

**MUNICIPALITY OF THE DISTRICT OF ARGYLE  
COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE MEETING  
Tuesday, October 27, 2015  
Tusket, NS 6:30 p.m.**

**Present:** Warden Aldric d'Entremont; Deputy Warden Calvin d'Entremont; Councillors Danny Muise, Nicole Albright, Roderick Murphy Jr., Guy Surette, Kathy Bourque, Richard Donaldson; Chief Administrative Officer Alain Muise, Director of Finance Marsha d'Eon and Executive Assistant/Deputy Clerk Chris Frotten.

**Regrets:** Councillor Lucien LeBlanc.

The Committee of the Whole Meeting was called to order at 6:32 p.m. by Deputy Warden Calvin d'Entremont.

**Agenda:**

On a motion by Roderick Murphy Jr. and seconded by Kathy Bourque, the agenda was approved as circulated.

*Motion Carried*

**Conflict of Interest Declaration:**

Deputy Warden Calvin d'Entremont asked for any declarations of conflict of interest from the floor.

None declared.

**Presentations and/or Petitions**

None.

**Business Arising from the Minutes**

Municipal Administration Building

CAO Muise briefly reviewed the report on the assessment of administration building options which was sent to all Councillors by e-mail in advance of the meeting and which was attached to the agenda. He noted that the report was written using a financial lens and outlined the three options presented to Council: take no significant action, retrofit and expand the old building or build a new building.

Council questioned and discussed the following topics:

1. Whether the size of the building in the report was determined by staff or an external architect. CAO Muise explained that the chart was prepared by John Sullivan but the information originates from Robert Chipman, a local architect. He noted that staff requested that he evaluate the building and the current and future needs of the building.
2. The timing of the decision and the impact it could have on the upcoming election. Some Councillors sensed that the review process and subsequent decision could bring along the opportunity for misinformation and misunderstanding on the

- project, in an election year, and that the misinformation could negatively impact existing councillors.
3. The cost of a retrofitted vs. a new building. Some Councillors raised the issue of the cost of a new building and the possible overruns in such a project which would inflate the price. CAO Muise confirms that the price is estimated at \$263 per square foot, at 8,500 per square foot. While overruns are always possible, the price per square foot is estimated at a high number, and the Municipality does have the ability to influence design and size which would influence the final price.
  4. Councillors asked about what money would be used to renovate/construct. CAO Muise confirms that Council had committed \$100,000 per year for 10 years, starting in 1998, for this purpose. The report suggests that \$1,600,000 of savings should be applied to the project. The construction or retrofit of the administration building shall not be the cause for any tax increases, as most of the funds were saved in reserves over the years.
  5. The location of a new building. Some Councillors noted that the feedback they received was more regarding the location rather than the decision to do nothing, renovate and expand or build new. They reported that some residents preferred the location to remain the same whereas it did not bother others if it would change. It was noted that if a new building was decided, that the community could be engaged to determine the best location.
  6. The lack of accessibility of the building not only to residents but also to staff, Council, colleagues and visitors. Some Councillors expressed their shame and discouragement that the municipal building was still not barrier free. They noted that in the past, some Councillors could not attend meetings due to injuries and that, in our current condition, we would not be able to accommodate an employee that required barrier free access to our facility.

CAO Muise highlighted the impracticality of the building and the lack of function for providing a proper service to the residents. He expressed that this decision was a difficult one, especially with the fear of residents and Councillors around the cost. He also touched on the impact of amalgamation on services being provided to our region.

During the discussion it was raised that no decision should be made on the building at that time as a lot of residents were having trouble paying their bills and it would not look good on Council's part and a suggestion was made to put a moratorium on the decision for 2, 3 or 5 years. There was also some question around whether the construction of a wheelchair ramp would impact the necessity to renovate the entire building. CAO Muise requested additional information and explained he would research that for Council.

Council concluded with a discussion regarding public consultations and the importance of consulting the public correctly. They noted that it was essential to provide the right information and the proper amount of time to allow residents an opportunity to provide an educated opinion.

It is moved by Guy Surette and seconded by Roderick Murphy Jr. to table a decision on the municipal administrative building to the next meeting.  
*Motion Carried (8 in favour, 0 against)*

*Report Attached.*

### Private Roads

CAO Muise explained that the request for decision presented to Council was the same presented to them in July.

Council discussed the importance to think of all private roads and not only one road in particular. Council was cautious regarding the precedence a decision to attain ownership of the Montague Road could set. It was suggested that a policy be drafted or amended to reflect Council's position on the issue or that it be passed on to the PAC for review.

Councillor Bourque suggested that the owner of the road should be contacted before a decision was to be made.

It is moved by Guy Surette and seconded by Richard Donaldson that staff ensure that the wording in the Municipal Planning Strategy is clear on our position to not take over private roads. *Motion Carried (7 in favour, 1 against – Kathy Bourque)*

### **Financial Report**

Director of Finance d'Eon summarized the financial report at September 30, 2015, representing the half way point of the 2015-2016 fiscal year. She indicated an anticipated surplus at fiscal year-end. She noted the considerable positive variances in the revenues and a variety of positive variances in the expenditures which resulted in the anticipated surplus as at March 31, 2016 of almost \$160,811.

It is moved by Richard Donaldson and seconded by Roderick Murphy Jr. to accept the unaudited Financial Report at September 30, 2015.  
*Motion carried (8 in favour, 0 against)*  
*Financial Report Attached*

### **Other Business and for Decision**

#### Mariners Centre Feasibility Study and Heat Recovery Projects

CAO Muise mentioned that the two request for decisions presented came from Mr. Gil Dares', the Mariners Centre Manager, presentation to Council at the last meeting. He first reviewed the background of the feasibility study and then of the heat recovery project. He noted that the feasibility study is an information gathering exercise and the heat recovery project would have an impact on the operations of the Mariners Centre and could be paid for by the gas tax.

Council expressed that the Mariners Centre was a very popular regional asset that our residents use often but had some concern regarding the lack of ACOA funding for the first phase. CAO Muise explained that

It is moved by Richard Donaldson and seconded by Danny Muise to approve financial support of up to a maximum of \$5,000 for phase 1 of the feasibility study of the Mariners Centre's needs, coming from the capital reserve.  
*Motion Carried (8 in favour, 0 against)*

It is moved by Guy Surette and seconded by Roderick Murphy Jr. to request a formal letter from the Mariners Centre requesting funding for the project and approve funding

between \$56,000 based on the presented calculations and representing 33.3% of the incremental costs of the project.

*Motion Carried (8 in favour, 0 against)*

Approval of RFP - Active Transportation

CAO Muise presented an RFP, prepared by the Recreation Department with the help of the Province, for the preparation of an Active Transportation Plan for the Municipality and highlighted the goals that were hoped to be attained by the study.

It is moved by Aldric d’Entremont and seconded by Kathy Bourque to approve the RFP for the preparation of an Active Transportation Plan for the Municipality of the District of Argyle

*Motion Carried (8 in favour, 0 against)*

**Correspondence and for Information**

Waste Check Minutes - October 19, 2015

The Waste Check Enforcement Officer Report of February 2015 was circulated to Council. No action was requested by Council.

**Financial Requests**

None.

**Notice of Motion**

Councillor Bourque provided a notice of motion for a future meeting on the Hipson Bridge and its structural condition.

**Question Period**

None.

There being no further business, it is moved by Roderick Murphy Jr. and seconded by Kathy Bourque to adjourn the Committee of the Whole meeting at 8:25 pm.

Recorder  
Chris Frotten

Date Approved: \_\_\_\_\_

Chairman/Deputy Warden \_\_\_\_\_

Alain Muise, Chief Administrative Officer \_\_\_\_\_