



COMMUNITY SERVICES COMMITTEE AGENDA

Community Services Committee Meeting
Monday, June 17, 2013
Tom Davies Square

COUNCILLOR RON DUPUIS, CHAIR

Terry Kett, Vice-Chair

6:00 p.m. or 30 minutes
after the conclusion of the
Operations Committee Meeting,
whichever is earlier.

COMMUNITY SERVICES COMMITTEE MEETING
COMMITTEE ROOM C-11

Council and Committee Meetings are accessible. For more information regarding accessibility,
please call 3-1-1 or email clerks@greatersudbury.ca.

DECLARATIONS OF PECUNIARY INTEREST AND THE GENERAL NATURE THEREOF

PRESENTATIONS

1. Report dated June 5, 2013 from the General Manager of Community Development regarding Changes to Child Care Funding and Junior Citizens Daycare. **4 - 8**
(ELECTRONIC PRESENTATION) (RECOMMENDATION PREPARED)
 - Tyler Campbell, Manager Children Services
 - Ron Henderson, Director Citizen Services
 - Melissa Pitfield, on behalf of Lois Mahon, Chair of Best Start Integration and Planning Network

(This report outlines the changes that have been introduced for Child Care funding in Ontario.)
2. Delivery of Emergency Medical Services in the City of Greater Sudbury
(ELECTRONIC PRESENTATION) (FOR INFORMATION ONLY)
 - Aaron Archibald, Deputy Chief of EMS Operations

(This presentation will provide an operational overview on the delivery of Emergency Medical Services to the City of Greater Sudbury.)
3. Report dated June 4, 2013 from the Chief of Emergency Services regarding Emergency Services Department 2014 Capital Budget. **9 - 13**
(ELECTRONIC PRESENTATION) (RECOMMENDATION PREPARED)
 - Tim P. Beadman, Chief of Emergency Services

(Emergency Service Department Draft 2014 Capital Budget and 2015 to 2018 Capital Forecast.)

REGULAR AGENDA

MANAGERS' REPORTS

- R-1. Report dated June 4, 2013 from the Chief of Emergency Services regarding Standardization of Ambulance Fleet. **14 - 16**
(RECOMMENDATION PREPARED)

(The Emergency Services Department, EMS Division is seeking authorization to maintain a standardized ambulance fleet with Demers Ambulance Incorporated.)
- R-2. Report dated May 30, 2013 from the General Manager of Community Development regarding Jean Tellier Community Trail Naming Request. **17 - 42**
(RECOMMENDATION PREPARED)

(The Coniston Community Action Network has submitted a request to name a trail that was built in the fall of 2012, the Jean Tellier Trail. The request is supported by the Coniston CAN, Councillor Doug Craig and Rainbow Routes Association.)

- R-3. Report dated May 23, 2013 from the General Manager of Community Development regarding Local Rules Under the Housing Services Act (HSA).
(RECOMMENDATION PREPARED)

43 - 53

(The report outlines social housing policies to be adopted as required under the Housing Services Act (HSA).)

ADDENDUM

CIVIC PETITIONS

QUESTION PERIOD AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

NOTICES OF MOTION

ADJOURNMENT

BRIGITTE SOBUSH, DEPUTY CITY CLERK

FRANCA BORTOLUSSI, COUNCIL ASSISTANT

Request for Decision

Changes to Child Care Funding and Junior Citizens Daycare

Presented To: Community Services Committee

Presented: Monday, Jun 17, 2013

Report Date Wednesday, Jun 05, 2013

Type: Presentations

Recommendation

WHEREAS the Ministry of Education has changed the provincial funding formula for child care which will produce a projected local municipal shortfall of \$1,079,804 for 2013;

AND WHEREAS staff have consulted the child care community and reviewed options for policy changes to mitigate the impact;

AND WHEREAS the province has provided the municipality \$6,676,180 in mitigation funding to assist with the transition of the system over the next 5 years;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the City Greater Sudbury authorize the policy changes outlined in the report dated June 5, 2013 from the General Manager of Community Development and authorize a system review of which Junior Citizens Daycare Centre (JCDC) will form part of a report back to the Community Services Committee in 8 to 12 months with respect to the future potential \$4.6 million loss to the local municipal child care system;

AND THAT mitigation funding be used to ensure children or families be grandparented out of the system over the next 2.5 years while the policy changes are implemented.

Signed By

Report Prepared By

Tyler Campbell
Manager of Children Services
Digitally Signed Jun 5, 13

Division Review

Ron Henderson
Director of Citizen Services
Digitally Signed Jun 5, 13

Recommended by the Department

Catherine Matheson
General Manager of Community Development
Digitally Signed Jun 5, 13

Recommended by the C.A.O.

Doug Nadorozny
Chief Administrative Officer
Digitally Signed Jun 5, 13

Background

As presented at both the February 4th and April 15th Community Services Committee meetings, the Ministry of Education has made changes to the provincial funding formula for child care. The net shortfall for 2013 is \$1,079,804 with an identified future risk of \$4,649,487. As well, at the April 15th Community Services Committee meeting, staff indicated that a community priority setting process was started to look at policy changes that would achieve the required savings for 2013.

Review of Funding – Ministry of Education Provincial and Municipal

Funding Type	Provincial	Municipal	Total ⁽¹⁾
Total 2012 Budget	\$17,529,589	\$2,681,240	\$20,210,829
Total 2012 Actual	\$16,665,063	\$2,332,093	\$18,997,156
2012 Surplus	\$ 864,526	\$ 349,147	\$ 1,213,673
Total 2013 Budget	\$15,758,250	\$2,159,102	\$17,917,352
2013 Funding Shortfall	\$ 1,079,804		
2013 Municipal Associated Budget Surplus		\$450,000 ⁽²⁾	
Mitigation Dollars Received	\$ 6,676,180		
Identified Future Risk	\$ 4,649,487		

(1) Net of JCDC parental revenue.

(2) Municipal associated budget surplus based on revised 2013 budget requirements.

As seen above, the municipality will have \$450,000 in surplus municipal funds which were previously allocated in the 2013 budget to match cost shared programs with the province. Traditionally CGS has not funded the shortfall from programs that have been previously funded by the province. Should the City re-invest the \$450,000 towards the provincial shortfall, it would represent a 100% municipal contribution towards provincially funded programs which are now under review in this report.

Junior Citizens Day Care (JCDC) is another aspect of the daycare system that the Community Services Committee began reviewing in 2012 to look specifically at levy savings and making it more viable. A sub-committee was formed as directed by the Community Services Committee. The new funding formula changes and impact were considered by the sub-committee as part of their review and a recommendation from the committee is outlined in this report.

Community Priority Setting Process

On March 28th, staff met with the child care community regarding the local impact of the child care funding formula changes. During that session, a facilitated process was undertaken by the Social Planning Council to arrive at the top priorities for the child care community. The top six priorities were listed as follows:

Community Priority	Rating
Early Childhood Educator recruitment and retention and plans for credential development	30 Points
Inclusive system planning and leadership	30 Points
Flexibility for working families (ie – part time and night shift)	28 Points
Quality Child care	18 Points
Inclusion of all children (special needs funding)	17 Points
Staff wages, benefits and continuity	16 Points

As shown in the above table, the majority of the priorities related to recruitment and retention of staff, wages and quality. All of these priorities are currently supported by the operating grant that the City pays to providers based on staffing and licensed capacity. Given the priorities set out by the child care community, the City has looked at policy changes that would have an indirect impact on operations of providers and allow them to continue to receive the full operating grant in 2013. City staff then looked at the core services that are provided to families and is recommending the following policy changes to achieve the required \$1,079,907 reduction:

Policy Changes

Policy	Reductions
School Readiness for High Risk Families	\$550,000
10 to 12 Year Olds	\$200,000
Administration and Miscellaneous Policy Changes	\$140,000
Waitlist	\$189,804
Total	\$1,079,804

** Note: Assumptions based on 2012 usage rates

Changes to School Readiness for High Risk Families

The policy is dedicated to Ontario Works/Ontario Disability Support families that have children 18 to 44 months in age. The need for this program is based on research that indicates that children from families with low socio-economic status benefit from school readiness programs. The total cost for the program was approximately \$800,000 in 2012. Social Services has agreed to fund a portion of the costs. A program evaluation is currently underway to determine the best way to continue with the future role out of the program. Existing children in the system would be grand parented. It could take over two years for the policy changes to take full effect. Overall, the policy changes would result in approximate savings of \$550,000 based on 2012 usage rates. The total number of children currently enrolled is 192.

Elimination of 10 to 12 Year Old Subsidized Care

Greater Sudbury has supported subsidies for 10 to 12 year olds in licensed care, however many communities in Ontario do not. The Child Care guidelines from the Province indicate that the City may grant subsidies to 10 to 12 year olds but it is not a core requirement of the guidelines. Existing children in the system that have reached the age of 10 will continue with services until they age out of the program which could take up to two years. Overall, the policy changes would result in approximate savings of \$200,000 per year based on 2012 usage rates. The total number of children in this category as of May 2013 is 126.

Administration and Misc. Policy Changes

Children Services will revisit its organizational structure in 2013 along with reviewing marketing supports to the system with the aim of achieving \$100,000 in savings. Marketing support to promote licensed care and childcare subsidy is not needed as much due to the maturation of the childcare system since the injection of Best Start dollars several years ago.

Miscellaneous Policy Changes

In the process of the policy review that was undertaken by staff, there were several policies that were identified that could be changed in order to align policies to core services. The following changes are proposed:

- **Reduce job search time from 12 weeks to 4 weeks** - This policy covers parents who lose their job while having a child in day care. It currently allows for continuity of care for a 12 week period so that the parent does not lose a day care spot if they are re-employed in the 12 week period. The change would be to 4 weeks which is consistent with the post-secondary job search policy of 4 weeks after graduating from post-secondary education.
- **Lower the minimum monthly contribution cap for parents from \$35 to \$10** - This policy allows CGS to cover the cost of a parent's contribution to child care if their monthly contribution is currently \$35 or less. This is the amount that is billed to the parent from the day care as the parental contribution, since subsidy is on a sliding scale. The proposal is to lower this threshold from \$35 to \$10, meaning parents will be responsible for the paying their contribution from \$10 and up on a monthly basis.

- **Reduce the number of absent days afforded to clients from 45 to 36 days per year** (pro-rated for part time clients) - This policy pays day cares the cost of an absence of the child up to 45 days per year. It is recommended that the number of days be reduced from 45 to 36 days, meaning that parents would be responsible for paying the full cost of any absences over 36 days.

- **Revise the self-employment start-up allowance from 2 years to 1 year** - This policy allows for access to full time child care while a parent is in the start-up phase of self-employment up to 2 years. The proposal would see this time frame reduced to 1 year, meaning that the parent would have to prove viability of the self-employment to continue with child care.

The above policy changes would result in approximate savings of \$40,000.

Waitlist

The final policy change that would be used to offset the funding reduction would be a prioritized waitlist. There was a prioritized waitlist being used for child care several years ago up to the inception of Best Start funding which gave CGS a unique opportunity to operate without the need for it. Several communities in Ontario currently have a prioritized system in place. A prioritized waitlist policy will be brought back to the Standing Committee for review and a 2014 implementation. The amount to which the policy will be used will depend on demand and usage within the system.

Mitigation Funding

Since the Ministry has made the new funding formula announcement in December of 2012, mitigation funding has been provided to municipalities to transition local daycare systems. CGS has received \$6,676,180 and will partly draw on these funds to transition the aforementioned policy changes in the system. This will ensure that children or families will be grand parented out of the system over the next 3 years while the policy changes are implemented. Based on a financial analysis, it is anticipated that the remaining mitigation dollars could be used to further transition the system if and when the \$4,649,487 in identified risk becomes a reality.

System Review

The positive change to the provincial funding formula has been the fact that municipalities have been given more flexibility with how they spend the provincial funding allocation. Therefore, Children Services will be moving towards changes in how the local system is funded. In the past, operational funding was given to day care centres based on a formula for wage subsidy. Staff is recommending a system review to look at possible changes to the operating grant that is provided to centres along with looking at efficiencies to prepare the system for the identified risk of \$4,649,487. Children Services staff have already shared some data with daycare providers about the number of children in the system along with the number of licensed spaces. It is recommended that a report be brought back to committee within the next 8 to 12 months on next steps.

Junior Citizens Sub-Committee

The JCDC Sub-Committee was formed after the January 21st, 2013 Community Services Committee meeting, in which the committee directed staff to work with stakeholders to review possible savings to the municipal levy. The sub-committee made up of union representatives, community childcare representatives, management, parents and a councilor, met twice to review JCDC operations. The committee was presented with detailed information on the operations of JCDC which included an overview of the new funding formula and its associated impact. The average cost per subsidized child was \$6,304 for JCDC versus \$3,063 at a community centre and that the municipality recovers part of its cost from the municipal levy. Closure of the centre would result in additional subsidy dollars for the community along with the savings to the municipal levy projected at approximately \$125,000 for 2013.

Many of the participants asked about possible reductions in overhead costs, which would be very difficult as

89% of costs (2012 actual) are directly related to salary and benefits. This is due to mandated staffing ratios under the Day Nurseries Act and the salary and benefit rates set out in the Collective Agreement. The group agreed that JCDC could form part of a bigger system review. The review would examine ways to make the system more efficient and allow for greater flexibility for part time children and parents working shift work requiring evening care. This aligns with the community priorities of system planning and flexibility for families.

Environmental Scan

As was reported at the December 3rd, 2012 Community Services Committee meeting, direct delivery has been a recent topic of discussion among municipalities as the discussion around non-core services continues across the province. The Region of Peel conducted a review of all of its municipally run centres and came to the following conclusions:

- Phased withdrawal of the Region from direct delivery of child care by September 2014
- Enhance funding for fee subsidy, wage subsidy, special needs supports, quality assurance initiatives and other service priorities and enhancements.

*Early Learning and Child Care Task Force Recommendations – Aug 27, 2012

Most recently, the City of Kingston made a decision to close its municipally run day care centre in the fall of 2013 after 38 years in operation. The City was facing a projected shortfall of approximately \$175,000 despite charging parents a daily rate of \$80 per child.

*Kingston EMC – May 30, 2013

Locally, Cambrian College decided in 2010 to close its college run child care centre which produced reported savings of \$250,000 per year. The College was a direct operator of child care and was subject to many of the same cost pressures that the City faces in regards to staffing costs.

In February 2013, College Boreal in Sudbury announced that it would be closing its directly operated child care centre. The College stated that they would be looking at an RFP process in an attempt to secure a community operator for the fall of 2013.

Conclusion

In summary, the recommended policy changes will achieve the immediate savings over the next two and a half years. In addition, mitigation funding will be used to ensure that existing children are grand parented out of the system. It is further recommended that a service system review with all community stakeholders be undertaken over the next eight to twelve months to prioritize system funding, given the potential \$4,649,487 identified risk, and that the municipally operated JCDC service form part of that review.

Request for Decision

Emergency Services Department 2014 Capital Budget

Presented To:	Community Services Committee
Presented:	Monday, Jun 17, 2013
Report Date	Tuesday, Jun 04, 2013
Type:	Presentations

Recommendation

THAT the City of Greater Sudbury accept the report dated June 4, 2013 from the Chief of Emergency Services regarding the Draft 2014 Capital Budget and 2015 to 2018 Capital Forecast.

Background

Enclosed within this report are the 2014 Emergency Services Department Capital Budget requirements for the continued delivery of emergency services for EMS, Fire, CLELC and Emergency Management, which have been funded through a Capital Envelope (\$1,252,952) and Reserves/Reserve Funds (\$1,329,472) for total allocation of \$2,582,424.

The Fire Services annual capital envelope (\$1,231,292) has been allocated on a 10 year tangible capital asset plan using life cycles primarily for vehicles and major equipment only. In 2012, the Fire Capital Budget gap was projected to be in excess of \$4.6 million over the next four years (2012-2015), and even with the addition of one time dollars allocated by Council, the 2014 Fire Unfunded Capital is projected to be \$3.5 million over the next four years (2014-2017).

This forecasted capital budget shortfall is not all inclusive to support the full liability/replacement of fire equipment and/or the necessary funding to support the capital requirement for maintaining or replacing the 24 Emergency Services Fire/EMS halls. Given the current service levels, it is anticipated that Fire Services will require an increase of \$1.4 million to its capital envelope from the existing \$1,231,292 to \$2,631,292.

Signed By

Report Prepared By

Tim Beadman
Chief of Emergency Services
Digitally Signed Jun 4, 13

Recommended by the Department

Tim Beadman
Chief of Emergency Services
Digitally Signed Jun 4, 13

Recommended by the C.A.O.

Doug Nadorozny
Chief Administrative Officer
Digitally Signed Jun 5, 13

A Comprehensive Fire Services review is currently underway which includes station, vehicle and equipment rationalization process. As well, a building condition assessment will be undertaken, for the 24 Emergency Service Fire/EMS stations, to provide a conditional review of the main building components and to highlight the forecasted capital outlay that will be required over the next ten (10) years. It is anticipated these rationalization exercises may provide further opportunities for reducing this projected capital funding gap of \$1.4 million. As an outcome, a long-term capital plan will be available in 2014 for the 2015 Capital Budget submission process.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION	PROJECT TYPE	2014 REQUEST	2015 OUTLOOK	2016 OUTLOOK	2017 OUTLOOK	2018 OUTLOOK
		R (Renewal)				
EMS						
Vehicles - Ambulance Type III x 3	R	\$ 455,664	\$ 465,916	\$ 476,399	\$ 487,118	\$ 498,078
Medical Equipment - Stretchers Power x 24	R	\$ 384,848	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Technology - Panasonic Toughbooks x 39	R	\$ 194,296	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 212,382
Medical Equipment - Defibrillators x 5	R	\$ 177,443	\$ 145,148	\$ 408,138	\$ 493,198	\$ -
Medical Equipment - Stretchers 9C x 16	R	\$ 17,221	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 14,118
Vehicles - Paramedic Response Unit (PRU) x 2	R	\$ -	\$ 97,838	\$ 200,080	\$ 102,291	\$ 209,184
Vehicles - Argo Unit	R	\$ -	\$ 47,216	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Vehicles - Emergency Support Unit (ESU)	R	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 207,100	\$ -	\$ -
Medical Equipment - Battery Chargers	R	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 31,551	\$ -	\$ -
Technology - Automatic Vehicle Locators (AVL)	R	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 100,886	\$ -
Medical Equipment - Automatic External Defibrillators Units (AED)	R	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 89,842	\$ 63,598
Medical Equipment - Continuous Positive Airway Pressure Units (CPAP)	R	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 69,021	\$ -
TOTAL - EMS		\$ 1,229,472	\$ 756,118	\$ 1,323,268	\$ 1,342,356	\$ 997,360
EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT						
Emergency Operation Centre Renewal	R	\$ 10,830	\$ 11,047	\$ 11,268	\$ 11,493	\$ 11,723
TOTAL - EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT		\$ 10,830	\$ 11,047	\$ 11,268	\$ 11,493	\$ 11,723
CLELC						
Equipment Upgrades	R	\$ 10,830	\$ 11,047	\$ 11,268	\$ 11,493	\$ 11,723
TOTAL - CLELC		\$ 10,830	\$ 11,047	\$ 11,268	\$ 11,493	\$ 11,723
PROJECT COSTS		\$ 1,251,132	\$ 778,212	\$ 1,345,804	\$ 1,365,342	\$ 1,020,806
PROJECT FINANCING						
Reserves: Capital		\$ (1,229,472)	\$ (756,118)	\$ (1,323,268)	\$ (1,342,356)	\$ (997,360)
CAPITAL ENVELOPE (Tax Levy)		\$ 21,660	\$ 22,094	\$ 22,536	\$ 22,986	\$ 23,446
CAPITAL ENVELOPES						
Emergency Management		\$ 10,830	\$ 11,047	\$ 11,268	\$ 11,493	\$ 11,723
CLELC		\$ 10,830	\$ 11,047	\$ 11,268	\$ 11,493	\$ 11,723
Total Capital Envelopes		\$ 21,660	\$ 22,094	\$ 22,536	\$ 22,986	\$ 23,446

Note 1: Emergency Medical Services (EMS) capital projects are funded from the Emergency Service Ambulance Reserve Fund. The City of Greater Sudbury and Ministry of Health and Long Term Care each contribute 50% funding to this reserve fund which are used for capital projects.

Note 2: The five year Capital Budget (with the exception of 2015 & 2018) includes an additional contribution from the Emergency Service Ambulance Reserve Fund versus the contribution to reserves per the Annual Operating Budget in order to meet lifecycle requirements.

Priority Setting:

EMS project priorities are based on a 10 year tangible capital asset plan using vehicle / equipment life cycles and utilization strategies.



Fire

PROJECT DESCRIPTION	PROJECT TYPE	2014 REQUEST	2015 OUTLOOK	2016 OUTLOOK	2017 OUTLOOK	2018 OUTLOOK
	R (Renewal)					
	E (Expansion)					
	N (New)					
Light Rescue Vehicle (x2)	R	\$ 365,928	\$ -	\$ 191,290	\$ -	\$ -
Commercial Pumper (x1)	R	\$ 313,971	\$ 321,064	\$ 330,367	\$ 335,910	\$ -
Station Generator (x3)	R	\$ 172,510	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 184,419	\$ -
Prevention - Virtual Office and Scheduling Optimization System	N	\$ 130,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Bunker Gear (x48)	R	\$ 125,484	\$ 23,663	\$ 125,728	\$ 125,734	\$ 142,880
Incident Management - Integrated Communication Solutions	N	\$ 100,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Vehicle Extrication Tools (x2)	R	\$ 62,731	\$ 32,071	\$ 32,793	\$ 33,531	\$ -
Hoses (70 rolls)	R	\$ 36,615	\$ 21,929	\$ 66,388	\$ 10,065	\$ -
Pagers (x50)	R	\$ 24,053	\$ 38,367	\$ 25,148	\$ 24,685	\$ 31,551
Squirt Truck	R	\$ -	\$ 534,515	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Heavy Rescue Vehicle	R	\$ -	\$ 213,806	\$ 218,617	\$ -	\$ -
Thermal Imaging Camera	R	\$ -	\$ 38,485	\$ 39,351	\$ -	\$ -
SCBA Fill Stations	R	\$ -	\$ 21,381	\$ 21,862	\$ 22,354	\$ -
Nozzles	R	\$ -	\$ 10,637	\$ 10,876	\$ 11,121	\$ 11,371
Tanker Truck	R	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 218,616	\$ 223,535	\$ -
Bush Truck	R	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 335,303	\$ 179,834
SCBA Compressors	R	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 483,692
Mobile Radios	R	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 196,019
Portable Radios	R	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 164,746
Mobile Repeaters	R	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 122,697
PROJECT COSTS		\$ 1,331,292	\$ 1,255,918	\$ 1,281,036	\$ 1,306,657	\$ 1,332,790
PROJECT FINANCING						
Reserves: Fire		\$ (100,000)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
CAPITAL ENVELOPE (Tax Levy)		\$ 1,231,292	\$ 1,255,918	\$ 1,281,036	\$ 1,306,657	\$ 1,332,790

Priority Setting:

Fire project priorities are based on a 10 year tangible capital asset plan using vehicle / equipment life cycles and current utilization strategies. A Comprehensive Fire Services review is currently underway which includes station, vehicle and equipment rationalization. As an outcome, a long-term capital plan will be available in 2014 for the 2015 Capital Budget submission process.



Unfunded Capital Projects

Fire

PROJECT DESCRIPTION		PROJECT TYPE	COST
		R (Renewal)	
		E (Expansion)	
		N (New)	
<hr/>			
2014 Unfunded			
Commercial Pump (x3)		R	940,955
Total 2014 Unfunded			940,955
<hr/>			
2015 Unfunded			
Aerial Pump - 75FT (x1)		R	962,128
Total 2015 Unfunded			962,128
<hr/>			
2016 Unfunded			
Heavy Rescue Vehicle (x1)		R	437,233
Total 2016 Unfunded			437,233
<hr/>			
2017 Unfunded			
Custom Pump (x1)		R	670,606
Heavy Rescue Vehicle (x1)		R	447,071
Total 2017 Unfunded			1,117,677
<hr/>			
TOTAL UNFUNDED PROJECTS			\$ 3,457,993

Note:

The unfunded Capital needs for 2014 - 2018 are based on a 10 year tangible capital asset plan using vehicle / equipment life cycles and current utilization strategies.
 A Comprehensive Fire Services review is currently underway which includes station, vehicle and equipment rationalization. As an outcome, a long-term capital plan will be available in 2014 for the 2015 Capital Budget submission process.

Request for Decision

Standardization of Ambulance Fleet

Presented To: Community Services
Committee

Presented: Monday, Jun 17, 2013

Report Date Tuesday, Jun 04, 2013

Type: Managers' Reports

Recommendation

THAT the City of Greater Sudbury authorize the City's Emergency Medical Services (EMS) Division to maintain a standardized ambulance fleet through purchases with Demers Ambulance of Beloeil, Quebec for the next five (5) years. In the event there is a special requirement for a non-standard ambulance or where provincial certification standards change or emerging technological advancements present themselves, a public tender may be issued by the City.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The City of Greater Sudbury EMS seeks Council authorization to maintain a standardized ambulance fleet with Demers Ambulance Incorporated.

In July 2004, Council approved (Resolution 2004-414) the EMS Division to move to a standardized ambulance fleet. The benefits of a standardized fleet are important to the EMS operation and include: standard vehicle configurations and medical equipment location in the vehicles; solid familiarization of the vehicle by Paramedics reducing training requirements associated with multiple models; experienced fleet staff who have training from Demers Ambulances coupled with years of experience in carrying out preventative maintenance and repairs on a single ambulance manufacturer; and use of a standard inventory of parts to minimize vehicle downtime.

BACKGROUND

The City of Greater Sudbury EMS responds to over 36,000 calls annually, travelling over one million kilometers with a fleet of twenty-one (21) ambulances, and twelve (12) Paramedic Response Units which are SUV style, single paramedic units.

The City of Greater Sudbury EMS Division, as part of our annual vehicle replacement program, requires three (3) new ambulances each year. These new vehicles replace those vehicles that have reached or exceeded their service life.

The Ontario Ministry of Health and Long-Term Care (MOHLTC) Emergency Health Services Branch (EHSB) continues to ensure as part of their mandate, only those ambulances certified for the Ontario market are used in the delivery of ambulance services. The MOHLTC indicates the following: Canadian vendors have vehicles certified under the Ontario Provincial Land Ambulance and Emergency Response Vehicle Standard – Version 5 and are able to provide certified ambulances for use by Ontario Emergency Medical Services.

Signed By

Division Review

Joseph Nicholls
Deputy Chief of Emergency Services
Digitally Signed Jun 4, 13

Recommended by the Department

Tim Beadman
Chief of Emergency Services
Digitally Signed Jun 4, 13

Recommended by the C.A.O.

Doug Nadorozny
Chief Administrative Officer
Digitally Signed Jun 4, 13

Ambulance Manufacturer	Cost
Demers Ambulances Inc., Beloeil, Quebec	\$109,376*
Crestline Coach Inc., Saskatoon, Sask.	\$108,403*
Malley Industries, New Brunswick	No GM Gas chassis model certified for Ontario No model available with mobility safety seating

*These comparative prices are base models only and do not reflect chassis rebates (\$11,500 for 2013), optional and custom upgrades that add approx. \$30,000 to the base price. Selected options are added to the base units to improve ergonomics, and enhance paramedic and patient safety. A Sudbury build ambulance costs approximately \$133,099 (net).

Demers Ambulances is one of the largest ambulance manufacturers in North America and is a leader in Canadian ambulance design, manufacture and distribution. Demers Ambulances shares almost the entire Ontario market with Crestline Coach; Malley Industries have only a few units across the province. There are currently no other ambulance manufacturers in Canada that can sell certified ambulances for use by Emergency Medical Services in Ontario.

The EMS Division's experience with Demers Ambulances has been very positive, with few concerns related to the vehicles. Demers has consistently demonstrated strong after sales service through timely commitment to problem resolution and solid technical support. In addition, Demers Ambulance will be undertaking a Preferred Vendor Program in 2013 that will maintain their conversion (excludes chassis) pricing with no increase for 3 years.

Current Sudbury build ambulances conform to the following:

- Demers Mystere MX160XTA Type III Modular Ambulance
- GM Gas chassis (diesel phase out as recommended by Fleet services to save capital and operating costs)
- 159" wheel base with air-ride suspension
- Eco-Smart (anti-idling technology to save fuel)
- Paramedic Mobility Safety Seat
- High performance LED warning system
- Bariatric carrying capability
- Cab console and computer technology/mounts
- Reversing sensors and camera, power seats, electric and heated mirrors

City of Greater Sudbury EMS Division continues to work with Demers Ambulances in developing new technologies that improve patient, paramedic and public safety as well as vehicle serviceability.

BENEFITS OF FLEET STANDARDIZATION

Fleet standardization is important to the EMS Division due to the large number of paramedics working in these vehicles. Standardization allows the Service to optimize the fleet in the areas of vehicle management, training, logistics and maintenance by reducing fleet variation.

The following are the key advantages and benefits of fleet standardization:

- Greater control of fleet logistical operations in terms of managing standard practices for locating equipment, restocking, cleaning and disinfecting practices.
- Standard patient compartment cabinet layout allows equipment to be located in a standardized manner across the entire fleet. This allows paramedics to easily locate emergency supplies and equipment when treating a patient.
- Simplified training required for paramedics as they only need to learn about operating one type of vehicle.
- Allows the city fleet and vendor to better manage warranties and technical support across the entire fleet, one stop shopping.
- Standardized fleet preventative maintenance program.
- Eliminates a need for different vendor parts to maintain ambulances and saves on storage space for fleet services.
- Fleet Services' Mechanics require one set of special tools, manuals, schematics used for diagnostics as well as adjustments and repairs.

- Faster and more efficient repairs due to technician familiarization, training, and experience with a single ambulance type.
- Fleet Services can interchange parts between vehicles to maintain serviceability.
- Mechanics have received specific training on Demers Ambulances; this improves maintenance quality while decreasing down time.

FLEET SERVICES

Standardization is supported by Eric Bertrand, Manager of Fleet Services, who states standardization provides efficiencies in inventory required in maintaining the ambulances as they carry only one line of product reducing inventory levels on hand. There are efficiencies in Technician skills as it is easier to train staff on one product line as opposed to two or three. Finally, standardization results in reduced downtime through proper inventory levels and reduced diagnostic time as Technicians become more proficient on the units.

RECOMMENDATION

The EMS Division recommends the continuation of a standard ambulance fleet for the next five (5) years. In the event there is a special requirement for a non-standard ambulance or where provincial certification standards change or emerging technological advancements present themselves, a public tender may be issued by the City.

Request for Decision

Jean Tellier Community Trail Naming Request

Presented To:	Community Services Committee
Presented:	Monday, Jun 17, 2013
Report Date	Thursday, May 30, 2013
Type:	Managers' Reports

Recommendation

WHEREAS By-law 2012-256 identifies the process of naming and re-naming municipal buildings, properties and parks and elements of buildings and parks;

AND WHEREAS the Coniston Community Action Network (CAN) has submitted a formal request to officially name a two kilometer trail built in Coniston in honour of long-standing community volunteer Jean Tellier;

AND WHEREAS Jean Tellier contributed significantly to bring the trail to fruition;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the City of Greater Sudbury authorize staff to work with the Coniston CAN to follow the required steps according to By-law 2012-256, including a community consultation process.

Background

Coniston community member Jean Tellier was instrumental in the vision for the one kilometer, wheelchair accessible trail built in Coniston and for bringing the project to fruition. The trail connects residents and two schools via the end of Rideau Road to Edward Avenue, and has been built on land owned by the City of Greater Sudbury. The trail is also part of the Trans Canada Trail, which spans the entire Country, which once completed will be 22,000 kilometers in length.

In 2007, retired geography teacher Jean Tellier started regularly visiting the local trail office of Rainbow Routes. He wanted to build a trail for the community of Coniston.

Mr. Tellier walked many routes for Rainbow Routes looking for a Trans Canada Trail connection from Moonlight Beach to Coniston and eastward. He prepared proposals with mapping, GPS coordinates and pictures. Gradually, over time he found a project to pursue and garnered the support of the community.

When Rainbow Routes was building the trail in the Summer of 2012, Mr. Tellier came out every day to check on the crew. His enthusiasm for the project was contagious throughout the community of Coniston, which resulted in a volunteer day with a crew of 15 community members coming out to rake gravel, cut brush and plant trees.

Signed By

Report Prepared By

Barb McDougall-Murdoch
Community Development Co-ordinator
Digitally Signed May 30, 13

Division Review

Real Carre
Director of Leisure Services
Digitally Signed May 30, 13

Recommended by the Department

Catherine Matheson
General Manager of Community Development
Digitally Signed May 30, 13

Recommended by the C.A.O.

Doug Nadorozny
Chief Administrative Officer
Digitally Signed May 30, 13

Jean Tellier's dream sparked the imaginations of the people of Coniston and gave them a source of pride. Over 100 people including students from the neighbouring schools attended the opening of the trail.

Jean passed away in late 2012 as a result of Lou Gehrig's, and because of his passion, drive and countless hours given, both the Coniston Community Action Network (CAN) and Rainbow Routes wish to officially name the trail in his honour and look to complete an additional 216 meters of the trail.

CGS Policy

It is a matter of policy that all naming and re-naming of municipal buildings, properties and parks and of all elements of buildings and parks requires Council approval and that such naming will be governed by the considerations described in the report below.

The Building, Property and Park Name Policy applies to Honorific Naming and New Park development and states several naming principles and priorities:

- Names shall assist in emergency response situations by: avoiding duplication, using similar sounding names.
- Names that place the element of the building, property or park in geographical context, so as to assist the citizens in locating the named element -this may reflect such things as significant ecological or natural resource features.
- Names reflect the purpose or use of the element within the building, property or park.
- Names convey a sense of place and community and celebrate the distinguishing characteristics of the neighbourhood or community.
- Names are understandable, recognizable and explainable to citizens and respect the values in regards to history, heritage and culture of the neighbourhood or community.
- Names reflect an individual or organization's significant contributions to public life in general.
- Names reflect an individual or organization with such extraordinary prominence and lasting distinction that no other individuals, families or organizations can come forward and suggest alternatives.

The significance of an individual's contribution is based on a graduated structure – Neighbourhood or Community. A neighbourhood is defined as an area that provides services and amenities in a specific locality within Greater Sudbury to a small group of citizens. The type of supporting documentation for the naming to occur are acknowledgements that reflect the contributions made by an organization in regards to a specific neighbourhood.

According to the above definition, this request would fall under the Neighbourhood category, meeting the needs of the immediate neighbourhood in Coniston. The applicants have provided the appropriate documentation for consideration.

Procedures

This naming request to name a trail built in Coniston the Sentier Jean Tellier Trail came forward from Coniston Community Action Network Member Kimberley Wahamaa, on behalf of the Coniston CAN. The CAN has the permission of the family of Jean Tellier to name the trail in his honour, and the request also has the support of Ward 9 Councillor Doug Craig.

The application was circulated to the Mayor and Council, and to the appropriate City departments, and a deposit of \$900 was received from the Coniston CAN.

In order to determine if this application is to proceed to the next steps, the Community Services Committee is being asked to evaluate the request by:

- Reviewing the application form (attached)
- Reviewing comments from City of Greater Sudbury Departments (attached)
- Reviewing documentation from the applicant (attached)
- Use the Checklist as a tool to assist in determining if the application satisfies the graduated structure selected along with the naming principles and priorities(attached)

Next Steps

Should the Community Services Committee decide to proceed with the naming request, the proper advertising and community consultation will be performed in accordance with By-law 2012-256. The final step will be to present the request to the Council of the City of Greater Sudbury.

Summary

All of the elements described in the Building, Property and Parks Naming Policy have been followed to this stage. This report outlines the request and process as per By-law 2012-256 which has been attached as a reference.



Sentier Jean Tellier Trail – Naming Request

VIA EMAIL

Barb McDougall-Murdoch
Community Development Co-ordinator
City of Greater Sudbury
PO Box 5000, Station A
200 Brady Street
Sudbury, ON P3A 5P3 Tel. (705) 674-4455, ext. 2422 Fax (705) 671-8145
barb.mcdougall@greatersudbury.ca

Dear Barb:

Re: Sentier Jean Tellier Trail – Naming Request

On behalf of the Coniston Community Action Network (CAN), please accept this proposal for the naming request of the **Sentier Jean Tellier Trail**, according to BY-LAW 2012-256.

For the past four years, Jean Tellier, has been actively urging the Rainbow Routes Association and the Coniston CAN to develop a nature trail in Coniston. Jean Tellier, a resident of Coniston since 1979, is a retired educator. Tellier has walked, flagged, and gps'd the trail every day, and on October 12, 2012, the trail was officially opened. The trail helps Jean keep a handle on the effects of Lou Gehrig's disease. "It keeps me young at heart. I go out and meet people. It gives me joy when I see the children coming to school on their bikes, taking the path. And you see also a lot of older people who said 'I remember walking a dirt trail a long time ago, and now there's a new trail. It's better.'" Tellier said.

Rainbow Routes Association officially opened the trail on October 12, 2012. The two-kilometre trail, which is wheelchair accessible, connects residents and two schools via the end of Rideau Road to Edward Avenue in Coniston. It is also part of the Trans

Canada Trail, which spans the entire country. Deb McIntosh, Rainbow Routes Association's executive director, said Tellier was a driving force behind the creation of the trail.

The Trans Canada Trail stretches across the entire country, and once completed, it will be 22,000 kilometres in length. Locally, the trail winds its way from Nairn Centre in the west, through the heart of the city towards Coniston and eventually to North Bay in the east.

This trail is a great way to meet people from all parts of Coniston. It is a way for our community to join the trend of making the area of Greater Sudbury a friendly environment for pedestrians and cyclists of all ages and encompasses the Coniston tag line..."We're part of a healthy community...We work together for a Green Coniston."

The Coniston Community Action Network (CAN) has endorsed this project. The trail allows pedestrians, student and seniors to walk in a natural setting in their backyard without motorized vehicles. This trail will have close proximity to the new Seniors Complex that is proposed the same area.

Below is a map showing the trail.



Since the opening of the trail, Tellier is also working on finishing the last 216 metres of the trail and hopes to have this trail open for snowshoeing in the winter. We welcome the City of Greater Sudbury to adopt the naming of this trail as the Sentier Jean Tellier Trail. Enclosed within this submission are letters of support and signatures of citizens in Coniston who have endorsed the naming of this trail. And media coverage of the official opening is included for your reference.

We thank you for your consideration and look forward to hearing from you.

Regards,

Kimberley Wahamaa

Kimberley Wahamaa
Administration/Marketing
Coniston CAN
www.myconiston.ca
wahamaa@persona.ca
705-694-9857

MEDIA RELEASE (Rainbow Routes) Greater Sudbury Has a New Trail!



Coniston trail opening.



MEDIA RELEASE

Trans Canada Trail through Coniston

Rainbow ROUTES Association officially opens the newest section of the Trans Canada Trail

Rainbow Routes Association officially opened the newest section of the Trans Canada Trail at a press conference held at midday Friday, October 12th in Coniston. This new wheelchair accessible trail connects residents and two schools via the end of Rideau Road to Edward Ave in Coniston, and serves as a portion of the Trans Canada Trail.

"It is through partnerships represented here today that Greater Sudbury will become the healthy community that we are all working toward," said Councilor Doug Craig in his greetings from the City of Greater Sudbury. "This trail will provide opportunities for active living regardless of age or ability. I've already heard that students from St. Paul the Apostle and Notre Dame de la Merci are already using this new path to get to and from school, now *that* is active transportation!"

Classes from the neighbouring schools attended the opening and presented cards of thanks thanking for this new addition to their community. The trail will serve as a recreational and commuter walking path for area residents, and with its close proximity to two elementary schools, will provide the opportunity for outdoor education for students.

"Our Coniston Community Action Network identified this trail project as a priority in our 2008 visioning session," stated C.A.N. Co-Chair Wyman MacKinnon in his message, "and we are so pleased that what we envisioned 4 years ago is now a reality."

The Trans Canada Trail stretches across the entire country from East to West to North and South. When completed, it will be 22,000 km in length. Locally, the trail winds its way from Nairn Centre in the west, through the heart of the City towards Coniston and eventually to North Bay in the east. Rainbow Routes announced at the opening that they have completed 85% of the route through Greater Sudbury and has set itself the goal of being complete by 2015.

“The Trans Canada Trail is widely considered to be one of the most ambitious endeavors ever

undertaken by the volunteer sector in Canada.” said Al MacPherson, Acting General Manager of Trans Canada Trail Ontario in a letter to Rainbow Routes. “We are truly pleased to be able to count on the support of partners like Rainbow Routes Association and we feel equally proud that the Coniston Trail is a part of this national iconic project.”

The community has named this trail Sentier Jean Tellier Trail pending City Council’s approval through the official naming process. Jean Tellier, a resident of Coniston and retired teacher has been the driving force to see Coniston become a part of the Trans Canada Trail. The trail will help provide access to the natural landscape and will contribute greatly to the promotion of active living.

Rainbow Routes’ President Samantha Baulch said, “Rainbow Routes Association is nothing without her partners and community of volunteers. We are continually amazed by the generosity of time and talent from people wanting to be a part of something bigger than themselves, and the number of people behind our trail development projects this summer is truly inspiring.”

This project was made possible in partnership with Rainbow Routes Association, Employment Ontario, Trans Canada Trail, Xstrata Nickel, the City of Greater Sudbury, the Coniston Community Action Network and local resident Jean Tellier. President Samantha Baulch provided a special thank you to the City’s Parks Department, “Rainbow Routes builds these trails, but it is the Parks Department that keeps them in such good shape and we are all very appreciative.”

The official ceremony concluded with coffee and cookies compliments of Tim Horton’s at the corner of Levesque and the Kingsway and a stroll down the new path.

-33-

FOR MORE INFORMATION PLEASE CALL: Deb McIntosh, Executive Director 674-4455 x 4603

www.rainbowroutes.com



To: Coniston C.A.N.
From: Rainbow Routes Association
Date: November 1, 2012
Re: Naming of the new trail in the community of Coniston

When Rainbow Routes develops a new trail, the name of the trail usually comes from the name of the nearby community e.g. Copper Cliff Trail or a near by water body e.g. Kelly Lake Trail.

In the case of this new link of the Trans Canada Trail in Coniston, the commitment of one volunteer to see a trail developed for his community calls out for an alternative name.

Jean Tellier started making appointments on a regular basis with the Rainbow Routes office over 5 years ago. He wanted a walkway for his community of Coniston and he has been persistent where others would have given up. Mr. Tellier hasn't just said he wanted a trail, he was also willing to flag and gps routes, walk the route with RRA staff and develop serious community support to see his vision become a reality.

We understand that the naming process has been put under a moratorium but given Jean Tellier's health condition (he suffers from Lou Gehrig's Disease) and the passion of your community of Coniston to name this trail after this man, we support your desire to move this process forward.

Rainbow Routes Association developed this trail in the Summer of 2012, and the RRA Board of Directors fully endorses the Coniston C.A.N. desire that it be named "Sentier Jean Tellier Trail"

Rainbow Routes Association
200 Brady Street, P.O Box 5000,
Stn A, Sudbury, Ontario, P3A 5P3
Phone (705) 674-4455, ext. 4603
Fax (705) 671-6767
rainbowroutes@greatersudbury.ca
Registered Charitable Number:
87320 8136 RR0001

October 28, 2012

To Whom It May Concern

The Coniston Playground Association has as its main goal, the promotion of physical activity among the people of Coniston, especially its youth. This is accomplished by having the appropriate facilities and programs within the community to achieve this goal.

With that being said, the Sentier Jean Tellier Trail has been an excellent addition to the community. It is another outlet for the people of Coniston to engage in physical activity within a beautiful natural setting.

Without the tireless efforts of Mr. Jean Tellier, this walking trail would never have come to be. And, therefore, we in the Coniston Playground Association support whole-heartedly the naming of the trail as the "Sentier Jean Tellier Trail".

Thank You,

Jason Marcon

Jason Marcon - Vice President

Coniston Playground Association



CONISTON SENIORS AND GOLDEN AGE CLUB

Coniston Community Action Network
PO Box 47,
Coniston, Ontario
P0M 1M0

October 31, 2012

To Whom It May Concern,

Subject: Official Naming Process for the Sentier Jean Tellier Trail

The Coniston Seniors and Golden Age Club on behalf of its members support the Coniston Community Action Network (CAN) in their endeavour to have the Coniston walking trail portion of the Trans Canada Trail within The City of Greater Sudbury officially named the Sentier Jean Tellier Trail.

Jean Tellier, a respected resident of Coniston and retired teacher, has been the driving force to see Coniston become a part of the Trans Canada Trail. The Sentier Jean Tellier Trail will help provide access to the natural landscape and will contribute to the promotion of active living in the area.

Please give careful consideration to the CAN committee's request

Sincerely

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Diane Talevi". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Diane Talevi, President
The Coniston Seniors and Golden Age Club

Please Print Return forms before Nov 1 to Kimberley Wahamaa

[illegible]

1

I SUPPORT THE OFFICIAL NAMING OF THE SENTIER JEAN TELLIER TRAIL
 CONISTON Community Action Network
www.myconiston.ca

Please Print Return forms before Nov 1 to Kimberley Wahamaa

Name	Address	Phone
Shirley		
Clare Smith		
Carleen Hoofbeek		
Mary Cloutier		
Deanna Price		
Esther Laporte		
Viviane Pascon		
Lennie Kalmusinski		
Brenda Dupont		
Reese MacLennan		
Karen Dunlop		
Susie LAFRAIE		
DIANE ANGOVE		
Sandra Hovorka		
Jeanine Cesari		
Suzanne Giroux		
Grace Leblanc		
Clare Boyd		
Mary Boyd-St		
Bertha Raymond		
Katherine Crosswell		
Shirley Barbe		
Erla Coppo		

I SUPPORT THE OFFICIAL NAMING OF THE SENTIER JEAN TELLIER TRAIL
 CONISTON Community Action Network
www.myconiston.ca

Please Print Return forms before Nov 1 to Kimberley Wahamaa

Name	Address	Phone
WAYNE WAHAMAA		
Stella		
DEBORAH CLEVER		
BOB CLEVER		
MARC LAFRANKE		
JOHN DZIMIDOWICZ		
John Cleaver		
LYNDA ZINGER		
S. Dzimidowicz		
Chris Manger		
Myke Lepore		
Stephen Lavigneau		
Frank B. La		
Richard Manger		

I SUPPORT THE OFFICIAL NAMING OF THE SENTIER JEAN TELLIER TRAIL
CONISTON Community Action Network
www.myconiston.ca

Please Print Return forms before Nov 1 to Kimberley Wahamaa

Name	Address	Phone
Bryan Geoffroy		
Debbie Geoffroy		
Joseph Blinn		
Shirley Blinn		
Gail Wahamaa		
Wayne Wahamaa		
Lora Wahamaa		
Andrew Wahamaa		
Kim Wahamaa		
Jim Sauter		
Karen Sauter		

I SUPPORT THE OFFICIAL NAMING OF THE SENTIER JEAN TELLIER TRAIL
 CONISTON Community Action Network
www.myconiston.ca

Please Print Return forms before Nov 1 to Kimberley Wahamaa

Name	Address	Phone
Reanne Fouchier		
Richard Lefebvre		
Walter Hilber		
Jeanne Yvan Plouffe		
Pat Casey		
Wm. D. D. D.		
DAN NIXON		
Pat Nixon		
Ray Lafreniere		
Merrica Eugène		
Faustine Lafreniere		
Suzanne Giroux		
Jeannine Cesnek		
Grace Leblanc		
DIANE ANGLADE		
Jim ANGLADE		
SUSIE LAPRAIRIE		
Roger Giroux		

I SUPPORT THE OFFICIAL NAMING OF THE SENTIER JEAN TELLIER TRAIL
CONISTON Community Action Network
www.myconiston.ca

Please Print Return forms before Nov 1 to Kimberley Wahamaa

Name	Address	Phone
Donna Bosch		
Shirley Lawrence		
Maxine Dale		
Cynthia Laprairie		
Lien Kirk		
Sandra Haurais		
Pam Stukut-Burgess		
Angie Haché		
Josée Portelance		
Bertrine Beddisa		
Suzette Gauthier		
Dawn Dumontelle		
Edwina Brindley		
Sharon Gauthier		
Glenn Dumontelle		
Pauline Lalonde		
Audrey Veno		

Oct 13/2012

■ RECREATION: Coniston walking path named after Jean Tellier

Trans Canada Trail gets addition

Star Staff

The newest link of Trans Canada Trail in Sudbury officially opened in Coniston on Friday.

The new wheelchair accessible trail, which connects residents and two schools via the end of Ildeau Road to Edward Avenue in Coniston, was named after Jean Tellier, pending city council's approval.

Tellier, a resident of Coniston and retired teacher, has been the driving force to see Coniston become a part of the Trans Canada Trail. The Sentier Jean Tellier Trail will help provide access to the natural landscape and will contribute to the promotion of active living in the area.

"It is through partnerships represented here today that Greater Sudbury will become the healthy community that we are all working towards," said Coun. Doug Craig in his greetings from the City of Greater Sudbury.

"This trail will provide opportunities for active living regardless of age or ability. I've already heard that students from St. Paul the Apostle and Notre Dame de la Merce are already using this new path to get to and from school. Now that is active transportation."

Classes from the neighbouring schools attended the opening and presented cards of thanks. The trail will serve as a recre-



LAURA STRICKER The Sudbury Star

From left, Coniston residents Jean Tellier and Bill Merrick on the newest portion of the Trans Canada Trail, which will be named after Tellier.

ational and commuter walking path for area residents, and with its close proximity to two elementary schools, will provide the opportunity for outdoor education for students.

"Our Coniston Community Action Network identified this trail project as a priority in our 2008 visioning session," said

CAN co-chair Wyman MacKinnon. "We are so pleased that what we envisioned four years ago is now a reality."

The Trans Canada Trail stretches across the entire country. When completed, it will be 22,000 km in length.

Locally, the trail winds its way from Bain Centre in the west

through the heart of the city toward Coniston and eventually to North Bay in the east. Rainbow Routes officials said Friday they have completed 85% of the route through Greater Sudbury and has set itself the goal of being complete by 2015.

"The Trans Canada Trail is widely considered to be one of

the most ambitious endeavors ever undertaken by the volunteer sector in Canada," said Al MacPherson, acting general manager of Trans Canada Trail Ontario in a letter to Rainbow Routes.

"We are truly pleased to be able to count on the support of partners like Rainbow Routes Association and we feel equally proud that the Coniston Trail is a part of this national iconic project."

Rainbow Routes' president Samantha Baulich said the trail is a co-operative effort. "Rainbow Routes Association is nothing without her partners and community of volunteers," Baulich said.

"We are continually amazed by the generosity of time and talent from people wanting to be a part of something bigger than themselves, and the number of people behind our trail development projects this summer is truly inspiring."

The project was made possible in partnership with Rainbow Routes Association, Employment Ontario, Trans Canada Trail, Xstrata Nickel, the City of Greater Sudbury, the Coniston Community Action Network and Tellier.

Baulich thanked the city's parks department. "Rainbow Routes builds these trails, but it is the parks department that keeps them in such good shape and all very soon."



Page 2	Même les pompiers voient la vie en rose	Page 3	L'ancienne école St-Louis de Gonzague sera rasée	Éditorial	4
				Voyage à Paris	14 et 15
				Vie active	20
				Sports	25

1,25 \$ TVA incluse Vol. 45, No 21 Mercredi 17 octobre 2012

Le Voyageur

Du nouveau à Coniston :

Le sentier Jean Tellier

Aubin CONISTON — La plus récente section du Sentier transcanadien se retrouve à Coniston. Complété tout récemment, le sentier de Coniston a été aménagé par la Rainbow Routes Association (RRA) en coopération avec le Réseau d'action communautaire (RAC) de Coniston. Le sentier, accessible aux gens en fauteuil roulant, permet aux élèves des écoles St. Paul the Apostle et Notre-Dame de la Merci de se rendre à l'école sans passer par les artères utilisées par les automobilistes.

La communauté de Coniston souhaite nommer son nouveau sentier le sentier Jean Tellier, en honneur de l'homme qui a d'abord réclamé sa création. Depuis 2008, M. Tellier, un enseignant à la retraite, s'est présenté aux réunions du RAC de Coniston afin de réclamer un sentier pour sa communauté. «Au début, dit-il, ce n'était pas évident parce qu'ici, pour les gens, des *trails* dans la nature c'est pour prendre ton VTT puis tu t'en vas dans la nature. Moi, je demandais une *trail* qui était ouverte au public avec des paramètres bien définis puis tout ça. Pour eux autres, c'était étrange de voir ça. Alors, ils ont finalement accepté et puis après ça c'était de faire intervenir les autorités [RRA]. Et puis là, on les a achalés [pendant] plusieurs années consécutives. Il y avait une question de financement aussi et puis le temps était bon cette année.»

C'est M. Tellier qui a établi le tracé du sentier. Celui-ci traverse un ruisseau à l'aide d'un pont anciennement situé sur la promenade flottante du ruisseau Lily à Sudbury. À l'origine, la RRA voulait s'approprier un sentier utilisé par les VTT. De dire M. Tellier : «Si on fait ça là-dessus, ça va être la guerre, j'ai dit "oublie ça"». Le nouveau sentier est donc parallèle au sentier pour les VTT.

À l'inauguration du sentier, la RRA a annoncé que la section sudburoise du Sentier transcanadien est complétée à 85 % et qu'elle devrait l'être complètement d'ici 2015. Le Sentier transcanadien lui-même sera d'environ 22 000 kilomètres lorsqu'il sera complété et traversera le pays entier, de l'ouest à l'est et du nord au sud.



Une artiste animalière d'ici parmi les 500 grands de ce monde

page 17

Je veux devenir
charpentière!

Financé par
Ontario

COLLEGE BOREAL.CA

Le COLLÈGE BORÉAL – campus de Sudbury vous offre le programme de préapprentissage

Charpentière-menuisière

Date de début : le 5 novembre 2012 Durée : 32 semaines

✓ Nombre de places limité ✓ Aide financière disponible
✓ Services d'appui ✓ Mise à niveau (*upgrading*)

Communique au 705.560.6673, poste 3003.

GRATUIT!



Sudbury Star & Northern Life Online.

<http://www.thesudburystar.com/2012/10/12/new-trail-opens-in-coniston>

<http://www.northernlife.ca/news/localNews/2012/10/14-jean-tellier-trail-coniston.aspx>

BUILDING, PROPERTY AND PARK NAMING POLICY**Policy**

The naming and re-naming of interior spaces, portions or elements of municipal buildings, properties, parks are important for public awareness, promotion and recognition. All honourific naming and re-naming will respect the need for public consultation and follow appropriate legislative approvals. Honourific naming requests must come from a recognized community or service group or organization, rather than from individuals or affiliated groups or organizations.

Purpose

The purpose of this policy is to ensure consistency and fairness in the naming and re-naming of interior spaces, portions or elements of municipal buildings, properties and parks. The goal is to provide an evaluation framework and approval process that is reflective of the name being proposed.

Scope

This policy applies to Honourific Naming and New Park Development. Names of municipal facilities will not be named after elected officials currently in office. The details of this policy refer to the honourific naming and re-naming of municipal assets which reflect the achievements and contributions from an individual or organization. The significance of their contribution(s) is based on a graduated structure – Neighbourhood or Community **SEE DEFINITIONS***. This structure determines the type of facility to be named and the type of supporting documentation required from the applicant.

When there is a large financial support that exceeds 35% or a sizable donation of the total capital contributions towards new or redeveloped facilities and properties it can also result in the naming of a municipal facility or property. When there is a substantial financial contribution towards a municipal facility or property in excess of 35% or a sizable donation of the total capital contributions, the request for naming may be brought forward for the approval of the Council of the City of Greater Sudbury outside of the Building, Property and Park Naming Policy.

TYPES OF SITUATIONS APPLICABLE TO NAMING**1. Honourific Naming**

Requested by a community group/organization to recognize a group or an individual's outstanding accomplishments, involvement or work in the local community.

2. New Park Development

New neighbourhood parks created as part of the subdivision development process, names are based on geographical association. No public consultation is required and City staff will select an appropriate name for Council's consideration, unless there is a request for a component within the park to be named, in which case the guidelines for honourific naming apply.

Policy Guidelines

Naming Principles and Priorities will be used in conjunction with the graduated system in order to consider a honourific name:

- Names shall assist in emergency response situations by: avoiding duplication, using similar sounding names.
- Names that place the element of the building, property or park in geographical context, so as to assist the citizens in locating the named element – this may reflect such things as significant ecological or natural resource features.
- Names reflect the purpose or use of the element within the building, property or park.
- Names convey a sense of place and community and celebrate the distinguishing characteristics of the neighbourhood or community.
- Names are understandable, recognizable and explainable to citizens and respect the values in regards to history, heritage and culture of the neighbourhood or community.
- Names reflect an individual or organization's significant contributions to public life in general.
- Names reflect an individual or organization with such extraordinary prominence and lasting distinction that no other individuals, families or organizations can come forward and suggest alternatives.

DEFINITIONS

Element: A component within a park or facility, being walkways, meeting rooms, dressing rooms, corridors, gazebos, squares, fountains and other such features.

GRADUATED STRUCTURE		
MUNICIPAL BOUNDARIES	TYPES OF FACILITIES TO BE NAMED	SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION
Neighbourhood = area that provides services and amenities in a specific locality within Greater Sudbury to a small group of citizens.	Accessory use of a public building Neighbourhood Park (meets the recreational needs of its immediate neighbourhood)	Acknowledgements reflect the contributions made by an individual or organization in regards to a specific neighbourhood.
Community = area that provides services and amenities to an area or district of Greater Sudbury that may encompass several neighbourhoods and benefit a large group of citizens.	Indoor building features Community Parks (provides the space and supportive facilities needed for active recreation)	Acknowledgements reflect the contributions made by an individual or organization in regards to the community and may be recognized throughout the City of Greater Sudbury.

PROCEDURE - APPLICATION AND APPROVAL PROCESS FOR HONOURIFIC NAMING**Step 1**

Applicant shall submit a request – Application Form, for naming to the City Clerk, along with a permission letter obtained from the organization, individual or family member for the proposed name.

A deposit of \$900.00 (price to vary according to costs of advertisement) will be submitted with the application form.

The application form will then be forwarded to the appropriate department that will lead the process.

The lead staff will forward the application form to the Mayor, all members of Council and the appropriate applicable City departments. Comments on the suitability of the application will be gathered from City departments.

The lead staff will work with the applicant to ensure that the following documentation is included:

- Background information outlying the rationale for consideration of the request;
- Biographical information;
- Documentation including but not limited to media clipping (s) as well as petitions and letters from organizations and individuals providing substantial support for the request – support is based on the graduated structure (Neighbourhood or Community);
- Lead staff to review that the contributions from an organization or individual are well documented;
- All discussions of naming and re-naming of municipal buildings, properties or parks and their elements will be considered initially by the appropriate Committee of Council (e.g. Community Services or Operations);
- The Committee will review the application form, comments from City Departments and documentation from the applicant to complete the Checklist. The graduated structure (neighbourhood, community) selected and information provided to the Committee will determine if the Naming Priorities and Principles satisfy the naming request;
- Lead staff and applicant will determine whether or not a special event is planned to coincide with a formal naming ceremony;
- All costs of establishing the naming option e.g., advertising, signage, event, etc., will be made known to the applicant. Funds from the applicant must be confirmed in order to proceed.

Step 2

- The applicant will work with the lead staff person for ensuring that community consultation is met in accordance with City of Greater Sudbury approved guidelines;
- All requests for naming will be advertised in the local media. Citizens will be provided with a period of 30 days within which to comment, as well, the advertisement will contain information about the day of the public meeting;
- All promotion will be done in both English and French;
- News release will be issued;
- PDF Flyer will be created with the information relating to the naming and sent to City Council, CGS Senior Management, Community Action Networks, key stakeholders, Tom Davies Square, CSC, Libraries and the facility where possible;
- Information will be posted on the City's website and other social media formats by which the municipality's Corporate Communications team delivers information (i.e. Facebook);
- Comments on the matter will be sent to the appropriate lead staff;
- Comments must be received by 4:30 p.m. from the 30 days of the notice being issued to residents and then passed along to the lead staff person; and,
- The lead staff person reviews the written comments which are recorded– Total Written Comments Received.

The process to provide notice on the naming process may change to reflect any new Notice By-law that deals with this matter.

- 14 days after the notice has been advertised in the local media, a public meeting will occur to review the name request in more detail.
- Meeting shall occur in the community and as close to the space or element of the building, property or park as possible;
- Lead staff person will facilitate the meeting. The applicant will be in attendance to review the name request and respond to inquiries in more detail;
- The date and time of the meeting will be scheduled so as to allow for the greatest number of the public to be in attendance; and,
- The lead staff person gathers only written comments at the meeting and records it accordingly – Total Written Comments Received.

Step 3

The City administration will bring forward a report for Council containing background information pertinent to one or more suggested names.

The report to Council shall include but not be limited to the following:

- Options for consideration;
- Application form;
- Comments from City Staff;
- Rationale for approval according to the naming principles and priorities;
- Background and biographical information;
- Documentation supporting the request in relation to the graduated structure selected;
- Comments received from the notice with the public;
- Recommendation from the Committee of Council;
- Whether or not a ceremony is required; and,
- All associated expenses with respect to signs, ceremonies, etc. will be paid for by the applicant.

Final decision on naming will be made by Council. Council retains the right to change any name at any time without notice.

CHECKLIST

Proposed Name: _____

Graduated Structure: _____

The Checklist is a tool used by the Committee of Council to determine if the request satisfies the Naming Principles and Priorities according to the selected Graduated Structure.

The application form, comments from City of Greater Sudbury staff and background information provided by the applicant will assist the Committee of Council in answering either Yes or No on the Checklist.

No.		YES	NO
1	Does the name assist in emergency response situations by: avoiding duplication, using similar sounding names and/or ensuring consistency between building and geographical naming conventions?		
2	Does the name place the element of the building, property or park in its geographical context, so as to assist the citizens in locating the named element – this may reflect such things as significant ecological or natural resource features?		
3	Is the name reflective of the purpose or use of the element within the building, property or park in relation to the graduated structure selected on the application form?		
4	Does the name convey a sense of place, community and/or celebrate the distinguishing characteristics of the neighbourhood or community?		
5	Is the name understandable, recognizable and explainable to citizens and respect the values in regards to history, heritage and culture in relation to neighbourhood or community?		
6	Does the name reflect an individual or organization's significant contributions to public life in general which are appropriate to the element of the specific building, property or park?		
7	Is the name reflective of an individual or organization within the scope of the application (neighbourhood or community), of such extraordinary prominence and lasting distinction that no other individuals, families or organizations can come forward and suggest alternatives?		

Request for Decision

Local Rules Under the Housing Services Act (HSA)

Presented To:	Community Services Committee
Presented:	Monday, Jun 17, 2013
Report Date	Thursday, May 23, 2013
Type:	Managers' Reports

Recommendation

WHEREAS the Housing Services Act (HSA) replaced the Social Housing Reform Act (SHRA) as the key piece of legislation governing social housing;

AND WHEREAS the HSA requires that Service Managers review any local rules adopted under the SHRA with a view of making them consistent with the HSA requirements;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the City of Greater Sudbury approve the revised HSA compatible local rules as outlined in the report dated May 23, 2013 from the General Manager of Community Development.

Finance Implications

There are no financial implications.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The City of Greater Sudbury has been designated as the Service Manager for the administration of the Provincial and Federal Housing programs transferred from the Province.

The Housing Services Act (HSA) gives Service Managers responsibility for establishing a number of rules, standards, practices and policies. Some of these were previously set out as provincial requirements under the Social Housing Reform Act (SHRA). Those are now subject to local discretion.

This report includes explanations of the areas of discretion, references to the related sections of the Act and associated regulations and provides recommendations regarding each area of discretion.

Listed below are the "areas of discretion" for which local policies need to be established.

1. Time frame for a household to notify the Service Manager of any change in their circumstances.
2. Household Asset Limits – the option of setting a maximum asset limit an RGI applicant may have and still remain eligible to receive rent-geared-to-income assistance.

Signed By

Report Prepared By

Shelly Upton
Program Supervisor, Housing Services
Digitally Signed May 23, 13

Division Review

Denis Desmeules
Director of Housing services
Digitally Signed May 24, 13

Recommended by the Department

Catherine Matheson
General Manager of Community Development
Digitally Signed May 24, 13

Recommended by the C.A.O.

Doug Nadorozny
Chief Administrative Officer
Digitally Signed May 27, 13

3. Disqualification period for misrepresentation and fraud.
4. Maximum absence from unit – the length of time all members of the household can be absent from their unit and remain eligible for rent-geared-to-income assistance.
5. Refusal of offers of accommodation – the maximum number of refusals of offers of accommodation a household may have and remain eligible to remain on the centralized wait list.
6. Occupancy Standards – the size of unit an RGI household is eligible to occupy.
7. Overhousing - household ceases to meet the occupancy standard for the unit they currently occupy.
8. System for selecting waiting households for vacant units – centralized wait list.
9. Rent-geared-to-income assistance for in-situ market rent households – market rent households currently residing in social housing who experience a significant change in their circumstances could be offered RGI assistance based on their original date of application.
10. Opportunity to Comment – households have the opportunity to comment on any third party information that may be used to make a decision regarding their eligibility for rent-geared-to-income assistance.
11. Transfers from other service manager areas – a local rule that would allow transfers from other service manager areas.
12. Refusal to Offer – the reasons why a housing provider may refuse to offer a vacant unit to an applicant household.

Housing Services held two consultation meetings with local social housing providers. The consultation examined the issues and concerns surrounding the local areas of discretion. The following table summarizes the existing policies and the proposed recommendations. These reflect the discussion and the consensus of the stakeholder consultations.

Policy Title	Current Policy	Recommendation
1. Notice of Change of Applicant Circumstances	Council approved local rule – all changes must be reported within 30 calendar days.	Confirm adoption of requirement to report and provide verification of all changes in circumstances within 30 calendar days.
2. Maximum Household Assets	Council approved no asset limit.	No asset limit be imposed at this time.
3. Disqualification Period for Misrepresentation and Fraud	Council approved 2 year disqualification period for reapplication for RGI assistance after conviction for RGI offence.	Confirm and adopt 2 year disqualification period.
4. Maximum Absence from Unit	No set limit for absence from unit.	No maximum absence period be imposed at this time.
5. Maximum Number of Refusals of Offers of Accommodation	SHRA deemed a household ineligible for the centralized wait list if they refused three (3) suitable offers of accommodation.	Confirm and adopt three (3) as the maximum number of refusals of offers of accommodation to remain eligible for the centralized wait list.
6. Occupancy Standards	Council approved a range from smallest to largest: - couples share a bedroom - one bedroom per additional household member - special consideration for medical conditions	Confirm and adopt existing occupancy standards.
7. Overhoused	SHRA deemed a household overhoused if they occupied a unit larger than required under occupancy standards. In order to remain eligible for continued RGI assistance a household was required to transfer to “right” sized unit.	Adopt existing policy requiring overhoused households to transfer to right sized unit.
8. System for Selecting Waiting Households	Centralized wait list is currently maintained on a modified chronological basis. Priority in placement on the wait list is given to victims of domestic violence. Council approved local priority Urgent status ranks immediately below provincially mandated Special Priority households and ahead of all chronological applicants.	Confirm and adopt modified chronological wait list system giving priority in placement to victims of domestic and those households who meet the eligibility criteria for Urgent status.
9. RGI Assistance for Market Renters	Council approved local rule which gave the original date of application to social housing market rent households who experience economic hardship and require RGI assistance.	Confirm and adopt policy granting original date of application on centralized wait list for social housing market rent households who have experienced a significant change in their circumstances.
10. Opportunity to Comment	SHRA required that households be given an opportunity to comment on any third party information received that would adversely affect a decision pertaining to the household.	Adopt policy requiring that households be given the opportunity to comment on third party information prior to any decision becoming final.
11. Transfers between Service Manager Areas	Any tenant household wishing to move from one housing community to another is required to make a new application and be added to the centralized wait list.	Adopt a policy confirming that all tenant households wishing to move from one housing community to another is required to make a new application and be added to the centralized wait list.
12. Refusals to Offer Accommodation	SHRA detailed limited reasons why a housing provider could refuse to offer accommodation to a prospective tenant.	Adopt a policy detailing the circumstances when a housing provider could refuse to offer accommodation to a prospective tenant: poor rent paying habits, unit not suitable for household due to physical characteristics of unit; in the case of a housing co-operative the housing provider believes the applicant household will not accept the responsibilities of being a member of a housing co-operative.

Background

The report provides the detail of the discussions/consultations regarding the areas of discretion available under the Housing Services Act.

Housing Services Act (HSA) Local Rules

1. Notice of Change of Applicant Circumstances

HSA, s 42, O. Reg. 367/11 s 28

Rent-geared-to-income households are required to provide notice of any changes to their circumstances and are required to provide information and documentation within thirty (30) days of the change taking place.

The previous legislation (SHRA) only allowed 10 days for households to report changes.

CGS adopted a local rule requiring RGI applicants and tenants to report changes in income, or any changes in the household composition within thirty (30) days of the change having taken place. Failure to do so could result in the household being found ineligible for RGI assistance. For consistency, the same time frame was adopted for both applicant and tenant households.

The intent of the regulation is to ensure that changes are reported in a timely manner. This will permit rent adjustments to be made to accurately reflect the household's financial circumstances and continued eligibility.

Service Managers have the discretion to establish a longer time frame for reporting changes.

The requirement to report changes within 30 days is consistent with the rent-geared-to-income program rules in place prior to devolution.

Households can continue to be eligible for rent-geared-to-income assistance if extenuating circumstances exist that prevented the household from reporting a change in their circumstances.

Where a change was not reported within 30 days of its occurrence, the household will be made ineligible for RGI assistance.

RECOMMENDATION

Rent-geared-to-income households and applicants must report all changes and supply supporting documentation to the Service Manager or Housing Provider within 30 calendar days of any change in information or documentation taking effect.

2. Maximum Household Assets

HSA, s 42, O. Reg. 367/11 s 35

The Service Manager has the flexibility to decide whether or not to establish local eligibility rules that set out a maximum income and asset limit amount that a household can have and still be considered eligible for rent-geared-to-income assistance in their service area. The asset limit cannot be set lower than \$20,000.

Service Managers have the discretion to establish a maximum asset limit that a household can have and still be eligible for RGI assistance. If established, an asset limit would have the effect of making a household ineligible for RGI assistance if the gross household income/assets exceed the limit set. There is

no requirement under the legislation to set an asset limit.

The HSA provides that the Service Manager may exempt or exclude certain types of assets from consideration under local asset limits. There were a number of exclusions omitted in the HSA that existed under the previous legislation, most notably student grants, loans or awards; amounts received for damages or compensation for pain and suffering or to cover expenses due to injury or death of a household member.

Applicants with significant assets have not traditionally been attracted to social housing communities. The establishment of an asset limit is viewed as an artificial barrier to accessing the social housing program. In a recent survey of other Service Manager areas, only 2 had established asset limits. Their asset limits were much greater than the minimum (\$60,000).

The Long Term Affordable Housing Strategy permits Service Managers to set up asset-building initiatives to help tenants save for education, home ownership, etc. Payments received from Service Managers under this type of initiative would also be exempt from the list of assets.

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that no asset limit be established for Greater Sudbury.

3. Disqualification Period for Misrepresentation and Fraud

HSA, s 42, O. Reg. 367/11 s 36

Service Managers may choose to implement a local rule making a household ineligible to re-apply to receive rent-geared-to-income assistance for up to 2 years from the time of conviction for a rent-geared-to-income related offence. (fraud or misrepresentation of income)

Under the SHRA a household convicted of a rent-geared-to-income related offence was automatically disqualified from receiving any further rent-geared-to-income assistance for a minimum period of 2 years.

Service Managers were able to set local rules establishing longer periods of disqualification. CGS adopted the provincial standard 2 year disqualification period.

There is no automatic disqualification under the HSA.

There have been very few households actually convicted by either the courts or the Landlord & Tenant Board of a rent-geared-to-income offence (fraud or misrepresentation of income). Of those, several have reapplied for rent-geared-to-income assistance after their disqualification period and, after repaying any outstanding arrears.

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the two (2) year disqualification period be continued.

4. Maximum Absence From Unit

HSA, s 42, O. Reg. 367/11 s 37

Service Managers may set a local rule which would deem a household ineligible to receive any further rent-geared-to-income assistance if all members of the household were absent from the unit for at least 60 consecutive days or up to a maximum of 90 days in a year. The HSA rule would not apply if the absence is for medical reasons.

Previously CGS chose not to adopt an absence from unit policy under the SHRA.

The HSA allows Service Managers to establish an absence from unit policy if all members of the household are absent from the unit for a specified number of consecutive days (no less than 60 days). The HSA also now allows the Service Manager to set a rule for the maximum number of days in a year all members are absent, where the days do not have to be consecutive (not less than 90 days).

Extended absences from rent-geared-to-income units are not a large issue for housing providers in this community.

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that no absence from unit policy be established.

5. Maximum Number of Refusals of Offers of Accommodation

HSA, s 42, O. Reg. 367/11 s 39

It was a mandatory requirement under the SHRA, that applicant households ceased to be eligible to be active on the centralized wait list if they refused three (3) suitable offers of accommodation.

The HSA allows Service Managers to set a local rule regarding the number of refusals before a household is deemed ineligible. The minimum number of refusals can be no less than three (3).

A very small number of applications (less than 30) are cancelled by the Housing Registry annually due to 3 refusals.

Setting a limit on the number of refusals is one method of culling the wait list – if there is no limit on the number of refusals the wait list grows. Adopting a policy limiting the number of refusals ensures that only those interested in being housed are active on the wait list.

The Service Manager continues to have discretion on what constitutes a refusal and may specify the reasons that an offer of accommodation would not be counted.

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that CGS continue to remove applications from the wait list after 3 refusals of a suitable offer of accommodation.

6. Occupancy Standards

HSA, s 42, O. Reg. 367/11 s 42

Under the SHRA Service Managers had the ability to set local occupancy standards. Greater Sudbury chose to adopt the provincial standard set out in the legislation. Greater Sudbury adopted a largest/smallest unit range when assessing the suitability of an available unit for an applicant household and as part of ongoing eligibility reviews.

Service Managers must now set their own occupancy standards, as long as they comply with provincial rules. The HSA requires Service Managers to ensure that the local occupancy standards consider households who occupy a larger unit than required due to a medical condition and households where a child who normally lives in the household is attending school elsewhere.

Under the occupancy standards currently in place the smallest unit for which an RGI household is eligible has: one bedroom for every two members of the household; plus an additional bedroom if there is an odd number of members of the household. The largest unit for which an RGI household is normally eligible has: one bedroom for any two members in the household who are spouses (including same sex partners); plus one additional bedroom for each additional member of the household.

In some circumstances, households may request one additional bedroom in excess of the largest unit for which they would normally qualify. An additional bedroom is approved in exceptional circumstances when the household can demonstrate that there is an inability to share a bedroom due to a disability or serious medical condition, additional room is required to accommodate essential medical or disability related equipment; or where an additional room is required for an individual who is not a member of the household but who is employed by a member of the household to provide support services necessitated by the member's disability or medical condition.

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the existing CGS occupancy standard continue to be followed.

The smallest unit for which a RGI household is eligible has:

- **one bedroom for every two members of the household; plus**
- **an additional bedroom if there is an odd number of members in the household.**

The largest unit for which an RGI household is normally eligible has:

- **one bedroom for any two members of the household who are spouses (including same sex partners); plus**
- **one additional bedroom for each member of the household.**

An additional bedroom can be assigned to a household if the household demonstrates the inability to share a bedroom due to a disability or serious medical condition, additional room is required to accommodate essential medical or disability related equipment; or where an additional room is required for an individual who is not a member of the household but who is employed by a member of the household to provide support services necessitated by the member's disability or medical condition.

7. Cease to meet Occupancy Standards – Overhousing

HSA, s 42, O. Reg. 367/11 s 38

Under the SHRA, households housed in a unit larger than the largest size permissible under the Service Manager's Occupancy Standard were required to move to the "right" sized unit in order to continue to be eligible to receive RGI assistance. These households are considered to be overhoused. The Service Manager has been given discretion under the HSA to set a local rule regarding the ongoing eligibility of overhoused households.

If the Service Manager does not adopt a rule regarding the eligibility of overhoused households, the household cannot be declared ineligible for ongoing RGI assistance, regardless of the number of refusals of offers of accommodation until at least 12 months after having been deemed overhoused. This is a change from the previous legislation.

Currently, a relatively small percentage of the social housing portfolio is occupied by overhoused households (less than 10%). Under the existing policy, when a household is initially deemed to be

overhoused, they may be added to the housing provider's internal transfer list if there is an appropriately sized unit within the provider's portfolio. If not, the overhoused household is added to the centralized wait list and are asked to select and maintain a minimum of three (3) housing projects. If the household has not been moved to an appropriate sized unit within their housing community within 12 months, their application is forwarded to the centralized wait list.

Should the tenant household still be overhoused after 12 months on the centralized wait list, they are required to further expand their housing selections to a minimum of six (6) housing projects.

Should an overhoused tenant household refuse three offers of accommodation or should they ask to have their application removed from the centralized wait list, they cease to qualify to receive any further rent-gear-to-income assistance.

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that CGS continue to require households deemed overhoused to move to units that meet the occupancy standard for the household. The household will continue to be eligible for rent-gear-to-income assistance for at least 12 months after being deemed overhoused.

It is further recommended that upon addition to the centralized wait list, overhoused households be required to initially select and maintain a minimum of three (3) housing selections. Should an overhoused household not be housed within 12 months of having been added to the centralized wait list, they would then be required to increase the number of selections to six (6). Overhoused households would be subject to the same policies regarding the maximum number of refusals while on the centralized wait list.

Should an overhoused household refuse three (3) suitable offers of accommodation, they would cease to be eligible to receive any further rent-gear-to-income assistance. Overhoused households would cease to be eligible to receive any further rent-gear-to-income assistance should they ask to have their application removed from the centralized wait list.

8. System for Selecting Waiting Household - Centralized Wait List

HSA, s 47, O. Reg. 367/11 s 45-46

The SHRA required Service Managers to co-ordinate access to rent-gear-to-income accommodation. The Service Managers were responsible to develop and administer a centralized wait list.

Under the HSA, Service Managers must have a system for selecting rent-gear-to-income households for vacant units. Service Managers must still maintain a centralized waiting list for rent-gear-to-income assistance, but now they have the flexibility to adopt alternative systems for selecting households from the wait list.

Regardless of the system selected, the provincial priority for placement on the centralized wait list for victims of domestic violence remains.

Service Managers continue to have the ability to set local priorities for placement on the centralized wait list (i.e. Urgent Status).

Currently the centralized waitlist is maintained on a modified chronological basis. Priority in placement on the wait list must be given to those applicants who meet the criteria for Special Priority status – victims of domestic violence. CGS previously adopted a local priority category URGENT status. Households who

meet the following criteria are eligible for Urgent status on the wait list and rank immediately below eligible Special Priority households: persons who are living on the street; persons living in substandard housing which has been condemned by the municipality; persons using the emergency shelter system as their primary residence or persons whose homes have been destroyed by natural disaster; persons awaiting release from hospital who cannot return to their former place of residence and will not be released from hospital until suitable accommodation is found or families whose children are at risk of apprehension by child protection agencies due to the household not having adequate housing and lack of housing is the only protection issue outstanding.

The wait list is maintained on a chronological basis after any priority category applications are considered. The applicant with the oldest date of application ranks higher than an applicant with a later date of application.

Maintaining the centralized waitlist on a modified chronological basis ensures that the housing needs of those applicants with the most urgent housing need (SPP & URG) are addressed relatively quickly and that all applicants have a reasonable expectation of being housed.

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the CGS continue to maintain the centralized wait list on a modified chronological basis with priority continuing to be given to victims of family violence, and those households who meet the criteria for Urgent status and then on a chronological basis.

9. RGI Assistance for In-Situ Market Rent Households – System for Selecting Households

HSA, s 47, O. Reg. 367/11 s 48

The Service Manager's system for selecting households must include rules for providing RGI assistance to market rent households residing in designated social housing projects. These tenants must be on the centralized wait list.

Under the previous legislation, CGS adopted a policy to permit social housing market rent households who have experienced a significant change in their circumstances to apply to receive RGI assistance "in-situ". If the household meets the criteria under the policy, they are given their original date of application and are added to the waiting list for the housing community where they live. This gives the household an advantage but not necessarily priority on the wait list. Based on their original date of application, the household may not be first for RGI assistance.

Households who are paying market rent as a result of ceasing to qualify for RGI under the social housing program rules do not currently meet the criteria and are given a current date of application. The SHRA set targeting restrictions for in-situ households. These restrictions have not been carried forward into the HSA.

Service Managers now have the ability to create a local rule that would allow RGI assistance to be offered to in-situ market rent household.

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that CGS continue to allow RGI assistance to be offered to in-situ social housing market rent households who have experienced a significant change in their circumstances based on their original date of application.

10. Opportunity to Comment

HSA, s 53, O. Reg. 367/11 s 61

Under the previous legislation the opportunity to comment was a mechanism which allows a household seeking or receiving RGI assistance to comment on information they did not directly provide to either the Service Manager or Housing Provider. A household is given the opportunity to comment on information received from a third party that will be used to make a decision affecting their eligibility for rent-geared-to-income assistance. The Opportunity to Comment provisions are not a requirement under the HSA.

It is procedurally fair to provide households with an opportunity to comment on information received from third parties that have a bearing on a decision impacting their eligibility for RGI assistance. Under the existing policy, the household must be given a summary of the information received; a description of the proposed decision to be made using the information; an opportunity and a deadline by which they may comment in writing on the information. Currently the household has 30 days within which to provide comment. Experience gained since the implementation of the original policy has shown that providing 30 days for a household to comment on third party information significantly delayed the effective date of the eligibility decision. A change to 10 days would allow sufficient time for the household to respond without significantly delaying any decision.

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that a household continue to be provided with an opportunity to comment on third party information received by the Service Manager or Housing Provider prior to a final decision regarding the household's eligibility for RGI assistance. It is further recommended that the time frame within which the household may provide written comment be set at 10 business days.

11. System for Selecting Waiting Households - Transfers from other Service Areas

HSA, s 47, O. Reg. 367/11 s 48

The service manager may adopt a local rule that would permit transfers of existing RGI households from other service areas, if there is an “exchange agreement” with another Service Manager. The exchange would be without regard to wait list or to priority on the wait list.

Under the SHRA, any tenant household wishing to move from one housing community to another was required to make a new application and be added to the centralized wait list. There are approximately 2000 households on the local centralized wait list at any given time.

The HSA allows for the “exchange” of RGI households between service manager areas. If adopted, such a policy would give an existing RGI household in another community priority in placement on the centralized waitlist in Greater Sudbury and vice versa. A recent survey of Service Managers did not indicate much interest in establishing exchange agreements.

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that CGS continue to require all existing households interested in rent-geared-to-income assistance to complete a new application. The application will be added to the centralized wait list and will be ranked on a chronological basis.

12. Refusals to Offer

The rules for refusal to offer were set out in the previous legislation and now can be set as a local rule. Housing Providers may refuse to offer a unit to an applicant only under the following circumstances: the applicant household does not meet the provider's mandate; based on the rental history the provider believes that the household is likely to fail to pay the rent/housing charge on time and in full; the provider has reasonable grounds to believe the unit is not suitable for the applicant household due to its physical characteristics, in the case of a housing co-op, the applicant household does not agree to accept the responsibilities of being a member of the co-op, or the co-op believes the household will not accept those responsibilities; and it is unreasonable for the household to reside in shared accommodation.

The household must be notified of the decision in writing and be provided the opportunity to ask for a review of the decision.

CGS currently follows the policies set out in the previous legislation.

In order to be considered eligible to be added to the centralized wait list, an applicant's household must meet the basic eligibility criteria for social housing.

It is rare that a social housing provider refuses to offer accommodation to a rent-geared-to-income household. It is very serious to be denied access to rent-geared-to-income housing. Procedural fairness would suggest that the "punishment should fit the crime" and everyone deserves a second chance.

Housing providers must be prepared to defend any refusal to offer as part of the decision review process.

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that CGS adopt the existing policy on Refusal to Offer confirming the circumstances when a housing provider could refuse to offer accommodation to a prospective tenant: poor rent paying habits, unit not suitable for household due to physical characteristics of unit; in the case of a housing co-operative the housing provider believes the applicant household will not accept the responsibilities of being a member of a housing co-operative.