

Vision: *The City of Greater Sudbury is a growing, world-class community bringing talent, technology and a great northern lifestyle together.*

Vision: *La Ville du Grand Sudbury est une communauté croissante de calibre international qui rassemble les talents, les technologies et le style de vie exceptionnel du Nord.*

Agenda

Ordre du jour

Councillor / Conseiller
Doug Craig

Chair / Président(e)

Councillor / Conseiller
Jacques Barbeau

Vice-Chair / Vice-président(e)



For the **Priorities Committee** meeting to be held
Pour la réunion du **Comité des priorités** qui aura lieu

Wednesday, March 4th, 2009 mercredi 4^e mars 2009

at 6:00 pm à 18h 00

Council Chamber, Tom Davies Square dans la Salle du Conseil, Place Tom Davies



PRIORITIES COMMITTEE AGENDA

For the 42nd Priorities Committee Meeting
to be held on **Wednesday, March 4, 2009**
Council Chamber, Tom Davies Square at 6:00 pm

COUNCILLOR DOUG CRAIG, CHAIR

Jacques Barbeau, Vice-Chair

(PLEASE ENSURE CELL PHONES AND PAGERS ARE TURNED OFF)

The Council Chamber of Tom Davies Square is wheelchair accessible. Please speak to the City Clerk prior to the meeting if you require a hearing amplification device. Persons requiring assistance are requested to contact the City Clerks Office at least 24 hours in advance of the meeting if special arrangements are required. Please call (705) 674-4455, extension 2471. Telecommunications Device for the Deaf (TTY) (705) 688-3919. Copies of Agendas can be viewed at www.greatersudbury.ca/agendas/.

DECLARATIONS OF PECUNIARY INTEREST AND THE GENERAL NATURE THEREOF

OPENING REMARKS - COUNCILLOR JACQUES BARBEAU, WARD 2

CITIZEN DELEGATIONS

1. Walden Community Action Network (CAN) Update
(FOR INFORMATION ONLY)

- Neeltje Van Roon, Vice-Chair, Walden CAN

2. Challenges of Aging
(FOR INFORMATION ONLY) (REPORT UNDER SEPARATE COVER)

10 - 11

- John Lindsay, Chair, Friendly to Seniors Group

COUNCILLOR BRIEFING SESSIONS

3. Proposed 2009 Ward 2 Capital Improvement Projects
(ELECTRONIC PRESENTATION) (FOR INFORMATION ONLY)

- Robert M. Falcioni, P. Eng., Director of Roads and Transportation
- Nick Benkovich, Director of Water/WasteWater Services

(Electronic presentation to Council outlining proposed 2009 Ward 2 Capital Improvement Projects.)

4. Report dated February 26, 2009 from the General Manager of Infrastructure Services regarding Road Budget Allocation Procedure.
(ELECTRONIC PRESENTATION) (FOR INFORMATION ONLY)

12 - 14

- David Shelsted, P. Eng., Roads Engineer
- Robert M. Falcioni, P. Eng., Director of Roads and Transportation

(In 2004, Council adopted the following guidelines for the Roads Budget allocation:

- 30% Major Roads and Arterials
- 20% Minor Roads, Local Streets and Collectors
- 20% New Roads/Widenings
- 15% Bridge Rehabilitation
- 5% Storm Water Systems
- 5% Engineering Consulting Services
- 1% Traffic Signals, New and Upgrades
- 4% Miscellaneous (Street Lighting, Crack Sealing, Contingencies)

Priorities for Road Projects are developed using the Pavement Management System, which has two (2) components, the database component and the evaluation component. The database component provides information on each road section's physical condition and the evaluation component develops a strategy to maximize the benefits within the budget guidelines. An update of the current condition of the road network is included.)

POLICY DISCUSSION PAPERS - PRELIMINARY DISCUSSION

POLICY DISCUSSION PAPERS - DECISION REQUESTED

5. Report dated February 23, 2009 from the Acting General Manager of Growth & Development/Planning Director regarding Top Soil Removal & Site Alteration By-law. **15 - 24**

(RECOMMENDATION PREPARED)

(At the Priorities Committee meeting of January 21, 2009, an initial presentation of the Top Soil Removal & Site Alteration By-law was made and staff was instructed to conduct a public meeting to present the draft by-law and provide opportunity for public input. The public meeting was held on February 10, 2009 and approximately 35 to 40 individuals attended the public meeting and 10 written submissions were received. The report provides the Committee with a summary of the key comments and a proposed response. The report seeks the Committee's direction with respect to two options that could be pursued relating to future treatment of top soil removal operations.)

6. Report dated February 25, 2009 from the Executive Director, Administrative Services regarding Shoreline Water Safety and Rescue. **25 - 36**

(RECOMMENDATION PREPARED)

(In follow-up to the recommendations of the Junction Creek Safety Committee relating to shoreline water safety and rescue, staff were directed to co-ordinate, prioritize and report back on a city-wide action plan that will promote safety awareness and reduce water-related accidents. The report recommends that education and safety awareness and swift water rescue training for first responders be the priorities for a city-wide shoreline safety and rescue plan.)

CORRESPONDENCE FOR INFORMATION ONLY

7. Report dated February 24, 2009 from the Executive Director, Administrative Services regarding Constellation City Report - Workplan Update. **37 - 48**

(FOR INFORMATION ONLY)

(This report updates the Constellation City Report Workplan.)

MANAGERS' REPORTS

ADDENDUM

CITIZEN PETITIONS

MOTIONS

COMMUNITY INPUT FOR WARD 2

CLOSING REMARKS - COUNCILLOR JACQUES BARBEAU, WARD 2

ADJOURNMENT (9:00 P.M.) (RECOMMENDATION PREPARED)

{TWO-THIRDS MAJORITY REQUIRED TO PROCEED PAST 9:00 P.M.}

Councillor Doug Craig
Chair

Franca Bortolussi
Council Secretary

COMITÉ DES PRIORITÉS ORDRE DU JOUR

Pour la 42^e réunion du Comité des priorités
qui aura lieu le **4 mars 2009**
dans la **Salle du Conseil, Place Tom Davies, à 18h 00**

CONSEILLER DOUG CRAIG, PRÉSIDENT(E)

Jacques Barbeau, Vice-président(e)

VEUILLEZ ÉTEINDRE LES TÉLÉPHONES CELLULAIRES ET LES TÉLÉAVERTISSEURS)
La salle du Conseil de la Place Tom Davies est accessible en fauteuil roulant. Si vous désirez obtenir un appareil auditif, veuillez communiquer avec la greffière municipale, avant la réunion. Les personnes qui prévoient avoir besoin d'aide doivent s'adresser au bureau du greffier municipal au moins 24 heures avant la réunion aux fins de dispositions spéciales. Veuillez composer le 705-674-4455, poste 2471; appareils de télécommunications pour les malentendants (ATS) 705-688-3919. Vous pouvez consulter l'ordre du jour à l'adresse www.greatersudbury.ca/agendas/.

DÉCLARATION D'INTÉRÊTS PÉCUNIAIRES ET LEUR NATURE GÉNÉRALES

ALLOCUTION D'OUVERTURE - LE CONSEILLER JACQUES BARBEAU, QUARTIER

2

DÉLÉGATIONS DE CITOYENS

1. Compte rendu du Réseau d'action communautaire (RAC) de Walden
(A TITRE D'INFORMATION)

- Neeltje Van Roon, vice-présidente du RAC de Walden

2. Défis du vieillissement
(A TITRE D'INFORMATION) (RAPPORT SOUS PLI SÉPARÉ)

10 - 11

- John Lindsay, président du groupe Friendly to Seniors Group

SÉANCES D'INFORMATION DES CONSEILLERS

3. Projets proposés d'amélioration aux immobilisations du quartier 2 en 2009
(PRÉSENTATION ÉLECTRONIQUE) (A TITRE D'INFORMATION)

- Robert M. Falcioni, ing., directeur des Routes et des Transports
- Nick Benkovich, directeur des Services d'eau et des eaux usées

(Présentation électronique au Conseil municipal décrivant brièvement les projets proposés d'amélioration aux immobilisations du quartier 2 en 2009)

4. Rapport du directeur général des Services d'infrastructure, daté du 26 février 2009 portant sur Procédure d'allocation du budget des routes.
(PRÉSENTATION ÉLECTRONIQUE) (A TITRE D'INFORMATION)

12 - 14

- David Shelsted, ing., ingénieur des routes
- Robert M. Falcioni, ing., directeur des Routes et des Transports

(En 2004, le Conseil a adopté les principes directeurs suivants pour l'allocation du budget des routes : • 30 % pour les routes principales et les voies artérielles • 20 % pour les routes secondaires, les rues locales et les routes collectrices • 20 % pour les nouvelles routes et les élargissements • 15 % pour la remise en état des ponts • 5 % pour les réseaux d'égout pluvial • 5 % pour les services d'ingénieurs-conseils • 1 % pour les feux de circulation nouveaux et améliorés • 4 % pour les dépenses diverses (l'éclairage de voies publiques, la réparation des fissures, les dépenses imprévues) Les priorités pour les projets routiers sont établies à l'aide du Système de gestion routière, qui comporte deux (2) volets, soit ceux de la base de données et de l'évaluation. Le volet de la base de données fournit des renseignements sur l'état physique de chaque tronçon de route et le volet de l'évaluation élabore une stratégie visant à maximiser les avantages dans le cadre des principes directeurs du budget. Un compte rendu de l'état actuel du réseau routier est inclus.)

DOCUMENTS DE TRAVAIL SUR LES POLITIQUES – DISCUSSION PRÉLIMINAIRE

DOCUMENTS DE TRAVAIL SUR LES POLITIQUES – DEMANDE DE DÉCISION

5. Rapport du directeur général intérimaire de la croissance et du développement / directeur de la planification, daté du 23 février 2009 portant sur Règlement sur l'enlèvement de la terre végétale et la modification des terrains. **15 - 24**
(RECOMMANDATION PRÉPARÉE)

6. Rapport de la directrice exécutive des Services administratifs, daté du 25 février 2009 portant sur Sécurité et sauvetage nautiques le long du rivage . **25 - 36**
(RECOMMANDATION PRÉPARÉE)

(Comme suite aux recommandations du Comité sur la sécurité du ruisseau au sujet de la sécurité et du sauvetage nautiques le long du rivage, on avait demandé au personnel de coordonner, de mettre en ordre de priorité et de faire un rapport sur un plan d'action à l'échelle de toute la ville qui encouragera la sensibilisation à la sécurité et réduira les accidents liés à l'eau. Le rapport recommande que l'éducation et la sensibilisation à la sécurité et la formation en matière de sauvetage nautique rapide à l'intention des premiers intervenants soient des priorités pour un plan de sécurité et de sauvetage le long du rivage dans toute la ville.)

CORRESPONDANCE À TITRE DE RENSEIGNEMENTS SEULEMENT

7. Rapport de la directrice exécutive des Services administratifs, daté du 24 février 2009 portant sur Rapport sur la Ville-constellation - compte rendu sur le plan de travail. **37 - 48**
(A TITRE D'INFORMATION)

(Ce rapport donne un compte rendu du plan de travail du rapport sur la Ville-constellation.)

RAPPORTS DES GESTIONNAIRES

ADDENDA

PÉTITIONS DE CITOYENS

MOTIONS

COMMENTAIRES ET SUGGESTION COMMUNAUTAIRES POUR LE QUARTIER 2

BR>

ALLOCUTION DE FERMETURE DU CONSEILLER JACQUES BARBEAU, QUARTIER 2

LEVÉE DE LA SÉANCE À 21 H (RECOMMANDATION PRÉPARÉE)

(UNE MAJORITÉ DES DEUX TIERS EST REQUISE POUR POURSUIVRE LA RÉUNION APRÈS 21 H.)

Le Conseiller Doug Craig,
Président

Franca Bortolussi,
Secrétaire du conseil



For Information Only
Challenges of Aging

Presented To:	Priorities Committee
Presented:	Wednesday, Mar 04, 2009
Report Date	Friday, Feb 13, 2009
Type:	Citizen Delegations

Recommendation

FOR INFORMATION ONLY

Friendly to Seniors have requested to make an information presentation regarding their findings on needs and experiences of seniors meeting the "challenges of aging" in the City of Greater Sudbury.

Signed By
No signatures or approvals were recorded for this report.

Challenges of Aging Report

The final report of the Challenges of Aging project will be presented to the City of Greater Sudbury on Wednesday March 4th 2009 and will be sent to provincial and federal representatives at the same time as well as other interested groups and individuals.

The project was made possible through a government of Canada New Horizons Grant and conducted by Friendly to Seniors – Sudbury. It consisted of a comprehensive telephone survey and focus groups representing a cross-section of Greater Sudbury seniors and older adults plus additional feedback and comment over a two year period during 2007 and 2008. The Social Planning Council of Sudbury was also involved as well as the United Way and a number of seniors groups in the area.

It was older adults and seniors themselves who contributed to this project and it was their input, suggestions and opinions that make up this report. Seniors, those over 65, are the fastest growing segment of our population and “older adults” those 50 to 65 are the second fastest growing population group. The first wave of the “baby boomers” turns 65 in just two years (2011). Average life expectancy is now 82 for men and 85 for women.

There is a growing appreciation of the impact that an aging population will have on many aspects of our society. Everyone, every concerned citizen, all levels of government, all involved agencies and groups etc. need to become involved in creating solution to the problems we face as our population ages.

Housing and health care were identified as two major areas of concern in the report among others such as transportation, taxation, recreation social contacts etc. Most felt they did not have a voice in influencing any level of government with respect to these subject areas and recommended the establishment of a Seniors Action Group involving all those concerned to positively address these issues, possibly an expanded city seniors’ advisory panel.

Also recommended was an improved senior’s information telephone line and an enhanced leisure guide to include more civic information related to seniors’ services and community events such as an arts calendar and tourist information as many seniors have friends and relatives who visit the city – a sample of what this guide might include is part of the report. Other recommendations were membership sharing between seniors groups and clubs throughout the city including the Parkside Older Adult Centre.

Free bus service for seniors during off peak service hours was suggested to encourage more ridership plus free sampling of city run activities to encourage increased participation. The removal of parking meters from street-side downtown and improved snow removal, sanding and salting of sidewalks and parking lots was recommended. Graffiti removal, more police presence, cleaner environment and public health inspection notices in restaurants were additional suggestions.

Besides improved home care to assist seniors to stay in their homes longer to reduce institutional care costs there was a strong recommendation for transitional accommodation for those not wishing to stay in their present home and based on recommendations as to what this type of residence might look like two plans were drawn up which make up part of the report. Additional recommendations were put forward with respect to tax relief and other considerations that would assist seniors with limited incomes. All suggestions are presented in detail in the printed report and on the internet at www.friendlytoseniors.ca.

Further information: John Lindsay, Chair Friendly to Seniors – Sudbury – 525-7526

Councillor Briefing Sessions



For Information Only

Road Budget Allocation Procedure

Presented To:	Priorities Committee
Presented:	Wednesday, Mar 04, 2009
Report Date	Thursday, Feb 26, 2009
Type:	Councillor Briefing Sessions

Recommendation

For Information Only

Background

In November of 2004, Council approved a budget allocation formula for Capital Road construction and rehabilitation projects. The allocations adopted were for different types of road classifications and various other project types contained in the annual Capital Roads Program. The following percentage distribution was approved by Council:

Project Category	Guideline Percentage
Major Roads and Arterials	30
Minor Roads, Local Streets and Sidewalks	20
New Roads/Road Widenings	20
Bridge Rehabilitation	15
Storm Water Systems	5

Signed By

Report Prepared By

David Shelsted, MBA, P.Eng.
Roads Engineer
Digitally Signed Feb 26, 09

Division Review

Robert Falcioni, P.Eng.
Director of Roads and Transportation
Digitally Signed Feb 26, 09

Recommended by the Department

Greg Clausen, P.Eng.
General Manager of Infrastructure Services
Digitally Signed Feb 26, 09

Recommended by the C.A.O.

Doug Nadorozny
Acting Chief Administrative Officer
Digitally Signed Feb 26, 09

Consulting Engineer Services, Design and Supervision	5
Traffic Signals; New and Upgrades	1
Miscellaneous (Street Lighting, Crack Sealing, Contingencies, etc.)	4
Total	100

The percentage distribution is used as a guideline in the preparation of the three (3) year Capital Roads Program. Specific priorities or other opportunities (for example Federal/Provincial/Private funding) approved may require that the percentages vary from year to year. The percentages used in the preparation of the 2009 Capital Roads Program are as follows:

2009 Capital Budget Allocation	Guideline Percentage	2009 Percentage
Major Roads and Arterials	30	29
Minor Roads, Local Streets and Sidewalks	20	20
New Roads/Road Widenings	20	20
Bridge Rehabilitation	15	12
Storm Water Systems	5	7
Engineering Consulting Services, Design and Supervision	5	3
Traffic Signals; New and Upgrades	1	1
Miscellaneous (Street Lighting, Crack Sealing,Contingencies, etc.)	4	8
Total	100	100

Based on the current approved Capital Roads Budget, Staff recommends that the existing percentage distribution be maintained.

To determine projects in the first four (4) Project Categories (Major Roads, Minor Roads, New Roads, and Bridge Rehabilitation), an Overall Condition Index (OCI) criteria is utilized. The following criteria are used to develop the OCI:

Overall Condition Index (OCI) Criteria	Points
---	---------------

a)	Condition Rating/Cost Benefit: Roads are physically examined for structural condition, ride smoothness, truck traffic, traffic volumes and drainage. A computerized Pavement Management System (Deighton), which generates recommended rehabilitation strategies and costs by road classification and at pre-established budget scenarios is one of the tools used to develop the OCI.	30
b)	Safety: Are there any safety concerns that a project will solve	25
c)	Associated with Water/Wastewater Projects: Where water/wastewater construction or rehabilitation is required, the road will be restored/upgraded if warranted.	20
d)	Economic Development Opportunity: site specific in conjunction with proposed development (commercial and/or residential).	15
e)	Environment and Traffic Congestion Issues: It has been demonstrated that reducing bottlenecks and resulting idling can reduce carbon monoxide and carbon dioxide between 50% and 80%.	10
Total		100

The annual Capital Roads Budget allocation and OCI are used to develop the Capital Roads Program. The 2009, 2010, and 2011 Capital Roads Program have been based on the above budget allocation guideline percentages and OCI criteria.

Policy Discussion Papers - Decision Requested



For Information Only

Top Soil Removal & Site Alteration By-law

Presented To:	Priorities Committee
Presented:	Wednesday, Mar 04, 2009
Report Date	Monday, Feb 23, 2009
Type:	Policy Discussion Papers - Decision Requested

Recommendation

Recommendation One:

THAT the City of Greater Sudbury maintain prohibition of removal of top soil within the Agricultural Reserve outlined in the draft Top Soil Removal & Site Alteration By-law presented on January 21, 2009.

Recommendation Two:

THAT provision be developed within the draft by-law which would allow the City of Greater Sudbury to "grandfather" existing top soil stock piles in the Agricultural Reserve which were established prior to January 1, 2009.

Finance Implications

If the development of a By-law is approved, there will be a minimal impact to the City of Greater Sudbury as only approximately \$50,000 of topsoil is purchased annually by the municipality.

Signed By

Report Prepared By

Guido Mazza
Director of Building Services/Chief
Building Official
Digitally Signed Feb 26, 09

Recommended by the Department

Bill Lautenbach
Acting General Manager of Growth and
Development / Planning Director
Digitally Signed Feb 26, 09

Recommended by the C.A.O.

Doug Nadorozny
Acting Chief Administrative Officer
Digitally Signed Feb 26, 09

Background & Purpose

Further to Council's Priorities Committee's initial presentation of the "Top Soil Removal and Site Alteration By-law" on January 21, 2009, staff was instructed to conduct a public meeting to present the draft by-law and provide opportunity for input by the general public, local agricultural community and top soil producers.

Staff facilitated a public meeting on February 10, 2009, at 5:30 p.m., at Tom Davies Square in Committee Room C-11. All representatives from the previous two public hearings held in 2006, as well all local top soil producers in the Bell Telephone Yellow Pages were sent registered mail invitations to attend. Newspaper notices of the public meeting were also posted in the Sudbury Star, Northern Life and Le Voyageur for a two week period before the meeting date.

Approximately 35 - 40 individuals attended the public meeting which generated feedback on some key aspects of the draft by-law. Minutes of the meeting were taken and are included as Appendix 'A' to this report. Subsequent to this meeting 10 written submissions were made. Staff has engaged some top soil producers to further discuss their concerns.

The report provides Council with a summary of some of the key comments made on the by-law and a proposed response. This report also seeks Council's direction with respect to two options that could be pursued relating to the future treatment of existing top soil removal operations.

Summary Comments (Received from the Public Meeting)

Proposed Moratorium Area

Planning and Official Plan issues took up 70% of the feed back that evening. The speakers took issue with the definition of what lands were included as Agricultural Reserve in the new amalgamated Official Plan and the majority would have liked to see more lands included in the area proposed for a moratorium of top soil removal since some of the lands, as much as 10%, have already had some top soil removal activity to date. The issue of the inability for owners to sever parcels for some to garner revenue to support agricultural activities was also raised.

Moratorium/Grandfathering

The current draft by-law proposes a moratorium on top soil removal within the reduced Agricultural Reserve. The industry raised issues that sites currently being operated both within and outside the new Agricultural Reserve should be grandfathered to allow continuation of revenue generation on investment and job protection within the industry. Some individuals reported having valid permits under the existing Valley East By-law that in their minds justify their operations in the new Agricultural Reserve within the boundaries of the former Town of Valley East.

Prescriptive vs. Objective Based Regulations

The industry raised issues related to the significant prescriptive measures detailed in Schedule 'B' of the draft by-law which appear too restrictive and do not allow for alternative design options to deal with dust control, siltation and storm water management issues.

Costs & Existing City Contracts

The producers indicated that existing City contracts for blanket purchase order supplies will be affected by the increased cost to comply with regulations within the by-law. Further, these additional costs will be passed on to other consumers. The current contracts expired at the end of December, 2008, with an option to extend for 2009 and 2010, subject to mutual agreement on applicable rates. The total expenditures last year amounted to approximately \$48,000. Neither the City nor the contractors are committed to any rates as of yet for 2009 or 2010. If a mutual agreement cannot be reached, the contract would be re-tendered.

It should be noted, we are currently working with our civil consultants to define the cost implications to the industry of the by-law to bring further clarity on this issue when we come back to the Committee in April.

Mining Operations & Mining Act

A verbal and written submission by a representative of the mining industry was submitted requesting exemption from the by-law based on the fact that their activities related to the by-law are governed by the Mining Act, which is regulated by the Province and these plans are already commented on by the City and subject to stringent regulations.

Residential Site Alteration Activity

Concerns were raised by both the industry and the public on the impact of the by-law on residential landscaping activities based on the restriction of no more than 0.6 metres grade differential, triggering provisions for a permit.

Summary Response (Staff)

The majority of the Planning Act issues revolved around the Official Plan definition of “Agricultural Reserve” raised at past public meetings as part of that process and are regulatory issues governed by provincial authority.

The boundaries of the new Agricultural Reserve are governed by Ontario Ministry of Agricultural, Food and Rural Affairs (OMAFRA), the Canada Land Inventory Classification of Soils, and the Province. The boundaries were set by the latest Official Plan process for the Agricultural Reserve and cannot be changed at present. Council could extend the boundaries of the prohibition beyond the defined Agricultural Reserve at a future date if they so wish.

In 2005, the Province amended its provincial policy statement amending severance rights in agricultural areas.

Proposed Modifications to the Draft By-law

The following modifications to the draft by-law are suggested to incorporate the concerns received by staff at the public meetings:

1. Provide an additional exemption from the by-law for site alteration activities on mining sites covered under a Closure Plan as defined in the Mining Act.
2. Provide for the use of landscape architects as an additional professional qualified to undertake a Control Plan Design.
3. Modify Schedule ‘B’ “Control Plan Requirements” to provide a more performance based document based on objectives instead of the current prescriptive version to allow the industry and professional engineer more flexibility in design to achieve objectives of the by-law.
4. With respect to the initial phasing in of the by-law, provide for a transitional Conditional Permit to allow applicants to apply for permits immediately without full Control Plan documentation allowing the industry to continue delivering product and design professionals time to gather information and put documentation together for City review, with the undertaking of operating within the objectives of the by-law.
5. Provide additional clarification within the by-law that residential landscaping activities, which are

captured within other municipal regulations and by-laws such as the existing Site Grading By-law, the Planning Act, Site Plan Approval process, Subdivision Grading Plans and the Ontario Building Code, are exempt from this by-law.

Required Council Direction

The remaining issues of whether existing operations within the by-law proposed prohibition of removal of top soil within the Agricultural Reserve is a matter requiring some direction of Council to staff.

Currently, based on last year's 2008 aerial photo survey and Valley East's by-law permit data base, we believe that we have the following existing situation:

- i. Three (3) parcels have top soil removal activity within the Agricultural Reserve under permits issued as part of the former Town of Valley East By-law.
- ii. Eleven (11) parcels within the Agricultural Reserve have top soil removal activity with no permitting,

Given that the permit applications for the above would be denied, the current by-law provides for appeals for these individuals through the Hearing Committee of Council for any decisions to refuse permitting within the confines of the Agricultural Reserve. Further, Council is within its authority to place a prohibition on the removal of top soil to protect its diminishing agricultural resource as per the Ontario Municipal Act, Official Plan Policy, Planning Act and Provincial Policy Statements.

Permits not acted upon at this stage or properties purchased with the intent of top soil removal within the reduced Agricultural Reserve would still be subject to the moratorium on removal since this speaks to the speculative nature of investment as opposed to those currently showing activity which sometimes takes 2 to 3 years to achieve a marketable product.

Therefore, Council is presented the first recommendation for direction by staff on this issue. The recommendation below is supported by staff.

Recommendation One

THAT the City of Greater Sudbury maintain prohibition of removal of top soil within the Agricultural Reserve outlined in the draft Top Soil Removal & Site Alteration By-law presented on January 21, 2009.

However, in the spirit of fairness, we have been approached by those individuals as part of this public process who have submitted for permitting under the old Valley East by-law and others for grandfathering. The grandfathering, it is suggested, would only allow them to clear what has been currently stock piled for processing no further. All provisions of the new by-law would apply with respect to protection of adjoining properties/structures as well as rehabilitation.

The grandfathering would allow the material which has been processed and thus been subjected to some investment by property owners or producers to be salvaged for return on investment but no further new removals to be initiated. Council has been presented with the second recommendation for consideration and direction of staff. The recommendation below is supported by staff.

Recommendation Two

THAT provision be developed within the draft by-law which would allow the City of Greater Sudbury to "grandfather" existing top soil stock piles in the Agricultural Reserve which were established prior to January 1, 2009.

Next Steps

Based on this update for Council's information and direction provided by Council's resolution, staff will revise the draft by-law to suit the public input and Council's wishes. We will continue consulting with top soil producers and the Agricultural & Top Soil Advisory Panel in the next month to discuss these and other key comments on the draft by-law with a view toward bringing a revised by-law back to the Committee on April 22, 2009, for final consideration.

Attachment

APPENDIX 'A'

Minutes of Public Meeting

**PUBLIC MEETING
TOP SOIL REMOVAL & SITE ALTERATION
DRAFT BY-LAW**

Date: February 10, 2009

Time: 5:30 p.m. – 8:25 p.m.

Place: Committee Room C-11, Tom Davies Square

Present: Guido Mazza, Director of Building Services/Chief Building Official
Jason Ferrigan, Senior Planner
Kris Longston, Senior Planner
Paul Baskcomb, Manager of Community & Strategic Planning
Eric Labelle, Assistant City Solicitor
Al Bonnis, Nickel District Conservation Authority
Alex Sorensen, Dennis Consultants
Corrie-Jo Delwo, Coordinator of Permits & Approvals Integration
Valerie Klotz, Recording Secretary

Discussion:

Mr. Mazza, Chair, advised the group that Council's Priorities Committee meeting on January 21, 2009, had requested a public meeting be held on the draft by-law. The intent was to include comments received at this meeting from the public in a report to the Priorities Committee at their March 4, 2009 meeting. The matter would then proceed to Council for their meeting on March 24, 2009.

Before opening the floor to comments and questions, Mr. Mazza gave a PowerPoint presentation entitled "Top Soil Removal & Site Alteration By-law" that outlined the historical background of the by-law, results of Public Meeting Information Sessions, Comparison to other Municipalities, Exemptions from the By-law, Top Soil Removal Permits, Permit Fees, Applicants' Responsibilities, Enforcement and the Next Steps.

Maps depicting the previous and current Agricultural Reserve areas for the City of Greater Sudbury were on display.

It was noted that under the new Official Plan, the Agricultural Reserve has been reduced from 78,000 acres to approximately 14,400 acres. The City determined what lands would be protected through the Official Plan adoption process. The new Official Plan adoption process started 2003 and concluded in 2006. As many as 90 meetings were held including Public meetings, some held in individual communities. The reserve was dealt with as part of the consultation process. The reserve protects agricultural lands from commercial and residential development.

Susie Bell, local farmer, expressed concern on how the City determined what areas would be designated as Agricultural Reserve. She noted because her land is in the Agricultural Reserve, she is unable to server her land in order to have her children build their own homes on the family property. She also noted that some of the land in the new Agricultural Reserve has already been stripped so it

seems pointless for this land to be “protected”. She is upset that the Agricultural Reserve has been reduced and that she didn’t know her land was in the reserve until she applied for a lot severance. She felt that the City didn’t do its homework when it chose which lands to put in the Agricultural Reserve.

Mrs. Bell also asked how farmers are being protected as they receive no financial support. What is the City prepared to do to assist people who want to continue farming? What happens when farmers have to sell their land because they can’t afford to continue to farm? She noted that sod farmers are stripping land and expressed concern about what’s going to happen to that land. If farmers can’t continue, sod farmers may take over the land and strip it.

Mr. Ferrigan responded that this is a complicated issue that many municipalities and provinces face. The City has an Agricultural Advisory Panel in place and they are bringing the matter forward to those who can help, such as the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Affairs. She could also write to her MPP regarding her concerns with lack of financial support for farmers.

Mrs. Bell asked why sod farmers are exempt. Mr. Mazza responded that they are considered exempt according to the Municipal Act. Sod farming is viewed as a gentler way of stripping soil. If citizens want to have sod farming removed from exemption, they could lobby the government, perhaps through the City’s Agricultural Advisory Panel.

Mrs. Bell asked if there was any way the boundaries of the Agricultural Reserve could be changed. Mr. Ferrigan responded that the City has a legal obligation to review its Official Plan every 5 years and Council may decide to expand the reserve when the Official Plan comes under review.

Mr. Ron Bradley, former City Councillor, addressed the group. In his position as City Councillor, he attended many conferences and stressed the importance of agriculture at every opportunity. He realizes the need for a top soil removal by-law which is long overdue. He noted that since 1985, people have wanted something done about top soil stripping. In the past, sod producers used to take 2½ inches of soil. However now, with improved equipment, not as much soil is removed.

Mr. Bradley hopes that rural areas will be well taken care of and that no mess is left behind after the land is stripped. Mr. Bradley provided photos of an 80 acre parcel of land that had been stripped. Top soil stripping shouldn’t take place in residential areas as the resulting dust issues have been problematic. Mr. Bradley agreed that there was too much of a reduction to the Agricultural Reserve.

Mr. Lee Riehl, 608 Bonin Street, Azilda, expressed his concern about the reduction of the Agricultural Reserve. He indicated several farms that weren’t included in the reserve that should be protected. He doesn’t understand why they weren’t included. He also felt that sod farms shouldn’t be exempt.

Mr. Mike Soenens, 333 Bonin Road, Chelmsford, questioned why some areas were left out of the reserve and if there was any way that City Council could expand this area. He commented that the draft by-law is a good first step in regulating top soil removal.

Mr. Ferrigan noted that citizens still have the right to farm in areas outside of the reserve. People outside of the reserve have the right to sever land unlike those in the reserve.

Mr. Guy Beaulieu, 4764-22 Regional Road 15, Chelmsford, stated that he is a top soil operator and has been for the last 20 years. When viewing his past projects, people would find it difficult to tell that soil had ever been removed. He offered to show these lands to anyone interested. He noted that in his business, they have to plan ahead. He indicated that there is no farming taking place on the lands designated for stripping and that our area is actually not conducive to farming due to the climate.

Mr. Beaulieu feels that the proposal contained in the draft by-law is erroneous and involves too much paperwork. He doesn't feel it's necessary to have a consultant involved. Revenues generated from the business are low. He's not against a by-law as long as it's reasonable and affordable and allows for a grandfather clause. If the by-law comes into effect in March, they will suffer significant losses. He noted that his firm is under contract with the City to provide top soil until 2010. He wondered what would happen to his contract if the by-law comes into effect. Growing top soil involves a 2 year process. They can't just stop it overnight. He would like the grandfather clause to remain in effect for at least 5 years to cover any leases they have on lands for stripping. After that time, they will decide whether they want to remain in the business or not. This industry generates jobs that Sudbury can't afford to lose.

Mr. Eric Labelle, Assistant City Solicitor, addressed Mr. Beaulieu's concern about his contract with the City, noting that he didn't have a response at this time and the matter would have to be considered by City Council at an upcoming meeting.

Mr. Lionel Brosseau, 470 Vermillion Lake Road, noted that he also has a contract with the City to supply top soil until 2010. He has 20 stock piles on his land and asked if he would have to put a fence around each pile. Mr. Brosseau noted that this places a burden on the industry and will increase prices. He would like the grandfather clause to remain in effect for 5 years.

Mr. Mazza responded that fencing, stock piles and dust control would be covered in the Control Plan prepared by the design consultant. He also drew attention to a sample site plan on display. Mr. Mazza noted that the by-law will have an appeal process that will be heard at City Council.

When questioned if the City has a map showing where top soil has already been removed, Mr. Mazza noted that the City hopes to create a data base that will show where stripping has occurred that will aid someone wishing to purchase property for farming. Prospective purchasers will be aware of what lands in the Agricultural Reserve won't be able to sustain agricultural activity. We currently have some of this information in a data base for Valley East.

Mr. Charlie Annett, 797 New Coben Road, Chelmsford, asked if it would be possible to take soil samples from areas that have been stripped to determine what can be grown (e.g. grain and canola). He would like to know how much it would cost to rehabilitate the land to get it farm ready.

Mr. Denis Charbonneau, 216 Seguin Street, asked how the City determines what is viable farmland and non-viable farmland. He noted that growers should be following Ontario Sod Growers Association guidelines, selling just sod, not top soil. Perhaps the City could stipulate that it will only use growers that follow these guidelines when tendering projects. He offered to provide the City with a copy of these guidelines.

Eddie Czerkas, 3348 Regional Road 15, a local cattle farmer, noted that the lands now designated as Agricultural Reserve actually contain 50% bush or swamp. This is not viable farm land. The City should have picked other spots for future preservation. Some of the best agricultural soil, for example on Dominion Drive, isn't included in the reserve. Top soil strippers should be encouraged to use non-viable farm land.

Mrs. Monique Laforge, 3480 Highway 69 North, Val Caron, expressed concern that some areas such as Dominion Drive and Kalmo Road are no longer in the reserve. She's noted top soil removal activity and wonders about what is happening with this land. She stressed the importance of preserving our streams, forests and wild life from the effects of erosion, pollution, etc..

Mr. Baskcomb asked her to provide him with a specific location after the meeting and he will research the area in question.

Mr. Steve Bene, Sudbury, asked how the City obtained its criteria to designate lands as Agricultural Reserve. Was any field work done?

Mr. Baskcomb responded that the Ministry of Agriculture, Food & Rural Affairs identified the area which was designated as Agricultural Reserve. The Provincial Policy Statement provides a definition of prime agricultural land and field work did take place. Agricultural Reserve land determination is soils based. During the Official Plan adoption process, there was too much land deemed as Agricultural Reserve in the previous Official Plan.

Mr. Don Theriault, 4537 Regional Road 35, Chelmsford, noted that even though we should be protecting land that has good soil, not all of this land has been designated Agricultural Reserve. Why is the City protecting farm land that has already been stripped? He doesn't understand why the City doesn't leave land that's already been stripped and grandfather it for the top soil industry. It makes more sense to control areas that are already being stripped rather than have new lands stripped outside the reserve. He noted that his industry needs a certain amount of acreage in order to make the business viable.

Alison (no last name given), spoke on behalf of a friend in the top soil business that was unable to attend the meeting. She reported that she had looked through top soil by-laws of other municipalities such as Guelph, Kingston and Brampton and felt that it was unfair for the City to request local farmers to employ a professional engineer. The City of Guelph provides this service from their City Engineer. The City of Kingston has the stipulation that "other similarly qualified persons" could provide this service. It's too expensive for local top soil producers.

They feel that a parcel registry is an undue burden and that a legal description should be sufficient. With respect to security, Kingston only asks for 10% up to \$200,000 then 1%. The Control Plan requirements depicted in Schedule B in the City's draft by-law is 14 pages, compared to the City of Kingston's ¼ to ½ a page.

An immediate moratorium doesn't allow businesses to plan and is unreasonable. The word "moratorium" has a negative connotation. They will be stuck with stock piles. They feel they should be able to use the land for the same purpose as when they bought it. The City has destroyed their future plans for the land. The City of Kingston has a transitional provision in its by-law that allowed people time to clean up their affairs. Local sod producers can't afford to hire engineers and the requirements of the Control Plan are too much for them to bear.

Mr. Mazza noted that the draft by-law has not been passed by City Council and the moratorium is not yet in effect. The by-law does require a professional engineer and unfortunately, the City is not able to provide the services of an engineer to the industry. A professional engineer carries errors and omissions insurance and follows a prescribed Code of Conduct. He noted that these other municipalities may have a broader tax base to draw upon to provide engineering services to the industry.

Mr. Max Sinclair addressed the group and noted that the City has spent a lot of time and effort creating this draft by-law. He noticed that the most recent amendments to the by-law are not included in the draft copies circulated at the meeting. He was advised that the amended exemptions will be added to the by-law (e.g. mine sites).

Mrs. Claire Viau, 4339 Regional Road 35, Chelmsford, noted that there was a large parcel of land that was stripped across from her property that is now barren. She is also upset that she can't split her land for her sons to build on as she is in the reserve. She bought the land so she could pass it on to her children. She has been approached by a company that wants to lease her land to strip.

Mr. Mazza concluded the meeting by thanking those present for attending and providing their comments. These comments will form part of a report to the Priorities Committee on the draft Top Soil Removal & Site Alteration By-law in March.

/vk

Request for Recommendation

Shoreline Water Safety and Rescue

Presented To:	Priorities Committee
Presented:	Wednesday, Mar 04, 2009
Report Date	Wednesday, Feb 25, 2009
Type:	Policy Discussion Papers - Decision Requested

Recommendation

THAT Priorities Committee thank the members of the Junction Creek Safety Committee for their diligence and hard work in bringing the issue of shoreline safety to their attention and making recommendations which are the foundation for a city-wide shoreline safety and rescue program;

AND THAT the Priorities Committee recommend to Council that the City of Greater Sudbury establish an education and awareness campaign for shoreline and swift-water safety and a swift-water rescue training program as the first priorities for action in accordance with the recommendations set out in this report;

AND THAT the \$110,000 in one-time funding for implementation of safety and public education for creeks and water bodies be allocated as described in the report;

AND THAT staff be directed to implement this report and to keep Council apprised of the status of that implementation.

Finance Implications

In the 2009 budget, the Finance Committee allocated \$110,000 for the Junction Creek and Creek Safety Implementation Strategy. No additional funds will be required for 2009 and it is expected that these funds will be sufficient for a multi-year educational and awareness initiative.

Background

Attached

Signed By

Report Prepared By

Jamie Canapini
Co-ordinator of Strategic Initiatives and Policies

Digitally Signed Feb 25, 09

Recommended by the Department

Caroline Hallsworth
Executive Director, Administrative Services

Digitally Signed Feb 25, 09

Recommended by the C.A.O.

Doug Nadorozny
Acting Chief Administrative Officer

Digitally Signed Feb 26, 09

SHORELINE WATER SAFETY REPORT

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report will build on the recommendations presented to the Priorities Committee on June 25 and August 13, 2008 by the Junction Creek Safety Committee (“the Safety Committee”), relating to shoreline water safety and rescue. As directed by the Priorities Committee, the mandate was to “*coordinate, prioritize and report back*” on a city-wide action plan that will promote safety awareness and reduce water-related accidents. Based on our research, staff recommends that the priorities for immediate action be:

1. An education and awareness campaign focused on shoreline water safety.
2. A swift water rescue training program for firefighters.

In light of the huge areas of water within the city’s limits, which include still water and swift water (defined by the National Fire Protection Association (“NFPA”) as having a current greater than one knot, or 3 metres/sec.), creeks, rivers and lakes, various types of water bodies and conditions must be considered in order to ensure the utmost safety for all residents of Greater Sudbury.

To that end, and taking into account a reasonable allocation of limited resources, it was determined from all sources examined in this report that child and youth education, rather than physical barriers (such as fences) or warning systems (such as signs), represents the most effective foundation for the development of any shoreline safety strategy.

A list of contributors to this report and background references are attached as an Appendix to this report.

BACKGROUND

Junction Creek Safety Committee

The tragic drowning death of Adam Dickie in Junction Creek in August, 2007, prompted city Council to establish the Junction Creek Safety Committee, spearheaded by Councillors Landry-Altmann and Cimino. The Safety Committee brought together individuals and agencies with various relevant backgrounds to share information, concerns and suggestions in order to:

- establish educational and public safety programs
- review infrastructure criteria and capacities under extreme events
- review safety / rescue procedures.

To this end, the Safety Committee established three sub-committees:

- Communications / Education
- Infrastructure
- Safety / Rescue

Their dedicated efforts generated a series of recommendations outlined in their June 18, 2008 Progress Report, which the Priorities Committee subsequently directed be reviewed, considered and prioritized. In the interim, as a direct result of the Safety Committee's hard work, several actions have already been taken in furtherance of shoreline safety and awareness, as described below.

Mapping: Currently, Emergency Services is working with the City's geographic information systems staff to develop a standardized mapping system for Junction Creek and Nolin Creek. These maps will establish specific "rendezvous points", focussing on where roadways intersect with the creeks. The rendezvous points, partly based on the fire department's already established drafting points (where fire hoses and pumps can access a water source), are broken down by geographic areas along the length of the creeks and will be used as congregation points for coordination of rescue operations.

Once complete, the maps can be located in emergency units for reference as well as with EMS, Police and Fire Services dispatch centres. This will ensure that all responding units and dispatchers are operating from the same maps.

Discussions are also underway between Emergency Services and the Nickel District Conservation Authority ("NDCA") to host an information session for all emergency services. The objective of the session would be for NDCA to provide background information on the characteristics of the Junction/Nolin Creek system and the review the new Larch Street access point to the underground culvert. This information could be taken back to the respective emergency services to be shared with front-line staff.

Pamphlets and Education: The Sudbury and District Health Unit will be preparing bilingual educational pamphlets highlighting creek safety and reminding us of the Adam Dickie drowning ("Remember Me, Adam D"). These pamphlets will be distributed to neighbourhoods and schools bordering the creek areas and perhaps expanded to other water access areas in the future. The first set of pamphlets will focus on Junction Creek, and the Health Unit has agreed to assist in the development of a more generic version applying to swift water bodies in general. In addition, the Health Unit will partner with Greater Sudbury Housing Services, which will include the pamphlets in their existing mail-out program for tenants. The pamphlets will also be available at the Rainbow Routes trailhead information areas.

Since 2001, the Junction Creek Stewardship Committee has been offering an educational program to local schools called "Bug Search". Approximately 1,000 students have participated in the classroom and field trip portions of this program. In response to the Safety Committee's recommendations, this program now includes a message for swift water safety.

The Safety Committee's work also resulted in the NDCA reviving its spring thaw advisory program, which will now become part of the annual spring flood preparedness program for elementary schools.

In yet another positive outcome, the Health Unit set up an interactive display at the Children's Water Festival demonstrating the suction hazards of soft or silty creek/river bottoms. Over 800 grade three and four students took part in this event, which will now include further shoreline safety displays on an annual basis.

Memorial: Councillors Landry-Altmann and Cimino have initiated a dialogue with family and community members regarding the possibility of erecting a permanent memorial in memory of the 23 drowning victims of Junction Creek at the site of Adam's drowning.

These positive initiatives prompted by the Safety Committee's work are the foundation for the recommendations in this report as they relate to still and swift water safety in the broader community of Greater Sudbury. Accordingly, a brief overview of CGS's geography may be helpful.

Geography

The City of Greater Sudbury is 3,627 square kilometres in area, making it the largest municipality in Ontario based on total area - five times the size of Toronto and two-thirds the size of Prince Edward Island. CGS is quite unique in that fully one-third of the city's total surface area is covered by lakes (16.5%), rivers/creeks (12.2%) and wetlands (4.3%).

Greater Sudbury's geographic boundaries encompass over 330 named lakes greater than 10 hectares in size, with 112 of those being larger than 100 hectares, including Lake Wanapitei which is the largest city-contained lake in the world. The city's shorelines for lakes alone (i.e. excluding rivers, creeks and wetlands) measure over 2,700 kilometres. There are also hundreds of kilometres of rivers and creeks, including:

- Junction, Nolin, Copper Cliff, Frood, Maley and Garson Creeks
- Vermillion, Whitefish, Wanapitei, Whitson and Onaping Rivers

Historically, the downtown core of Greater Sudbury experienced flooding during high water events due to Junction Creek overflowing its banks. Over the decades, an active program of storm water management resulted in such flood events becoming virtually non-existent. Major capital projects completed by the NDCA include the construction of the Maley Flood Control Dam in 1971 and the Nickeldale Flood Control Dam in 1980 in the headwaters of Junction Creek. The 1,755 metres of box culvert built by the municipality and the Conservation Authority over the years provide significant flood protection for the downtown core by re-directing storm water runoff.

Most recently, as part of this ongoing process, the Larch Street bridge/culvert replacement is nearing completion, which incorporates a box culvert access structure that greatly enhances water access in the event rescue operations become necessary. Several other bridge/culvert replacements are envisioned, subject to availability of funding, including the Durham Street location where it crosses over Nolin Creek. Work is expected to commence on that project later this year.

In short, given the geographic nature of our “City of Lakes”, the issue of water safety goes beyond Junction Creek.

SOLUTIONS FOR SHORELINE SAFETY

As part of its broad overview of the various stakeholders’ input, the Safety Committee developed possible courses of action, which are examined below.

Restricting Access

Restricted access to waterways elicited varied perspectives, balancing safety with possible impediments to the use of trails and to rescue operations. The World Health Organization’s (“WHO”) “World Report on Child Injury Prevention” found that there is insufficient information to determine with any certainty whether restricting access to areas unsafe for swimming is an effective strategy. According to that report:

“While a barrier, for example, might be effective in preventing drowning in young children, this measure is not in general likely to keep older children and adolescents from accessing water.”

Similarly, there is no evidence that signage discourages children in such circumstances and it is not listed as an effective prevention measure by the WHO.

Currently the Rainbow Routes trail system encompasses over 120 kilometres of pathways, most of which border waterways. The stakeholder organizations responsible for trails and pathways feel that fencing areas along their borders would be contrary to their mission. For example, the 1991 Junction Creek Waterway Park Community Improvement Plan, as endorsed by Council, promotes increased access and use of the creek’s pathways:

“... interaction with the creek during non-runoff periods should be encouraged; safety concern should be a higher priority during high runoff or hazard periods.”

This is reflected in the CGS Official Plan, which states:

“...open space remains an integral component of the development. In particular, the linear open space system of the Junction Creek Waterway Park shall be maintained.”

In the preparation of this report, several municipalities that have urban waterways within their city limits were contacted to determine what, if any, policies or procedures were in place with regard to fencing. These municipalities include:

- Ontario - London, Brampton, Quinte West
- British Columbia - Kamloops, Chilliwack, Prince George
- Alberta - Wood Buffalo
- Saskatchewan - Regina
- Nova Scotia - Halifax

Even though most of these cities have experienced drowning deaths in the past, as a general rule fencing is not considered a viable part of a shoreline safety program due to various factors, such as interference with recreational pathways, the impracticality of fencing and/or erecting signs along lengthy shorelines, cost of installation and maintenance and the implication that areas that were not fenced or signed might be assumed to be safe.

A couple of municipalities do however erect fencing at specific locations, for example: at a retaining pond in a residential neighbourhood (Chilliwack); and where the threat exists of rapid changes in water flow conditions for drainage ditches (Halifax).

Currently CGS, like the municipalities mentioned above, has not implemented a fencing policy. Our practices are specific to individual circumstances. For example, Greater Sudbury Housing Services has fencing on their properties, however its purpose is to delineate the boundary lines. In addition, when deemed necessary CGS Parks Department maintains shorter “tot fences” along the edges of playgrounds where necessary to outline the safe play area. The Parks Department plans to erect such a fence at the Louis Street playground.

As an alternative to fencing, consideration might be given to planting bushes and shrubs along slopes to act as a buffer against someone accidentally rolling down the hill. This would be preferable to tree planting, which might interfere with the view of the bordering waterways. As a starting point, shrubs could be planted on the slope at the Louis Street playground, which borders Junction Creek.

Education and Awareness

Rather than physical barriers, the World Health Organization has commented that the most promising drowning prevention strategy for children involves targeted awareness-raising programs - in effect “psychological fencing”:

“Educating parents and caregivers about the risks for drowning is an important step for changing knowledge, beliefs and attitudes which in turn determine behaviour.”

This was confirmed through our interview process, during which each individual, without exception, strongly recommended putting our limited resources towards targeted education.

As a result, and in accordance with the Priorities Committee's direction to prioritize the Safety Committee's recommendations, it is felt that this recommendation be considered a priority action item by Council.

Raising awareness and providing information on water safety is only effective if it is coupled with a specific strategy aimed at changing behaviour by way of identifying high-risk target groups, developing a meaningful message, and ensuring that the message is received at a time and place where a change of behaviour is most probable (e.g. during high-water season, in schools, etc.).

Therefore, while shoreline safety is important to everyone, safety awareness is particularly essential for children aged 5 to 17, since the majority of drownings in that age group relate to natural waterway, non-motorized activities (as opposed to swimming pools or boats). A sound educational program targeting school-aged children could realistically achieve positive results, particularly when coupled with parental and public awareness initiatives.

One example of a targeted messaging opportunity involves the Junction Creek Stewardship Committee which, through the Junction Creek Educational Film Project, is currently producing a live action and animated film recounting the history of Junction Creek. There will be a particular emphasis on screenings in schools, which will be accompanied by supplementary educational materials provided free of charge to school boards. This Committee has agreed to include a swift water safety message in those materials.

In order to emphasize the need for swift water shoreline safety education, it is recommended that the City correspond with the various safety and lifesaving organizations such as The Lifesaving Society, The Canadian Red Cross, The Hospital for Sick Children's "Safe Kids Canada" and the NFPA's "Risk Watch", requesting that they review their national/provincial education packages in order to ensure that swift water safety is promoted. It may be of assistance to note that members of the CGS Health Unit's School Team sit on the "Risk Watch Coalition", which teaches safety to students (pre-kindergarten to grade 8) based on a national program, including water safety. In that capacity, the Health Unit should be strongly encouraged to support and emphasize the City's recommendation.

"Putting a face" to the education strategy would garner interest and humanize the process, taking it out of the realm of simple theory. In addition to the pamphlet campaign showing a photo of Adam, consideration might be given to partnering with the NDCA to initiate a billboard project in residential areas where shoreline safety is a concern, especially during the high water season. Such simple but high public profile projects must, however, be packaged with a targeted education and awareness program, as outlined above.

Rescue

Drownings in Ontario have declined approximately one-quarter since 1991, with the greatest decreases occurring in lake and river situations. However, it remains the second leading cause of death among children, second only to car crashes. Accordingly, it is important to ensure that our municipal rescue agencies receive proper training in this field, including swift water scenarios.

For the reasons to follow, we are also recommending that this be accepted as a priority item by Council.

Most drownings in Ontario occur while swimming. For children, the following statistics apply:

- *Under 5 years of age:* 95% of Ontario drownings occurred while the child was alone, with half of these fatalities involving backyard swimming pools, which is outside the scope of this report's mandate as it relates to open water situations.
- *Between the ages of 5 and 12:* 57% of Ontario drownings happened in lakes or rivers. For this age group, 63% of them were either playing in water or swimming, and one-quarter of them were either alone or with other minors.
- *Between the ages of 13 and 17:* 64% of Ontario drownings happened in lakes or rivers, with almost half of these involving swimming. Over half of them were either alone or with other minors.

With regard to rescuers, one recent study showed that while only 1% to 2% of firefighter-related incidents are swift water rescue calls, these accounted for an inordinately high frequency of firefighter deaths. In total, rescuer deaths represent one-third of North American drownings. This demonstrates that while swift water dangers form a relatively small percentage of emergency calls, they represent an exceedingly high risk not only to the victim, but to the rescuers as well. This is partly due to the natural instinct to enter the water in order to get to the helpless victim as quickly as possible.

Regarding the possible installation of anchor pins along the length of moving water bodies, fire rescue teams in Greater Sudbury are already trained to use natural or improvised features as anchor points for rescue lines where it is felt that this is necessary. Furthermore, rescue manuals emphasize the perhaps counter-intuitive warning not to tie a standard safety line to a rescuer near swift moving water. Should the rescuer be swept into the water, he/she could be inadvertently "pinned" underwater at the end of the tether, with the current preventing efforts to pull the rescuer back upstream to safety. According to an American expert in swift water safety, two firefighters died in this manner in 1995.

In the same vein, while it might be thought that a fixed horizontal cable across a moving body of water might be useful as a grab point for victims being swept downstream, this could act as a challenge to youngsters who may try to use it to cross a river/creek on a dare. Furthermore, there would be no way of predicting exactly where such lines should be installed given the great length of the waterways in question. Once again, firefighters are trained to use natural features to set up such a line should it become necessary on a case by case basis. This was in fact done during a recent Onaping River rescue.

On the topic of having a special alert for children in peril, Ontario EMS and fire rescue agencies have standardized communication procedures and terminology for dispatchers and crews, employed through a Computer Assisted Dispatch (CAD). Dispatchers are trained to obtain all relevant information from a caller in order to prioritize the urgency of the call and assign appropriate responding units. This information, which includes the nature of the emergency, condition of the patient and location assists in quickly determining the appropriate level of response.

It is recognized that a coordinated response to water emergencies is vital in order to ensure that a victim receives medical attention at the earliest possible opportunity. In possible drowning situations, minutes can be crucial in order to achieve a successful rescue operation.

In addition to the EMS mapping initiative described above, CGS's EMS, Fire and Police Services already meet on operational issues as required. Independent of the Safety Committee's recommendations, Emergency Services is currently in the process of drafting terms of reference for a formal joint emergency services operational group, who would look at interagency issues to improve coordination of response.

Addressing the Safety Committee's terms of reference relating to identifying rescue capabilities versus risk, statements from rescuers emphasized the significant hazards involved in water-based swift water rescues, including danger to the rescuers themselves (as mentioned above). It was therefore strongly suggested that shore-based water rescue training would represent an efficient use of limited resources, while at the same time increasing the safety factor for rescue personnel. Current rescue training for CGS firefighters relates to still water (shore and water based), boats and ice rescues.

The estimated initial and ongoing costs of swift water rescue training are as follows:

- Start-up costs of \$20,000 to have eight CGS firefighter personnel undergo instructor training, plus \$25,000 for the first year of CGS firefighter rescue training (which includes additional wages and expenses for 40 personnel). All remaining firefighters would be trained as shore-based emergency responders (e.g. riggers, safety personnel, lookouts, etc.), at no additional cost.
- Re-certification costs for the CGS instructors of approximately \$20,000 every two years.

Removal of Obstructions and Debris

For natural obstructions in creek beds, on a case by case basis a determination must be made as to whether this obstruction constitutes a safety hazard and/or unduly restricts water flow. A balancing of interests must be accounted for since, for example, Fisheries and Oceans Canada recommends that fallen trees may nurture important ecosystem and should be left in place, yet in some instances these may cause an obstruction resulting in a high-water situation.

Currently, there are processes in place dealing with fallen trees and other obstructions. For example, when the City is alerted to such obstructions, they will be removed by the Parks Department if within park areas, or otherwise by Roads and Transportation Services (Drainage).

In addition, the Junction Creek Stewardship Committee's "Adopt a Creek" program helps remove accumulated garbage where feasible, and many local grocery and department stores have their own programs in place for recovery of shopping carts, since these carts represent a significant investment for the business owner. It is suggested that the City facilitate a meeting of affected retail store owners and representatives of the NDCA and the Junction Creek Stewardship Committee with a view to discussion cooperative plans for recovery of abandoned carts along our waterways.

Nevertheless, without evidence linking waterway obstructions to drownings in CGS, it is not feasible to make any definitive recommendations regarding safety at this time, other than to invite further input from stakeholders and the community with a view to revisiting these particular issues under a future mandate.

Similarly, with regard to the *Drainage Act*, insufficient information as to the benefits, cost, and legal impact of such a designation is currently available, therefore this too may be brought forward at a later date.

Alternatively, given that these issues share a common theme, that being possible diversion of water flow, as reflected in the Safety Committee's recommendations these issues could be incorporated into the City's Storm Water Management Study in order to gather more detailed information. This study, which is examining water flow rates, is currently in progress however resource limitations have resulted in an extended time span for completion.

BUDGETING

During its budget deliberations on January 12, 2009, the Finance Committee allocated a one-time distribution of \$110,000 for a creek and moving water implementation strategy. Keeping in mind the two priority recommendations of an education/awareness campaign and firefighter rescue training made in this report, the following budget allocations are proposed:

- Swift-water rescue training \$45,000 (start-up cost)
- Education and awareness campaign \$50,000
- Junction Creek Memorial \$10,000
- Shrub and bush planting on slopes \$ 5,000

CONCLUSION

As directed by the Priorities Committee, the focus of this report has been to coordinate a review of the Safety Committee's recommendations through further consultation and research, prioritize those recommendations based on the outcome of those tasks, and report back to the Priorities Committee on specific recommendations.

Throughout all interviews, research and contacts, one common theme emerged: the importance of targeted education with a view to changing behaviours of children and youths, coupled with an awareness campaign for their caregivers and the community at large.

In addition, should a swift water emergency situation arise, the need for proper firefighter training that would increase safety to victim and rescuer alike has been demonstrated.

Accordingly, in addition to the commendable initiatives prompted by the work of the Safety Committee as described in the body of this report, it is recommended that the Priorities Committee support a shoreline water safety program and swift water rescue training for our firefighters, pursuant to the global themes outlined in this report.

APPENDIX

REFERENCE SOURCES

The following stakeholders contributed to this report:

- Junction Creek Safety Committee – Councillors Joscelyne Landry-Altmann & Joe Cimino
- Emergency Services - Joe Nicholls
- Fire Services - Bill Battison and Gord Stauffer
- Police Services – Todd Zimmerman
- Infrastructure Services (Operations-Drainage) - Ron Norton
- Nickel District Conservation Authority - Paul Sajatovic
- Risk Management - Bruce Drake
- Junction Creek Stewardship Committee - Carrie Regenstreif and Johanne Jamieson
- Parks Services - Kevan Moxam
- Rainbow Routes - Deb McIntosh
- Sudbury & District Health Unit - Shelley Westhaver and Ghislaine Goudreau
- Greater Sudbury Housing Services - Denis Desmoules and Robert Sutherland

Various research sources were examined, including the following:

- World Report on Child Injury Prevention (World Health Organization/Unicef)
- Water Smart Action Guide (Lifesaving Society)
- The National Drowning Report, 2000 Edition (Lifesaving Society)
- National Drowning Trends Report, 1992 – 2001 (Lifesaving Society)
- The Drowning Report, 2008 Edition (Lifesaving Society, Ontario)
- Facts about Child Drowning (The Hospital for Sick Children)
- Child & Youth Unintentional Injury, 1994 – 2003 (Safe Kids Canada)
- NFPA 1006 Standard for Technical Rescuer Professional Qualifications, and NFPA 1670 Standard on Operations and Training for Technical Search and Rescue Incidents (National Fire Protection Association)
- City of Lakes website
- Water Incident Research Alliance website
- Risk Watch website (NFPA)

In addition, outside agencies were contacted to obtain further details, including the Royal Lifesaving Society of Canada (for drowning statistics) and various other Canadian municipalities (to determine their shoreline water safety policies).



For Information Only

Constellation City Report - Workplan Update

Presented To:	Priorities Committee
Presented:	Wednesday, Mar 04, 2009
Report Date	Tuesday, Feb 24, 2009
Type:	Correspondence for Information Only

Recommendation

For Information Only

Background:

In 2006, City Council created a Community Solutions Team to conduct extensive consultations as to how the newly formed City of Greater Sudbury might be more responsive to the needs of its citizens. Over a period of eight months, the Greater Sudbury Community Solutions Team heard from approximately 700 citizens and had a series of working groups provide more detailed input on priority themes. Their final report, entitled "Constellation City: Building a Community of Communities in Greater Sudbury" was presented to Council in January 2007 and contained thirty-five recommendations.

One of those recommendations was that the City commits to an annual review of the recommendations over the four years of this term of Council, and that the review be made public.

Attached, for the information of the Priorities Committee, is a Chart which summarizes the recommendations from the Constellation City Report and for each, provides comments as to the status of the item. The Priorities Committee agenda is a public document, is available on the CGS website and hardcopies can be provided to citizens upon request.

Signed By

Report Prepared By
Caroline Hallsworth
Executive Director, Administrative Services
Digitally Signed Feb 25, 09

Recommended by the C.A.O.
Doug Nadorozny
Acting Chief Administrative Officer
Digitally Signed Feb 26, 09

Constellation City: Priorities Committee Reporting Plan - Update

Updated: February 24, 2009

Recommendation	Department	Comments
Introduction		
#1 That the City Council adopt a resolution declaring that the City of Greater Sudbury is a Community of Communities and that the Constellation City concept and its core values form the basis for municipal policies and decision-making in Greater Sudbury.	Administrative Services	The Priorities Committee of Council adopted this resolution on February 7, 2007.
Connected City: Communications		
#2 That the City of Greater Sudbury produce a municipal newsletter on a regular basis. It should be made available both in print and electronically and contain information on subjects such as capital projects, road standards and special events. Efforts should be made to link with and include local information from communities both inside and outside the city core.	Administrative Services	The first My!City/Ma!Ville quarterly Newsletter was distributed to all households in January 2007. Communications Staff have initiated the development of a Communications Strategic Plan, and as part of that process will consider how best to include local and area specific content in communications with citizens.
#3 That the City of Greater Sudbury establish an advisory group and develop a strategy to evaluate, revise, improve and promote municipal websites in order to enhance usability: www.greatersudbury.ca , www.sudbury.ca , and www.mysudbury.ca	Administrative Services	Following extensive consultations, the City of Greater Sudbury website has been revised and restructured to enhance usability.
#4 That the City of Greater Sudbury work with other community agencies to create a single directory of community services both in print form and on the Internet. This directory should build upon and link with existing directories of community services.	Community Development / Growth and Development	Citizen and Leisure Services reviews and updates the Community Contact list bi-annually for the Leisure Guide publication and for posting of the information on the CGS website. A community directory of over 900 groups, which is updated annually, is available at: http://www.mysudbury.ca/Communities/Index
#5 That the City of Greater Sudbury formulate a strategy to resolve issues controlled by private enterprise that are central to the well being of the city as a whole. These include Bell Telephone long distance charges, cell phone coverage and broadband Internet access.	GSDC / Administrative Services	Local Area Calling has been approved by the CRTC and was implemented in April 2008. G&D continues to work with service providers on "holes" in high speed internet service areas but many of the areas are not economically feasible to service with current technology costs.

Recommendation	Department	Comments
Connected City: Public Transit		
#6 That the City of Greater Sudbury undertake a full review of transit services and explore the potential for expanded intra-community transit, expansion of handi-transit and an end to two-tier fares. Full-year pilot projects should be undertaken to evaluate this potential, starting as soon as possible. Further, the city should establish an ongoing transit advisory group, using riders from across the entire community.	Growth and Development	The creation of the Transit Committee has had a significant impact on the transit system. They have been able to review all recommendations and concerns from customers across the entire community. An intra-community transit route has been running for over a year. With the elimination of the \$2 transcab fee we now have a single tier fare system. Since amalgamation, there have been over 45 new transit initiatives. Most of the new initiatives had as a goal to support all the communities within the City of Greater Sudbury. Transit ridership for 2005 was over 5 million trips.
Caring City: Council Meetings		
#7 That the City of Greater Sudbury Council hold at least six meetings per year in communities outside the city core.	Administrative Services	In 2007 and 2008, the Priorities Committee held meetings in communities outside the city core. Meetings with an emphasis on specific wards will continue and will be held at Tom Davies Square.
Caring City: Developing Staff Awareness and Sensitivity		
#8 That the City of Greater Sudbury develop orientation training sessions for all staff, new and existing, to be made aware of population diversity as well as the unique conditions and specific concerns of outlying areas in order to be able to communicate in an efficient and sensitive manner with all citizens. Further, that the City of Greater Sudbury establish a employment transition policy to ensure that knowledge gained through experience is retained.	Human Resources & Organizational Development	An "Employment Transition Policy" was presented to Council in May 2007. The HR Trainer is developing an employee orientation program and citizen service program for roll out in 2009.
Caring City: Citizen Service Centres		
#9 That the City of Greater Sudbury review the mandate of the Citizen Service Centre and Community Libraries, along with the menu of services available in each. The focus of the review should be on innovations that will improve access to services across the City, considering factors such as the distance residents must travel for service, the potential to expand the number of services available and the potential co-location of additional library and CSCs. Further, the review should consider the potential for mobile services, additional web services and the potential to enhance a lead staff position to allow that person to be more active and proactive in local community affairs.	Community Development	The Citizen Service Centres / Libraries continue to expand services to residents through onsite partnering with: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Social Services Employment Support counselors who provide vocational services to OW and ODSP recipients; • Housing Services in providing application forms and information on subsidized housing; • Service Ontario for increased accessibility to provincial services. Budget constraints have prevented hiring a Lead position so existing staff have become more involved with the CA

Recommendation	Department	Comments
Caring City: Caring for Volunteers		
<p>#10 That the City of Greater Sudbury develop a written Declaration of Support for community volunteer groups and local events. The declaration should clearly delineate the assistance that the city can provide as well as how individual groups and community event organizers can access this assistance. Further, that the City of Greater Sudbury continue to support growth of programs and services of Volunteer Sudbury/Sudbury Bénévolat and encourages efforts to bring these services to community groups in smaller communities. Further the declaration should outline the obligations that community groups might have to meet and provide an updated contact list of staff who can provide support to such groups.</p>	Community Development	<p>Since amalgamation, various special events have been grand-fathered into the existing system and these processes have not yet been harmonized. In addition to harmonizing processes and rates for community halls, the support provided to community groups will also be reviewed. Once the standardization, as approved by Council, has occurred then the next steps will include the development of an official declaration.</p> <p>To assist various community groups running events, additional equipment has been purchased (ie: equipment trailers to ease the transporting of tables, chairs, etc.). A budget option will be presented during the 2010 budget process to reflect projected increases in demands for both equipment and staff costs.</p>
<p>#11 That the City of Greater Sudbury work with the Greater Sudbury Police Service to reduce or eliminate the fee for police checks for volunteers who provide valuable service for community events, community groups and non-profits.</p>	Community Development / Greater Sudbury Police	<p>Volunteer Sudbury and GSPS are in ongoing discussion regarding police check fees for volunteers.</p> <p>Social Services, in co-operation with GSPS have implemented a more efficient payment process to assist clients in obtaining police checks.</p>
<p>#12 That the City of Greater Sudbury review how the City formally recognizes individuals and groups and consider ways to improve recognition in all communities.</p>	Community Development	<p>Annual Volunteer Recognition events currently exist in addition to Civic Awards. The direction of volunteer recognition is being reviewed to ensure equitable and effective recognition is provided to all volunteers throughout the CGS.</p> <p>For 2008, the Civic Awards Ceremony was moved to coincide with National Volunteer Week. Nominations are reviewed by Volunteer Sudbury, City Council representatives and the Community Partnership Section.</p> <p>In 2008, Volunteer Sudbury was relocated to Minnow Lake Place.</p> <p>Volunteer Sudbury is working with the Ontario Summer Games 2010 Organizing Committee to recruit volunteers for this summer event.</p>

Recommendation	Department	Comments
<p>#13 That the CGS review gaming regulations and procedures as they apply to non-profit and volunteer groups and develop options to make the regulations simpler and less onerous. Further, that Council work with the Federation of Northern Ontario Municipalities and the Association of Municipalities of Ontario to lobby the provincial government to make changes to provincial regulations to provide more flexibility for use of funds and simpler reporting standards.</p>	<p>Growth and Development</p>	<p>The Alcohol and Gaming Commission have revised their regulations that make to easier for seniors groups to obtain a lottery licence.</p> <p>The Licencing Section have revised the Lottery Licence Application such that is much easier to complete.</p>
<p>#14 That the CGS nurture the creation and support the operation of a special events group that can share expertise on managing of major/minor special events.</p>	<p>Growth and Development / Community Development</p>	<p>A Special Events Manual has been created and is pending finalization. Key processing information is now publically available on the CGS website and is updated regularly.</p> <p>Working in partnership with Economic Development and community groups, a series of meetings were held in 2008 to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Address concerns specific to Bell Park; • Review all special events occurring with CGS. <p>Funding for a 7 month contract position for a special events co-ordinator remains to assist groups in the planning and implementation of annual special events.</p> <p>The 2009 budget enhancement requesting the conversion of the 7 month contract to a full time position was not approved. This same budget enhancement will be put forward in 2010 as the conversion to full time would provide enhanced supports to local groups.</p>
<p>Sustaining the Rural Environment</p>		
<p>#15 That Council continue the development of a comprehensive by-law to govern the use of All Terrain Vehicles (ATVs) within the CGS.</p>	<p>Growth and Development</p>	<p>This action is being driven by the Leisure Services Section in particular, G. Pafford. An ATV Committee has been struck and a report will be forthcoming in early 2009.</p>
<p>#16 That the City of Greater Sudbury continue to investigate the environmental impact of current road salting practices, research alternatives and propose a strategy to reduce the impact of road salt or mitigate the damage it causes, while ensuring traffic safety.</p>	<p>Infrastructure Services</p>	<p>Staff continually monitor the industry for effective alternatives to the use of salt.</p>

Recommendation	Department	Comments
Empowered City: Municipal Wards		
#17 That the City of Greater Sudbury undertake a full review of the number of municipal wards and their boundaries in order to better recognize the diversity and the large geographic size of the City of Greater Sudbury. The intent of this review is to allow better representation and a more natural grouping of communities of interest in each ward. Further, the Community Solutions Team recommends that the geographic boundaries of the former towns of Onaping Falls and Capreol each form the basis for a single ward in any new system.	Administrative Services	Priorities Committee approved a new Ward Boundary Review Policy on February 20, 2008.
Empowered City: Increased Transparency		
#18 That the City of Greater Sudbury create a full list of municipal infrastructure along with a transparent list of capital priorities and criteria for support and that this list is made available to the public on an ongoing basis.	Infrastructure Services	Staff are completing an inventory of all municipal infrastructure. The current three (3) year capital list of projects is approved annually by Council and is available to the public. The list of future priority projects will be available to the public.
#19 That the map-based inventory of existing services infrastructure throughout Greater Sudbury be updated and promoted to the public for the purposes of indicating the ability of the infrastructure to support expansion of current subdivisions or new development.	Infrastructure Services	The City is expanding use of GIS mapping of municipal infrastructure. This information along with an accurate inventory will allow staff, with the assistance of current computer modeling, to better estimate available capacity and to identify needed growth areas. This recommendation would require a significant investment in GIS.
#20 That the City of Greater Sudbury conduct an annual review and produce a written report on the status of all major studies undertaken by the municipality since 2005.	Administrative Services	Information related to major studies is incorporated into the business planning cycle and described in business plans and Council reports as appropriate.
#21 That the City of Greater Sudbury adopt a policy on the use of consultants which ensures better use of existing expertise and establishes clear criteria for the use or retention of consultants.	Finance	The Policy is being developed and will be presented to the Priorities Committee in 2009.

Recommendation	Department	Comments
Empowered City: Empowering Local Communities		
<p>#22 That the City of Greater Sudbury continue to encourage the development of Community Action Networks at the local community level. Further, that the CGS establish Terms of Reference for 12 Area CANs across the City. These Terms of Reference are to include a role for CANs in the following municipal areas: Planning Public Consultation; Economic Development; Community Development, including funded projects; Municipal Newsletter and Communications; Pre-Budget Consultation including capital planning; Assisting with full utilization of existing community spaces; Building links with community policing efforts. Further that the territories of six of the area CANs have the same boundaries as the former municipalities of Onaping Falls, Walden, Capreol, Valley East, Rayside Balfour and Nickel Centre and, that the territories of the six remaining CANs encompass the area of the former City of Sudbury and that the former unorganized townships annexed in 2001 be added to the territory of the adjacent CAN. Further, that the City of Greater Sudbury provide meeting space and a basic office for Area CANs and itinerant municipal staff within local community buildings. Further, that the City of Greater Sudbury designate an individual employee as the staff liaison for each of the Area CANs and that each employee so designated be responsible for no more than three Area CANs and that these employees spend at least 25% of their time working in the Area CAN locations. Further, that the City of Greater Sudbury establish a key contact list, by municipal section, for each Area CAN and, that staff from all municipal sections be encouraged to attend CAN meetings, work out of Area Can locations and also have the requirement to follow up on issues raised by CANs or liaison staff.</p>	<p>Senior Management Team / Community Development</p>	<p>The Terms of Engagement for CAN's was prepared incorporating the Public Participation Spectrum from the recently adopted Public Participation Policy which was presented to Council in May of 2008. In June 2008, the report was presented to Council and was granted approval.</p> <p>The Terms of Engagement helps to define the roles of City Staff and CAN Members at varying levels of the public participation spectrum.</p> <p>Information on CAN's:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are 15 active CAN's within the CGS • The liaison responsibilities are divided amongst the 4 Community Development Co-ordinators (CDCO and the Manager within the Community Partnerships Section • CGS staff are available to respond to departmental questions • Annual administrative support funds were approved by Council and began in the Fall of 2008 • Survey conducted which identified subjects of interest by the CAN's • December 2008, the first CAN Forum was organized by the Community Partnerships Section • The next CAN Forum is scheduled for the Spring of 2009.
Empowered City: Reinvigorate Community Institutions and Facilities		
<p>#23 That the City of Greater Sudbury foster the development of local committees to work in a support or advisory capacity with city staff on issues including recreation, libraries, museums and parks.</p>	<p>Community Development</p>	<p>Staff will continue to work co-operatively and responsively with established Advisory Panels, neighbourhood associations, the Library and Museum Boards and community groups including the 15 Community Action Networks (CAN's) on issues regarding recreation programs, public libraries, heritage museums and parks and open space.</p>

Recommendation	Department	Comments
Equitable City: Maintaining Rural Areas		
<p>#24 That the City of Greater Sudbury establish clear and transparent standards for road improvements as well as summer and winter road maintenance and, that these standards be set by road segment and that this information be made public and available online using GIS technology. Further, that the City of Greater Sudbury make every effort to determine the standards and services levels for road maintenance that existed prior to amalgamation and ensure that this information is made available in the same manner as current standards for comparison purposes. Further, that the City of Greater Sudbury ensure that driving condition assessments and decision on winter control call outs are decentralized so that the municipality can better respond to variations in weather across the city. Further, that the City of Greater Sudbury proceed with implementation of a 311 telephone customer service tracking system and that the performance reports and issues summaries resulting from this system be made public on a quarterly basis. A similar system should be adopted for Internet based communications. Further, that the City of Greater Sudbury equip all public works vehicles with web enabled GIS transponder technology to allow citizens to view the locations of plows, sanders etc. on the Internet in real time. Such a system is already in place in St. John's Newfoundland.</p>	Infrastructure Services	<p>311 was implemented in February 2007, utilizing CRM which was upgraded to the Active Citizen Request (ACR) system at the beginning of 2008. There was a subsequent upgrade in mid October 2008. Our Dispatchers utilize ACR for service requests from the public that involve our Roads and Transportation Division and our Water/Wastewater Division. Calls are logged and tracked for action taken. The Department is working towards increasing the number of Infrastructure Services staff with access to the system, to allow for more immediate update of actions taken on service requests, and some of our forepersons are now trained and on-line. The Department is also in the process of adding more sections to the system, such as Construction Services.</p> <p>Winter Control Standards are to be reviewed in 2009. The City has not been able to establish stable summer service levels as Council continues to wrestle with budget implications.</p> <p>The City currently has GPS units on all plow/sander units and sidewalk plows.</p>
<p>#25 That the City of Greater Sudbury eliminate tipping fees for home or personal garbage, as well as the surcharge for tires, and, that the City of Greater Sudbury increase the minimum fine for illegal dumping to \$500 (the maximum permitted under the Provincial Offences Act). Further, that the City of Greater Sudbury continue to promote proper waste management and look for ways to increase public awareness.</p>	Infrastructure Services	<p>Staff continue to review and make recommendations to eliminate or reduce tipping fees for source-related items. The most recent changes include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The elimination of tipping fees for source separated 'other wood waste' to all generators. This category includes doors, cabinets, bookshelves, painted lumber, cupboards, etc. Wood waste treated with chemical preservative such as railroad ties, utility poles, pressure treated lumber does not qualify; and 2) The elimination of tipping fees for source-separated furniture from low density residential homes. <p>In 2009, staff will be conducting a pilot on construction and demolition waste. Results and recommendations will be presented to Council in late 2009 or 2010.</p>

Recommendation	Department	Comments
Equitable City: Facility Rates		
#26 That the City of Greater Sudbury establish a fair rates policy for the use of community facilities and fields across the CGS. Build upon the 2004 report of the Community Halls Solution Team and establish a harmonization rates review process for facility use, user fees for recreational programs and liability insurance costs for community groups. In determining fees, consideration should be given to community outcomes of fee changes and liability rates. The original intent of the facility as a focal point for community gatherings and celebrations, or as a recreational resource, should be weighed in the balance. Further, consideration should be given to establishing a dedicated staff position to coordinate and market facilities to maximize use and value to the community.	Community Development	<p>Leisure Services Staff will review facility usage as it relates to liability costs, user fees and access by community and local recreational groups in order to develop a fair and equitable policy.</p> <p>In the Fall of 2008, a preliminary meeting was held to review the past report to Council regarding Community Halls. More information was required and the committee will schedule regular meetings and bring forth a report to Council in 2009.</p>
Equitable City: Downtowns and Parks (Community Pride)		
#27 That the City of Greater Sudbury designate specific downtown areas in appropriate communities. Further, that the city commit to improving the development of downtowns in outlying areas and ensure that city programs that are established for the improvement or enhancement of downtowns and target areas be made available across the city.	Growth and Development	The GSDC has developed an incentive program for the core downtown area and reported to Council on June 13, 2007. It is expected that ongoing work with CAN's will further this effort in key areas throughout the city. Recent changes in Planning Act regulations related to CIP's will also offer opportunities to more easily advance these programs.
#28 That the City of Greater Sudbury improve maintenance standards and beautification for local parks, arenas, downtowns and neighbourhood entrances.	Growth and Development / Community Development / Infrastructure Services	<p>The Planning Section is leading the development of a beautification strategy for the community which will be presented to the Priorities Committee in the Spring of 2009.</p> <p>Carbon monoxide, propane detection and improved ventilation have been installed in all arenas. Energy savings measures including the installation of programmable thermostats and light sensors have been installed at various arenas.</p>

Recommendation	Department	Comments
Equitable City: Senior and Youth Services		
<p>#29 That the City of Greater Sudbury review the availability and type of services available to youth and to seniors in our city. Further, that the CGS develop a strategy to ensure that senior and youth services are more accessible and equitable across the city. Finally, the CGS should ensure that youth and senior representatives play an active role in the development of the respective strategies.</p>	Community Development	<p>Library Services has established two teen advisory groups (located in Valley East and at the Main Branch) which provide input regarding programs and collections that are of interest to teens.</p> <p>The Community Partnerships Section:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provided a report to Council (Dec 2006) regarding Greater Sudbury Youth Centers outlining the varied level of supports for these programs. • Drafted a budget option which was approved, providing annual funding to three area youth centers. • Dependent on budget and opportunity, report recommendations are reviewed and implemented. • Partnerships have been formed with Kids Help Phone, the Sudbury & District Health Unit, local Community Action Networks and Greater Sudbury Police Services to ensure that youth can access required services and are connected with their local community. • Section staff are active members of the Young Community Leaders Project Advisory Team. <p>The North East Specialized Geriatric Services (NESGS);</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will be opening April/May 2009 in Sudbury at the North East Centre of Excellence for Seniors' Health. • Dr. Jo-Anne Clarke, Geriatrician and clinical lead will collaborate with a specialized geriatric inter-professional team. • Will provide regional service to northeastern Ontario, including the City of Greater Sudbury. • It will provide education, best practice, consultation, research and evaluation and advocacy to meet the needs and diversity of the seniors' population.

Recommendation	Department	Comments
#29 (Cont'd)		<p>New 2-storey Dementia / Alzheimer Building:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pioneer Manor is currently constructing a new 2-storey building. The environmental design will specifically meet the needs of individuals diagnosed with Dementia. 32 beds on each floor for a total of 64 beds at a cost of \$14.6 million. Anticipated completion date will be June 2010.
Equitable City: Decentralization		
#30 That the City of Greater Sudbury investigate and report by department the potential to decentralize services with the intent to improve these services and service levels across the entire city. Potential changes should improve access while maintaining efficient use of municipal resources.	Senior Management Team	A report with options related to service delivery was presented to Priorities Committee on September 19, 2007.
Equitable City: Area Tax Rates and Electricity Costs		
#31 That the City of Greater Sudbury undertake a full review of tax rates in remote areas and establish rates that are more closely based on services provided.	Finance	Council reviewed area rating during tax policy discussions in the Spring of 2007.
#32 That the City of Greater Sudbury work with citizens and CANs in areas served by Hydro One to determine a position and strategy on unification that is in the best interests of those affected.	Greater Sudbury Utilities Inc.	On September 15, 2005 Council passed a motion, directing Greater Sudbury Utilities Inc. to pursue acquisition of Hydro One assets located within the City of Greater Sudbury. An update on this matter was provided at the annual Shareholder's meeting.
Equitable City: Equitable Representation on Boards and Committees		
#33 That the City of Greater Sudbury adopt a policy whereby communities of interest are considered for representation on city panels, committees and boards.	Administrative Services	Current practice is to appoint citizens based on equal opportunity and who are reflective of the demographic and geographical make up of the City of Greater Sudbury. This requirement can be further formalized as part of the comprehensive Procedure By-Law review, planned for 2008/9.

Recommendation	Department	Comments
<p>#34 That the City of Greater Sudbury formally recognize the importance of the local agricultural community, ensure that the preservation of viable agricultural land is a priority in development planning, and establish an Agricultural Advisory Committee to provide input on farm-related issues.</p>	<p>Growth and Development</p>	<p>The recently approved new Official Plan for the City of Greater Sudbury insures that agricultural lands are protected in keeping with provincial land use policies. The Agriculture and Topsoil Advisory Panel was recommended to Council in the report of January 31, 2007. Additional consulting work on a potential Top Soil Stripping Bylaw was funded by Council in the 2008 budget and work has now commenced.</p> <p>The Agricultural & Top Soil Advisory Committee presented recommendations for a draft by-law November 3, 2008. Approved for presented to Council. Council was presented a draft Top Soil Removal & Site Alteration By-Law and report at their meeting of January 21, 2009. Council required a public meeting be held prior to second reading at Priorities Committee. Public Meeting held on February 10, 2009. Final Presentation to Council's Priorities Committee on March 4, 2009. Council approval and by-law passing expected by April 2009.</p>
<p>Conclusion</p>		
<p>#35 That Greater Sudbury Council commit to a public review of the recommendations of the Community Solutions Team on an annual basis for the next four years and that a full report on the implementation and status of these recommendations be undertaken in 2010 and made public by September 1 of that year.</p>	<p>Administrative Services</p>	<p>The Priorities Committee passed a resolution that it be considered as the Implementation Committee which will guide and monitor the progress of implementation of this report. This table will be updated periodically and will be provided to the Priorities Committee.</p>