strategies would need to be reviewed.

The payroll modules in Dynamics GP will continue to be used. HR Systems Strategies have developed the required interfaces between Info:HR and the Dynamics GP payroll modules as well as the interface with JBS, the scheduling system used in Lanark Lodge. This will save any duplicate data entry and ensure consistency in the information that is kept in both systems.

Admittedly, Info:HR would be an additional system and therefore would require some additional IT work such as updating the system whenever HR Systems Strategies releases an upgrade. There would also be a need for IT to gain an understanding of the technical and business features of the system. However, compared to the HR module in GP, Info:HR is easier to use and also is easier for IT to support because of its relative simplicity. Therefore, there will be fewer service calls from HR due to its ease of use and calls can be handled faster by IT due to its ease of support. Based on feedback from current clients and our own experience, we can expect the service available from HR Systems Strategies to be more effective than the support we currently receive as the company’s focus is solely on HR. The additional IT duties are minimal and Info:HR could be accommodated within the current IT complement.

Management Perspective

Established in 1990, HR Systems Strategies Inc is a Canadian company based in Toronto that develops, implements, and maintains the Info:HR software. Info:HR software is their sole product and the core of their business success. HR Systems Strategies Inc is privately owned by Andy Staniewski who purchased the company in January, 2008 from its original owners. The original two owners continue to be actively involved in the management of the company as Vice Presidents.

The company has shown slow but steady growth in its client base over the years. The company has over 300 clients using the Info:HR software with 40% in the broader public sector. Over 30 Ontario municipalities currently use Info:HR as their HRIS. According to the new owner, the company will place more emphasis on marketing and growth without jeopardizing the service to existing clients.
The company has continued to invest in its product over the years and remains current from both the business and technology perspectives. System enhancements to the product’s functionality are based on feedback from clients and on the direction of the marketplace; both technical and business. HR Systems Strategies Inc. has formed partnerships with companies that provide complementary products to their client base including Microsoft Dynamics GP. This allows clients to develop their own integrated solutions rather than being obligated to choose a single product to meet all their business requirements.

From a support perspective, HR Systems Strategies would meet the County’s IT and business requirements. Based on our past experience and client feedback, the company is responsive, understands the business of HR, and knows their software’s capability and how it can be applied to resolve a business “challenge”.

**Financial Implications of Option 1**

Costs are broken down into one time costs by fiscal years 2009 and 2010 as well as by ongoing costs. Total project cost of Option 1 for 2009 is $42,000 excluding salary costs for regular staff and students working on the project. These are included in the HR salary budget submission.

HR Systems Strategies has provided the County with its standard pricing and then reduced the costs to take into consideration our Access version of the Info:HR system as well as foregoing the annual support costs that we would have had to incur for the Access version over the last 4 years.

**2009 Costs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Software including 2009 software support costs</td>
<td>$7,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Costs</td>
<td>16,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Including analysis, data conversion, training, specifications etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Management</td>
<td>13,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency (10%)</td>
<td>3,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total 2009 Costs (rounded)</strong></td>
<td><strong>$42,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2010 Costs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New modules (employee self service and WSIB forms)</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Please note: other 2010 costs are ongoing support costs – next item)
Ongoing Costs

Annual software support costs (HR Systems Strategies) $4,935
Expected reduction in Dynamics GP support costs 2,600

Net annual support costs (Rounded) $2,300

Option 2 – Enhance Dynamics GP to meet the County’s high priority HR requirements

Overview

As mentioned, project staff prepared a document outlining the high priority HR business requirements that were not being met by the HR module in Dynamics GP. This document was reviewed by Diamond Municipal Solutions and several conference calls were held between the County and Diamond to discuss the requirements and how they could be best addressed.

Under this option, Diamond would enhance our “version” of Dynamics GP system to address the requirements outlined in the aforementioned document. The HR staff would receive training on the overall GP system and in-depth training on those modules and smart lists that are of particular use to HR. Line managers would also receive training on specific system capabilities that they would use to fulfill their HR responsibilities. HR procedures would be changed to incorporate the GP system capabilities.

Based on the HR requirements document and the conference calls, Diamond has proposed that the project be broken into 3 main phases:

- Business Process Review / Scoping Phase
  This would involve Diamond completing an initial review of the County’s HR business processes and identify areas in the software that meet the County’s requirements and areas where there are functionality gaps. The result would be a report providing a high level business process review, outlining key business requirements, identifying current software fits / gaps, and providing an overview of any additional scoping work that might be required as well as estimates for the next phase.

- Customization Design Phase
  This phase would include any additional scoping not completed in the first phase, the defining and documenting of business processes, and the design of proposed system customizations. The report would also include a proposed phasing of the implementation of system customizations with cost estimates and time frame for the next phase.

- Implementation phase
  This phase would consist of one or more sub-phases depending on the results of the previous phase. It would include the development and implementation of the customized code required to meet the County’s HR requirements.
Staff Assessment of Option 2

Business Perspective

The HR modules in Dynamics GP meet the minimal HR requirements of the County. HR staff find the system difficult to use and challenging to extract information from the system. As mentioned previously, the system is a financial system at its base and the terms and database are complex and more finance oriented. Additional training would help ameliorate the situation but not eliminate the difficulties. The system would perhaps prove adequate for a less complicated HR environment.

County staff consider the approach proposed by Diamond to be a sound, methodical approach. We are confident that the high priority requirements would, in the end, be satisfied with the changes that Diamond would make. However, the changes would not make any significant improvements in the system’s ease-of-use or significantly reduce the effort required to extract information and produce reports. The bottom line is that the system is not “HR friendly”. The complexity of the data base and associated screens would remain.

Committing to Dynamics GP as the long term solution would require HR to make some changes to its business processes and associated procedures. The changes made by Diamond would address the system requirements but it would still require HR to change procedures to be consistent with those work processes “imposed” by Dynamics GP.

IT Perspective

With this option, there would be no changes to the IT environment. Committing to this option would result in an increase in the use being made of the HR modules by HR staff and by line managers particularly when the required enhancements have been made by Diamond. This would result in increased requests for IT support for the module and increased requests for assistance in producing reports. The increase in requests could be absorbed within the current IT complement but might negatively impact IT service levels.

Should we proceed with this option, the system enhancements required by the County would be additional to the core GP product and the generic Diamond enhancements made for their municipal clients. It is not known whether this would result in extra work for IT when new versions of the system are released. This option could result in a need for at least two (2) more licenses at an annual cost of about $500 each.

Management Perspective

Dynamics GP is a Microsoft Business Solutions product offering and will continue to be offered by Microsoft as one of its key product lines. The focus in its marketing is on its value for business from a financial and business development perspective with lesser emphasis on its payroll and human
resource capabilities. Microsoft continues to invest in the product and ensures that it takes advantage of the enhancements introduced in its other office products.

Based on our experience, Diamond Municipal Solutions is a stable, growing Canadian company with municipal organizations as its market niche. We have established a reasonably sound working relationship with Diamond promoting our advanced use of their product offering in their marketing. The use made by Lanark County of Dynamics GP in 2007 to support PSAB is featured on their home web page. We have received awards from Diamond for the use we make of the system and they nominated us for a Microsoft award.

That said, Diamond does emphasize the financial capabilities of the system and its software enhancements to the Microsoft product, entitled Diamond Municipal Solutions, are “focused on providing municipal accounting and utility billing products”. Their web site goes on to state “you get the best municipal accounting products and services in the industry”. Their support team appears to be stronger on the financial side and their last annual user conference had no sessions dedicated to HR. A review of their most recent training calendar shows, inter alia, courses on finance, report writing, and Canadian payroll. There is no course scheduled for HR though one could be arranged.

Financial Implications of Option 2

The costs are based on discussions with Diamond, their proposal for completing Phase 1, and our own internal knowledge of HR, the GP system, and our project management expertise and experience with similar projects. Diamond would provide estimates for Phase 2 at the end of Phase 1 and similarly, provide an estimate for Phase 3 at the end of Phase 2. With this option, there would be no need for internal or student resources to assist with file conversion as it would not be necessary. The estimated total project cost for 2009 for Option 2 is $110,000 excluding regular staff’s salary costs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase 1</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diamond proposal</td>
<td>$18,375</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associated Travel</td>
<td>5,036</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project management</td>
<td>1,960</td>
<td>$25,371</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase 2</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diamond support</td>
<td>$19,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associated travel</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Management</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>23,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(note: This phase 2 estimate is not from Diamond. It is based on their proposal for phase 1 and is felt to be conservative)
### Phase 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Training and coaching</td>
<td>$7,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associated travel</td>
<td>$3,190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$10,890</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System enhancements</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associated travel</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$45,000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Management</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$60,890</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: The phase 3 estimate is not from Diamond. It is based on 7 days training for HR staff during the phase using rates provided by Diamond for other GP training and 40 days of technical staff development time.*

**Total 2009 for Option 2 (rounded)** $110,000

### Option 3 – Continue with Dynamics GP with no enhancements using manual workarounds, spreadsheets, and internally developed Access systems

**Overview**

This option is basically the status quo with more attention paid to improving current processes and adding additional small Access systems to attempt to meet the HR requirements that are not being met today. It would require more continuous use of scarce IT resources. There would be a need to invest in Dynamics GP training for HR staff and for line managers. This option could see the purchase of some additional HR Dynamics GP modules though this aspect hasn’t been investigated or costed. Work flow processes will be somewhat compromised as they will be system driven as opposed to driven by business operations.

**Staff Assessment of Option 3**

**Business Perspective**

It is not expected that this option would ever address all the HR priority requirements that have been identified by HR. The difficulties inherent in the current system would continue. There would be additional work for HR staff to change work processes and develop procedures to offset the limitations in the current Dynamics GP system.

**IT Perspective**

This option would require IT to develop several systems and complex spreadsheets to assist HR meet their business obligations. Without hiring an additional resource, this would constrain IT’s ability to support other parts of the organization and municipalities.
It is the County’s strategy to buy rather than build systems to support its main business functions such as HR. This option would contradict this overall strategy. These one off systems would have to be maintained internally for years to come.

Management Perspective

This option is unlikely to meet the HR requirements in either the short or long term.

Financial Implications of Option 3

This option requires some expenditure for HR training for HR staff and managers. There would be a requirement for project management to keep the many small initiatives on track. This and the project tasks themselves would be completed by internal staff if they could be freed up from operational duties.

Training and associated travel $15,000

6. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

The estimated 2009 cost for the recommended Option 1 is $42,000. This includes the cost of the software, conversion and implementation resources. It excludes salaries of regular staff and any students assigned to the project. It is recommended that the implementation of 2 additional software modules be delayed until 2010 at a cost of $5,000. Net ongoing software support costs are estimated at $2,300 per annum as the total support cost of $4,900 for Info:HR is offset by an expected $2,600 reduction in Dynamics GP support costs for the HR module.

The estimated 2009 cost for Option 2 is $110,000. The option 3 estimated 2009 cost is $15,000.

Please note: There was $10,000 budgeted for the HRIS project in 2008 which was transferred to reserves at year end.

7. LOCAL MUNICIPAL IMPACT

There is no impact on municipalities for options 1 and 2. The systems support that IT now provides to the municipalities could be negatively impacted by Option 3 as IT will need to spend more time developing and maintaining small HR support systems.

8. CONCLUSION

The HR module in Dynamics GP is the primary system used to support the HR function within the County. There are several high priority HR requirements (Attachment “A”) that are not met by the system. Manual
procedures, spreadsheets and small databases have been developed to address part, though not all, of these missing requirements. The system is finance based and is not “HR friendly”. In addition, the HR module was built initially to support American based companies and this initial focus is still evident in the module.

In late 2008, County staff held several conference calls with Diamond Municipal Solutions, the company that provides the County with the Dynamics GP system. Diamond has proposed a sound, methodical approach to review the requirements and determine how the system can be changed to meet our high priority needs. However, the project team estimates the costs of their approach to be over $100,000 and in the end, HR would be still using a financially based system that would remain difficult for HR to use in daily operations as well as difficult to extract information and produce management reports.

Up until the introduction of Dynamics GP in January, 2004, HR and line managers had used an Access database version of the Info:HR system. It was rich in HR functionality and addressed the HR needs of HR staff and those of line managers as well. It was the County’s initial intent to convert Info:HR to its Microsoft SQL version so that it would be compatible with Dynamics GP. However, this initial intent was changed as it was deemed a more effective corporate strategy to convert all systems, including Info:HR to Dynamics GP.

The HR project team developed criteria to assess options on how to best move forward with a system to support HR as well as line managers in their HR responsibilities. These criteria were considered from the following perspectives; business, IT, and management including costs. They were used in assessing three (3) options:
- Move forward with the latest version of Info:HR – recommended option;
- Upgrade Dynamics GP to meet outstanding high priority HR requirements;
- Continue with Dynamics GP as is and develop workarounds, manual and automated, to address deficiencies.

Based on these criteria, moving forward with the latest version of Info:HR was chosen as the best solution to meet the HR requirements of HR staff and line managers. This option best satisfies the business requirements and is much easier to use than Dynamics GP for HR functions. The system is compatible with the County’s HR processes and operating procedures. Improvements have been made to the system since we last used it in 2003 which will only increase its value to the organization. There are interfaces to Dynamics GP which will ensure that HR information and the payroll information in Dynamics GP are always consistent. This option should result in some time savings for staff and line managers and improved service.

From the IT perspective, Info:HR is fully compatible with the County’s current IT environment and could be implemented without any additional hardware or systems software. Info:HR is less complex than Dynamics GP and easier for
IT to support.

From the management perspective, the company that provides the system, HR Systems Strategies, is Ontario based and focuses solely on the Info:HR system. It is well established in Ontario municipalities with over 30 municipalities using the Info:HR system. Feedback from existing clients confirms that their service levels and client focus continue to be as strong as we experienced prior to moving to Dynamics GP.

The estimated cost to implement Info:HR is $42,000 in 2009 with further enhancements in 2010 costing $5,000. This includes the software, implementation costs, project management, and initial training. It does not include salary costs.

If the project and associated budget is approved by Council by the end of March, conversion to the new system is expected to be completed by the end of June with up to 2 months of follow-up to stabilize the system and update any missing information.

9. ATTACHMENTS

i) Attachment “A” – High Level HR Requirements

Prepared and Recommended By:  
Richard Morris, Project Manager
Lisa Crosbie-Larmon, Director, Human Resources

Approved for Submission By:  
Peter Wagland,  
Chief Administrative Officer
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Requirement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1 Security</strong></td>
<td>Sound security consistent with operational needs to access HR module in order to safeguard employee information and to be in compliance with privacy legislation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **2 Injury Illness** | 1) A Canadian based product compatible with all WSIB requirements.  
2) System should address Occupational Injury or Illness (WSIB) and Non-Occupational, specifically: short-term disability, long term disability, unpaid sick.  
3) Incident report tracking. |
| **3 Grievance**      | 1) Grievance linked to employee with a “description” field for consistent data entry = consisting reporting and statistical tracking.  
2) Multi-union functionality.  
3) Reporting capability on what stage grievances are settled. |
| **4 Training & Development Capability** | 1) Ability to effectively track and report employee training taken on a multi-topic agenda as well as individual course training basis.  
2) The ability to log and track mandatory annual training e.g. WHIMIS. |
| **5 Attendance Support Program** | 1) System must be compatible with program. |
| **6 Employee Status** | 1) Additional options required when entering the status of employees, ie. PTOC (part-time on-call) and student.  
2) Additional marital status options required. |
| **7 Reviews**        | 1) System to recognize full-time and part-time employment.  
2) Automatic reminders when reviews are to be completed.  
3) Empower managers to run reports to track when reviews are required.  
4) Run quarterly and annual roll-up reports to indicate the total number of appraisals that have been completed. |
| **8 Business Alerts** | **Reminders:** For HR, PR, and Managers to track Performance Appraisals, Probationary Reviews and pay increments. Manual tracking is tremendously time consuming and conducive to human error. |
| **9 Reporting**      | Reliable and accurate information for quarterly and annual reporting purposes. Reports include; attendance, disability claims, turnover, overtime, seniority and performance reviews. |
| **10 Seniority**     | Must be able to accurately track and report seniority. |
| **11 Notes**         | The ability to report or extract information from notes that are logged on system. |
Report to
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Lanark County Ambulance Service

Summary of Activities through December 2008

- Continued to meet with our Ontario partners (AMEMSO) to discuss issues regarding mutual concerns and partnerships in Ontario.
- Monitoring of The Ministry of Health and Long Term Care, Emergency Health Services Branch MPR & ADDAS system at our administrative office continues.

Being over the mandated 1996 90th percentile of 15:49 for three consecutive months, requires notification to Mr. Blake Forsyth, Field Manager, MOH&LTC, Eastern Region. Note that responses by other UTM’s into Lanark County are included in our 90th percentile, and therefore I will report any outside response time over our 1996, 90th percentile.

January 2008 County 90th Percentile Response Time 13:54
(Note: Leeds Grenville County 90th Percentile Response time for January 2008 within Lanark County 16:50, Ottawa 90th Percentile Response time for January 2008 within Lanark County 19:12)

February 2008 County 90th Percentile Response Time 16:04 (Up to latest data rec’d Feb 19-08)
(Note: Renfrew County 90th Percentile Response time for February 2008 within Lanark County 19:59)

March 2008 County 90th Percentile Response Time 18:19 (Up to latest data rec’d April 16-08)
(Note: Leeds Grenville County 90th Percentile Response time for March 2008 within Lanark County 20:24)

April 2008 County 90th Percentile Response Time 15:00 (Up to latest data rec’d May 8-08)

May 2008 County 90th Percentile Response Time 14:58 (Up to latest data rec’d June 13-08)
(Note: Renfrew County 90th Percentile Response time for May 2008 within Lanark County 30:07)

June 2008 County 90th Percentile Response Time 15:10 (Up to latest data rec’d July 14-08)
(Note: Renfrew County 90th Percentile Response time for June 2008 within Lanark County 29:16)

July 2008 County 90th Percentile Response Time 17:25 (Up to latest data rec’d Sept 15-08)
(Note: Renfrew County 90th Percentile Response time for July 2008 within Lanark County 32:28)

August 2008 County 90th Percentile Response Time 16:34 (Up to latest data rec’d Sept 15-08)

September 2008 County 90th Percentile Response Time 15:45 (Up to latest data rec’d Sept 15-08)

October 2008 County 90th Percentile Response Time 17:13 (Up to latest data rec’d Jan 14-09)

November 2008 County 90th Percentile Response Time 16:42 (Up to latest data rec’d Jan 14-09)

December 2008 County 90th Percentile Response Time 15:29 (Up to latest data rec’d Jan 14-09)

Overall 2008 Average 15:34
Attached you will find additional reports attached with the breakdown of calls done in outside Upper Tier Municipalities as well as 90th Percentile response times from previous months.

Respectfully submitted;
James R. McIsaac, Manager Dated January 20, 2009

Lanark County Land Ambulance Service

Activity Levels / Response Times Within Municipalities
For the Activity Period Ended December 31, 2008

Chart 1 - Response Time Within Various Municipalities (To Nearest Minute) Codes 3 & 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>1999</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>TenInc/Dec Year Since 2001 Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Smiths Falls</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8 9 9 10 10 10 10 11 11 10 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carleton Place</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12 11 10 10 10 10 10 9 10 10 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perth</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beckwith</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18 -2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drummond North Elmsley</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi Mills</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montague</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tay Valley</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lanark Highlands</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>29 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Average Time For County</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Overall Average Response Times</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Chart 2 - Call Volume by Municipality - Year to Date - Codes 1 to 4 and 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drummond North Elmsley</td>
<td>2,941</td>
<td>2,948</td>
<td>1,376</td>
<td>2,104</td>
<td>2,398</td>
<td>2,342</td>
<td>2,475</td>
<td>2,408</td>
<td>2,493</td>
<td>2,334</td>
<td>958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi Mills</td>
<td>2,139</td>
<td>1,956</td>
<td>1,529</td>
<td>1,838</td>
<td>2,391</td>
<td>2,414</td>
<td>2,555</td>
<td>2,925</td>
<td>3,124</td>
<td>3,322</td>
<td>1,793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smiths Falls</td>
<td>699</td>
<td>699</td>
<td>1,837</td>
<td>2,304</td>
<td>2,239</td>
<td>2,094</td>
<td>1,946</td>
<td>1,866</td>
<td>1,875</td>
<td>1,831</td>
<td>-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perth</td>
<td>2,067</td>
<td>1,906</td>
<td>2,157</td>
<td>2,107</td>
<td>2,202</td>
<td>2,240</td>
<td>2,086</td>
<td>1,941</td>
<td>2,482</td>
<td>2,503</td>
<td>346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carleton Place</td>
<td>962</td>
<td>928</td>
<td>1,245</td>
<td>1,214</td>
<td>1,425</td>
<td>1,442</td>
<td>1,540</td>
<td>1,780</td>
<td>1,810</td>
<td>1,858</td>
<td>613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non Jurisdictional</td>
<td>825</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>1,271</td>
<td>1,185</td>
<td>1,021</td>
<td>1,008</td>
<td>937</td>
<td>977</td>
<td>1,060</td>
<td>-40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beckwith</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>559</td>
<td>607</td>
<td>633</td>
<td>675</td>
<td>718</td>
<td>463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tay Valley</td>
<td>497</td>
<td>539</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>-195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lanark Highlands</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montague</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Calls</strong></td>
<td>10,641</td>
<td>10,516</td>
<td>10,007</td>
<td>11,738</td>
<td>12,908</td>
<td>12,539</td>
<td>12,701</td>
<td>12,991</td>
<td>14,086</td>
<td>14,239</td>
<td>4,232</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Chart 3 - Call Volume by Ambulance Base - Year to Date - Codes 1 to 4 and 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Almonte</th>
<th>Carleton Place</th>
<th>Perth</th>
<th>Smiths Falls</th>
<th>2008 To Date</th>
<th>2008 Projected Total</th>
<th>2008 Calls By Mun</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drummond North Elmsley</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1,194</td>
<td>1,106</td>
<td>2,334</td>
<td>2,334</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi Mills</td>
<td>1,449</td>
<td>1,838</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3,322</td>
<td>3,322</td>
<td>45.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smiths Falls</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>1,539</td>
<td>1,831</td>
<td>1,831</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perth</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1,908</td>
<td>554</td>
<td>2,503</td>
<td>2,503</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carleton Place</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>1,397</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>1,858</td>
<td>1,858</td>
<td>34.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non Jurisdictional</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>537</td>
<td>1,060</td>
<td>1,060</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beckwith</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>718</td>
<td>718</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tay Valley</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lanark Highlands</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montague</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,032</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,056</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,070</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,081</strong></td>
<td><strong>14,239</strong></td>
<td><strong>14,239</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percentage of Calls by Base</strong></td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>28.5%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>28.7%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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- Almonte: 14%
- Carleton Place: 28%
- Perth: 29%
- Smiths Falls: 29%
## Chart 4 - Dispatch Priority Codes - Year To Date

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Codes</th>
<th>1999</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Code 1 - Routine Transfer</td>
<td>2,508</td>
<td>2,501</td>
<td>2,276</td>
<td>2,153</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>1,828</td>
<td>1,366</td>
<td>1,045</td>
<td>856</td>
<td>792</td>
<td>792</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code 2 - Booked Call</td>
<td>1,516</td>
<td>1,657</td>
<td>1,732</td>
<td>1,229</td>
<td>943</td>
<td>931</td>
<td>706</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code 3 - Urgent Not Life Threatening</td>
<td>1,523</td>
<td>1,541</td>
<td>1,338</td>
<td>1,390</td>
<td>1,537</td>
<td>1,455</td>
<td>1,496</td>
<td>1,710</td>
<td>2,084</td>
<td>1,943</td>
<td>1,943</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code 4 - Life Threatening</td>
<td>2,653</td>
<td>2,910</td>
<td>2,643</td>
<td>3,088</td>
<td>3,441</td>
<td>3,382</td>
<td>3,807</td>
<td>3,925</td>
<td>4,347</td>
<td>4,394</td>
<td>4,394</td>
<td>30.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code 8 - Standby Call</td>
<td>2,441</td>
<td>1,907</td>
<td>2,018</td>
<td>3,880</td>
<td>4,987</td>
<td>4,943</td>
<td>5,326</td>
<td>5,806</td>
<td>6,342</td>
<td>6,674</td>
<td>6,674</td>
<td>46.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Calls</strong></td>
<td>10,641</td>
<td>10,516</td>
<td>10,007</td>
<td>11,740</td>
<td>12,908</td>
<td>12,539</td>
<td>12,701</td>
<td>12,991</td>
<td>14,086</td>
<td>14,239</td>
<td>14,239</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Projected Calls**
- **Calls By Date**
- **% of Total Calls**
From: 1/01/08 to 12/31/08  
**Codes 1 to 4 and 8**  
**Base: Head Office**

## Call Volume by NonJurisdiction Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Calls</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leeds &amp; Grenville County</td>
<td>501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ottawa Region</td>
<td>455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingston</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renfrew County</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frontenac County</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Calls:** 1060
The Sub-Committee met on Monday, February 2\textsuperscript{nd}, 2009 at 3:00 p.m. at the Lanark County Administration Building, 99 Christie Lake Road, Perth, Ontario.

Members Present: Bruce Horlin, Councillor  
Dianne McConkey, Professional from the Stakeholder Community  
Debbie Bonselaar, Citizen Volunteer  
Richard Allan, Member with a Disability  
Deborah Bowes, Member with a Disability  
Martha Read, Member with a Disability  
Sharon Lee, Member with a Disability

Staff/Others Present: Sandy Grey, Social Housing Manager  
Cathie Ritchie, Clerk  
Leslie Drynan, Deputy Clerk  
Marilyn Allen, Occupational Health & Safety Specialist  
Tammy Kealy-Donaldson, Ontario Works Supervisor

Absent: Nancy Green, Director of Social Services  
Jonathan Allen, Facilities and Fleet Manager  
Kim Richard, Member with a Disability

ACCESSIBILITY ADVISORY SUB-COMMITTEE

Chair: Bruce Horlin, Councillor

1. **CALL TO ORDER**

   The meeting was called to order at 3:04 p.m.  
   A quorum was present.

2. **ELECTION OF CHAIR**

   **MOTION #LCAA-2009-01**

      **MOVED BY:** Debbie Bonselaar  
      **SECONDED BY:** Martha Read

      “\textbf{THAT}, Bruce Horlin be appointed as Chair of the 2009 Lanark County Accessibility Advisory Sub-Committee.”

      **ADOPTED**

3. **DISCLOSURE OF PECUNIARY INTEREST**

   None at this time.
4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MOTION #LCAA-2009-02

MOVED BY: Dianne McConkey
SECONDED BY: Sharon Lee

“THAT, the minutes of the Lanark County Accessibility Advisory Sub-Committee meeting held on December 2\textsuperscript{nd}, 2008 be approved as amended.”

ADOPTED

5. ADDITIONS AND APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Under Communications:

ii) Ministry of Community & Social Services – Posting of Final Proposed Transportation Standard

iii) Deadline for Public Review of Infrastructure and Communication Standard

iv) Lanark County Media Release – Tribute to Round Garden Volunteers

MOTION #LCAA-2008-03

MOVED BY: Debbie Bonselaar
SECONDED BY: Martha Read

“THAT, the agenda be adopted as amended.”

ADOPTED

6. DELEGATIONS/PRESENTATIONS

Introduction of New Member – Richard Allan
Social Housing Manager, Sandy Grey

S. Grey introduced and welcomed Richard Allan to the Committee. R. Allan provided a brief overview of his experience and interest in participating on this Committee.

7. COMMUNICATIONS

i) Sub-Committee Contact List

ii) Ministry of Community & Social Services – Posting of Final Proposed Transportation Standard

iii) Deadline for Public Review of Infrastructure and Communication Standard

iv) Lanark County Media Release – Tribute to Round Garden Volunteers

B. Horlin explained that Round Garden volunteers have diminished over the years. There are three remaining volunteers and sufficient funds to purchase plants/flowers for the 2009 season, however the intent is for the County to take over maintenance.
C. Ritchie explained that Round Garden volunteers will be recognized for their efforts at the March Council meeting. A brief discussion took place in regards to a magazine article written about the Round Garden.

**MOTION #LCAA-2008-04**

MOVED BY: Deborah Bowes  
SECONDED BY: Sharon Lee

“THAT, the February 2009 Communications be accepted as information.”

**ADOPTED**

8. REPORTS

i) Accessibility Standards  
**Social Housing Manager, Sandy Grey**

S. Grey explained that the draft report regarding Accessibility Standards has been prepared to inform council of the municipal requirements contained in the Provincial regulation. The Report provides a summary of the three standards. The intent is that the report will go forward to the Corporate Services Committee meeting on February 11th, 2009.

**MOTION #LCAA-2008-05**

MOVED BY: Dianne McConkey  
SECONDED BY: Debbie Bonselaar

“THAT, the Accessibility Advisory Sub-Committee recommend that the Draft Accessibility Standards Report be forwarded to the February Corporate Services Committee meeting.”

**ADOPTED**

ii) Draft Accessibility Plan 2008  
**Social Housing Manager, Sandy Grey**

S. Grey explained that the 2008 Accessibility Plan has been prepared in draft format and circulated to Sub-Committee members for comment. Minor grammatical corrections have been made. Comments were made pertaining to the accessible washroom symbols illustrated throughout the document.

**MOTION #LCAA-2008-06**

MOVED BY: Martha Read  
SECONDED BY: Dianne McConkey

“THAT, the Accessibility Advisory Sub-Committee recommend that the Draft 2008 Accessibility Plan, as amended be forwarded to the February Corporate Services Committee meeting.

**ADOPTED**
D. Bonselaar, on behalf of herself and D. Bowes thanked the Committee for allowing their participation at the Reach – Equality & Justice for People with Disabilities Conference. D. Bonselaar provided an overview of two workshops; Put Our Minds to Work: Rethinking Mental Health and Illness in the Workplace and Mental Health Works: Issues and Solutions in the Workplace.

Discussion took place regarding the duty of the employer, employee and alternate work arrangements with respect to mental illness. Comments were made with respect to informing management / co-workers of mental illness and privacy issues.

**MOTION #LCAA-2008-07**

MOVED BY: Sharon Lee  
SECONDED BY: Dianne McConkey

“**THAT**, the information regarding the Reach – Equality & Justice for People with Disabilities Conference be received as information.

ADOPTED

S. Grey explained that the Draft Accessibility – Customer Service Policy has been circulated to Sub-Committee members for comment. In addition, two handbooks have been developed in an attempt to include all training requirements in one document. It was noted that the Accessibility Standards for Customer Service came into force on January 1, 2008, and Lanark County, as a designated public services organization is required to be in compliance with the standard by January 1, 2010. Given the varied workplaces throughout the County of Lanark, an array of training options must be created in order to accommodate the training needs of all employees. S. Grey suggested that members test the free online training offered by accessing the following website:  
[www.mcss.gov.on.ca/mcss/serve-ability/splash.html](http://www.mcss.gov.on.ca/mcss/serve-ability/splash.html).

**MOTION #LCAA-2008-08**

MOVED BY: Sharon Lee  
SECONDED BY: Debbie Bonselaar

“**THAT**, the Draft Accessibility - Customer Service Policy be received as information.

ADOPTED
9. NEW/OTHER BUSINESS

i) 2009 Meeting schedule

**MOTION #LCAA-2008-09**

MOVED BY: Martha Read  
SECONDED BY: Deborah Bowes

“THAT, the Accessibility Advisory Sub-Committee – 2009 Schedule be accepted as information.

ADOPTED

ii) Suggested Accessibility Committee Goals for 2009

S. Grey individually reviewed the 2009 Suggested Goals for the Accessibility Sub-Committee. Discussion took place regarding the suggested goals, and each item was prioritized with respect to workload and timing.

D. Bonselaar and M. Read agreed to assist in locating a venue and guest speaker for the December 2009 luncheon. A suggestion was made that the Lanark Transportation Association be included as part of the December 2009 meeting luncheon.

D. McConkey agreed to assist in undertaking a review of the County communications systems.

It was noted that the Accessibility Guide document has not been recently updated. Direction was provided to staff to draft a letter to AMCTO (Association of Municipal Managers, Clerks & Treasurers) seeking access to an updated guideline.

D. McConkey agreed to draft an article promoting Access Awareness Week for the EMC.

B. Horlin suggested that it may be beneficial to undertake an accessibility promotion initiative whereby the local Mayors attempt to navigate their town as a person with a disability. Discussion took place regarding this potential initiative and a recommendation was made to defer further discussion to the April meeting.

**MOTION #LCAA-2008-10**

MOVED BY: Martha Read  
SECONDED BY: Deborah Bowes

“THAT, the Accessibility Advisory Committee adopt the following goals for 2009:
1. Prepare for compliance with AODA standards
   > maintain awareness of AODA standards as they are developed
   > increase staff knowledge of disability related issues and legislated requirements
   > provide assistance to departments with impact analysis
   > work with local municipalities to prepare training plan
   > explore alternate format options for publications
2. Organize a joint meeting of local accessibility representatives for December 2009. Agenda to include Christmas luncheon, guest speaker, training opportunity etc.
3. Develop relationship with Lanark Transportation Association
   > invite to meeting
   > attend their board meeting
4. Equip staff ( & public?) with accessibility resources and information tools
5. Promote Access Awareness Week
6. Review communications systems for people who are deaf, deafened or hard of hearing – TTY, pocket talker, text based communications systems
7. Promote employment opportunities for people with disabilities
   > workshop on employment equity
   > workshop on harassment & discrimination
8. Accessibility audit of sub offices – Smiths Falls, Carleton Place, Almonte
9. Develop Resource Guide to promote existing programs to assist people with disabilities
10. Participate in review of development of accessible trail at Lanark County Administration Building

ADOPTED

10. NEXT MEETING

    Monday, April 6th, 2009 at 3:00 p.m.

11. ADJOURNMENT

    The Sub-Committee adjourned at 4:39 p.m. on motion by D. Bowes and M. Read.
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